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Abstract

In this study, I examine how terrorism is produced and consumed in communication. Using discourse analysis, I investigate how terrorism is constituted in the accounts of four women described in online news reports as having joined, or almost joined the so-called Islamic State (IS): “Alex,” constructed as having been lonely and flirted with IS; “Khadija,” presented as a schoolteacher turned member of IS’s all-women’s brigade; Laura, described as a woman whose partner abandoned her, who met a man online, and who brought her son with her to join IS; and Tareena, referred to as a health worker who brought her child with her to join IS. My analyses address how each interview can add to our insights about becoming a woman of IS. I make four arguments. First, terrorism is mobilized through interaction. Second, the double bind is a dynamic uniquely applicable to women because becoming a member of IS can be examined as an act of gender resistance. Third, accounts of becoming a woman of IS work as rhetoric designed to prevent other vulnerable people from being recruited. Fourth, terrorism is mobilized through narrative storytelling, especially through the use of paralinguistic features in the building of accounts. By researching terrorism as communication, and focusing in particular on four women’s interviews of their recruitment experiences, this dissertation contributes to new, applicable, and actionable interventions designed to counter and prevent the violence of terrorism, as well as to research about women, terrorism, and communication.

Keywords: terrorism, women, media interviews, discourse, accounts, multimodality, rhetoric
Introduction:

“The man just saw my make-up and waved me through.”

Just a few years after World War II ended, Simone de Beauvoir (1949/2009) wrote, “On ne naît pas femme: on le devient,” which has been translated to, “One is not born, but rather becomes, woman” (p. 330). This means that woman is a category of discourse. As such, the category of woman emerges, by implication, in opposition to the category of man. This also acknowledges that woman is a social and political category, and through social interaction, the construct of woman is ideologically built and rebuilt into what we treat as a natural group.

Another French writer, Monique Wittig (1993), explains how this ideological building happens:

We [women] have been compelled in our bodies and in our minds to correspond, feature by feature, with the idea of nature that has been established for us. Distorted to such an extent that our deformed body is what they call ‘natural,’ what is supposed to exist as such before oppression. Distorted to such an extent that in the end oppression seems to be a consequence of this ‘nature’ within ourselves (a nature which is only an idea). (p. 103)

I open this project with de Beauvoir’s notion that one is not born, but rather becomes, woman, because for me this idea was the catalyst of this dissertation.

Since well before I began this dissertation, I have been writing about gender, communication, and terrorism. In my work, I aimed to identify how gender, and identity more generally, develops over time in different contexts. I focused on how identities were constantly built and rebuilt through processes of communication. Understanding gender in this way meant
recognizing identity as the variable modes of an individual’s acculturation, or the processes through which people come to acquire cultural meanings and forms that are embedded and implicated (Butler, 1986). Since our identities, what we understand as our “selves,” are created and recreated in social interaction, identities are, therefore, processes that are constantly unfolding, never ending. When I write, one of my aims is always to show how identities are social. My interest in how identities are constructed in communication led me to wonder how this happens in multimodal contexts, namely in news reporting about people who have been labeled terrorists. My curiosity led me to analyze case after case of women online news reports have called terrorists, namely how those women are constructed in online news report discourse, and the public storytelling about those women’s joining terrorist groups. Through my research and writing about these women, I saw how, one is not born, but rather becomes terrorist, and how that becoming happens through communication.

In this project, I study how identity is constituted in communication. To do this, I analyze what are presented as interviews of four women whom online news reporters construct as having joined the group that calls itself the Islamic State (IS). Since 2013, the transnational Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group, IS, also known Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), ISIS, and Daesh, has seized areas of Iraq and Syria and continues to threaten the wider region (Blanchard, Humud, Katzman, & Weed, 2015). Akin to de Beauvoir’s observation on womanhood as social becoming, I see the stories we tell and circulate about terrorism become what we understand as terrorism. In my analyses, I point out how the various stories, or ideas (Wittig, 1993), about how a woman becomes a terrorist are built and rebuilt. As each text unfolds, different accounts are built about the phenomenon of becoming a woman of IS, including the where, when, why, and hows of the process. I show how, in the four texts, the four women
develop and produce accounts, or what Prior (2015) defines as, the “explanatory devices that describe ruptures in the social order and speakers’ attitudes toward and role in those events - as well as their representation in the ‘here-and-now’” (p. 56). In the following section, I offer an overview of women’s involvement in terrorism.

**Herstories of Terrorism**

Since well before the events of 9/11, terrorism has been a prominent topic of discussion in both public and academic discourse fora. Most recently, “by the 1990s, and certainly since 2000, women have been increasingly involved with Islamist and jihadi terrorist organizations throughout the world, as well as right-wing and left-wing (e.g., environmental, animal rights) terror in the United States and Europe” (Lindemann, 2015, p. 1). Though women have been involved in terrorist and politically violent organizations for centuries, women and girls are often presented in public and academic discourse as though they are completely new to the world of terrorism. Scholars are simply limited by a “willingness to look” (Lindemann, p. 1) at herstories like these.

Women have been and continue to be tactically and operationally crucial to the future of terrorist organizations. Events of the last few decades show girls and women serving as the “ideal stealth weapon for terrorist groups” (Bloom, 2011) because they are highly effective not only in their organizations’ attacks, but also in recruitment efforts. As the following herstories of terrorism illustrate, the past is “replete with examples of women and terrorism,” women were “among the first to join terrorist movements,” and, in fact, “the very first person tried in a court of law for terrorism” was a woman, Vera Zasulich (Bloom, 2017, p. 1).

In 1878, with a revolver hidden under her shawl, Vera Zasulich, a woman and anarchist for the Narodnaya Volya (the People’s Will) in Tsarist Russia, and Masha Kolenkina shot the
Governor General of St. Petersburg. Governor General Trepov survived the assassination attempt, and Vera Zasulich was arrested and tried for attempted murder (Bloom, 2016b). At the time, Vera Zasulich’s trial was called the trial of the century, and huge crowds attended, including all of Russia’s intellectual elite:

On the stand Zasulich balked at the attempted murder charges levied against her. ‘I am a terrorist… not a murder! [sic]’ She proudly proclaimed. Vera was ultimately acquitted as the crowd lifted her out of the courtroom and carried her on their shoulders in victory.

(Bloom, 2016b)

After the trial, Zasulich was celebrated as a martyr for the oppressed social classes, and she even became the face of the revolution. Calling herself a “terrorist,” Zasulich publicized that she considered what murderers do to be quite different from what terrorists do: the latter group carries out their actions for a particular political purpose or cause, while the former does not.

In addition to Vera Zasulich, many women served as key members of the Narodnaya Volya (the People’s Will) organization, including Vera Figner, Sophia Perovskaya, Maria Oshanina, and Anna Yakimova; in fact, women constituted as much as one third of the core leadership of the People’s Will (Bloom, 2016b). After Vera Zasulich was found not guilty, and was then carried away on the shoulders of the crowd:

several other prominent female anarchists were tried for terror related plots. The women of Narodnaya Volya, including Sofia Perovskaya and Vera Figner, participated in several high-profile operations and were involved in one of the anarchists’ last operations, the assassination of the Russian Czar. (Bloom, 2017, p. 2)

Women’s involvement in terrorism and political violence goes well beyond 1800s Russia.
On September 30, 1956, during the Algerian War of Independence, a woman named Zohra Drif planted one of the first bombs that targeted the French quarter of Algiers, Algeria. This act at the popular Milk Bar café has been “viewed as a heroic measure instrumental in the eventual independence of Algeria,” and has made Zohra Drif “one of the notorious heroines of the Front de Libération Nationale’s independence movement during the Algerian War” (Hubbell, 2016, p. 1). The explosion that resulted from the bomb Zohra Drif planted killed three civilians and maimed and wounded sixty others, including children. Once captured in 1957, Zohra Drif was “sentenced to twenty years hard labor” (Cixous, 2009, p. 163). When Algeria won its independence in 1962, French President Charles de Gaulle pardoned Zohra Drif, and she later served Algeria as a “non-elected senator appointed by the president,” Charles de Gaulle (Vince, 2015, p. 169). In addition to women in Russia and Algeria, women in countries in the Middle East have also been involved in terrorism for many years.

In August of 1969, Palestinian liberation fighter Leila Khaled became the first woman to hijack an airplane (Euronews, 2016). After the event, she underwent cosmetic surgery so that she could do it again (Viner, 2001). Leila Khaled took control of a TWA flight en route from Rome to Athens and Tel Aviv that was carrying 113 passengers and seven crewmembers, and diverted it to Damascus (Cragin & Daly, 2009). Once there, Leila Khaled and another Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) member blew up the Boeing 707’s nose section. After the event, the Syrian government arrested the hijackers but released them without charge two months later (Goodenough, 2017). Khaled recounts, “I had a pistol in my belt, a grenade in my pocket and TNT in my bag. I was a woman dressed in a fashionable way. I opened my bag for security but the man just saw my make-up and waved me through” (Kendall, 2015). In addition to being a prominent member of the PFLP, classed as a terrorist organisation by the European Union and
the U.S., Leila Khaled is a symbol of Palestinian resistance, member of the Palestinian National Council, and icon of female power (Euronews, 2016; Viner, 2001). For generations, women have participated in violent terrorist acts and have served as terrorist groups’ operational leaders.

In the mid-1970s, two student teachers at Belfast University, Delours Price and Marian Price, served as two of the four operational leaders in a Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA, or IRA) cell that was responsible for having conducted a series of bombings in London (Cragin & Daly, 2009, p. 82). After having been arrested and tried, Delours and Marian Price were imprisoned for the attacks until 1980 (Cragin & Daly). Since the 1980s, women in terrorist organizations transitioned from more frequently engaging in “soft” tasks like logistics and recruitment, to more frequently assuming visible frontline roles (Raghavan & Balasubramaniyan, 2014).

From 2000 until 2018, women have taken increasingly active roles in carrying out violent acts including, but not limited to, taking hostages, hijacking airplanes, and executing suicide bombings (Sjoberg & Gentry, 2011). In 2010, a woman known as the deadliest identified woman suicide bomber in history, Dzhanet Abdullayeva, killed 38 people when she blew up a Moscow tube train (Blair, 2015).

More recently, in April of 2016, a woman suicide bomber blew herself up and wounded thirteen people in the Turkish city of Bursa near the city’s 14th century Grand Mosque, a historic symbol of the city that was the first capital of the Ottoman Empire (Agence France-Presse, The Telegraph, 2016).

Only a few months later, in September of 2016, a twenty-nine year old woman reporters refer to as, “Ornella G.,” was charged for a “failed terror attack” on Notre-Dame in Paris, France.
She has been identified as being part of a women’s terror “commando” guided by the so-called Islamic State (Chrisafis, *The Guardian*, 2016; Amiel, Hume & Haddad, *CNN*, 2016).

In an article about the terrorist group, Boko Haram, Dionne Searcey (2016) explains that, in many ways, women are ideal weapons in terrorism because, “at security points run by men, they are often searched less thoroughly, if at all. Tucked under the bunched fabric of dresses or religious gowns, explosives are easy to conceal” (p. 1). For decades, a trademark of terrorists has been the woman suicide bomber: in the Chechnya conflict, they were nicknamed, “black widows,” and in Sri Lanka, they fought with the Tamil Tigers (Searcey). From 1985 to 2008, women committed approximately one quarter of all suicide bombings (Bloom, 2011).

Another account of women’s involvement in terrorist organizations focuses on their physical, emotional, and relational contributions to terrorist groups. In addition to serving in operational, tactical, and recruitment capacities for such organizations, girls and women have been constructed as crucial to their terrorist organizations because of their biology: terrorist groups use girls and women’s bodies as incubators for future terrorist group members. In organizations like IS, girls and women are also expected to nurse and raise “Cubs of the Caliphate,” i.e. children who are groomed to be “the next generation of fighters” (Bloom, 2016c). For terrorist groups, and IS especially, “women are a tool or an instrument, to be exploited for whatever purposes necessary, and their objectives are ultimately longevity, survival and to flourish” (Mackintosh, 2017).

In organizations like the Taliban, al-Qaeda, and IS, women are also used as tools “to recruit other women, reward militants, retain their base and produce the next generation of fighters” (Mackintosh, 2017). This is evident, for example, in al-Qaeda’s *Al Shamikha* (Arabic for “Majestic Woman”) magazine, a publication that has been dubbed “Jihad Cosmo” (Bloom,
2011; Mackintosh, 2017). As the publication’s preamble reads, “women constitute half of the population - and one might even say that they are the population since they give birth to the next generation” (Huffington Post, 2011). According to the results of a London counter-extremism think-tank’s investigation, in 2016 over 31,000 pregnant women were living in the so-called Islamic State, and were being used to “create the next generation of terrorists” (Cowburn, 2016).

Women’s presence as “frontline activists, propagandists, and recruiters is increasing around the globe” (Bloom, 2017). Terrorist attacks have become more frequent over the last several years, and more and more of those events are involving attackers who are women. On November 13, 2015, violent events in Paris and Saint-Denis, France resulted in 137 people dead and 368 injured. In the events’ aftermath, twenty-six year old Hasna Aitboulahcen blew herself up as police stormed “the terrorist lair where she was holed up [with] fellow Islamic State terrorists” suspected of being Paris and Saint-Denis attackers, and in so doing Hasna Aitboulahcen became Europe’s first woman suicide bomber (Sawer & Samuel, 2015).

Just two weeks later, on December 2, 2015, a mass shooting and attempted bombing in San Bernardino, California killed 14 and seriously injured 22 (FBI, 2015; Comey, 2015). Syed Rizwan Farook and Tashfeen Malik, a married man and woman, the latter having pledged allegiance to IS on social media, targeted a San Bernardino County Department of Public Health training event and Christmas party (BBC, 2015b). At the time, this attack was the deadliest mass shooting in the U.S. since the Sandy Hook Elementary School shooting in 2012 (Schuppe, Chuck, & Kwong, 2015; BBC, 2015a), and the deadliest terrorist attack to occur in the U.S. since 9/11 (Chang, 2015).

Only six months later, twenty-nine year old Omar Mateen, a man who had pledged allegiance to IS, killed 49 people and wounded 58 at Pulse, a nightclub in Orlando, Florida. Until
January 2017, that event was not only the deadliest mass shooting, but also the worst terror attack that has taken place on U.S. soil since the events of September 11th (Ellis, Fantz, Karimi, & McLaughlin, 2016).

Online news reports about attacks like that of San Bernardino connect these violent acts to the terrorist group, IS. Uniquely, in that reporting, women are accounted for as agents who are, increasingly, playing crucial roles the planning, the execution, and the aftermath of such events. In the following chapter – Chapter One: “How is it that the thing comes off?” – I introduce my analytical framework by explaining how I orient to terrorism as social inter-action, and addressing the four premises about terrorism and communication that I use to organize this project.
Chapter One: “How is it that the thing comes off?”

Terrorism as Social Interaction

The U.S.’s overall budget for intelligence evidences this nation’s commitment to strengthen intelligence collection and critical counterterrorist operations (National Intelligence Program, 2015). Since 2010, counterterrorist expenditure has ranged from $65 billion to more than $80 billion (FAS, 2015; Sahadi, 2015). Defending a country against terrorism is expensive. For example, the total of the U.S.’s Military Intelligence Program top line budget request for fiscal year 2017, including the base budget and Overseas Contingency Operations funding, was $16.8 billion. According to U.S. national security budget expert, Gordon Adams, the U.S. spends at least $100 billion a year on counter-terrorism efforts, and this amount spent on defense and counter-terrorism is far more than that of any other country in the world (Sahadi, 2015). The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute reports that the U.S.’s military expenditures alone surpass those of the next seven countries combined: China, Russia, Saudi Arabia, France, the United Kingdom, India and Germany (Sahadi). Statistics like these show the U.S.’s fiscal dedication to fighting terrorism. Yet, while national and international initiatives continue to financially support counterterrorist security operations, the current understanding of terrorism is both limited and limiting.

Terrorism is currently conceptualized, and therefore treated, as a phenomenon that exists in particular individuals, and that is because those individuals commit certain violent acts. Thus, the claim, as tautological as it might be, is this: terrorism is somehow in terrorists because
terrorism is what terrorists do. To illustrate this, let us consider a few official definitions of terrorism.

According to the U.S. Department of State, terrorism is the actions of “sub-national groups or clandestine agents” (2002).

The FBI’s definition of terrorism is certain individuals and groups’ “unlawful use of force or violence” (2005). To the FBI (2015), terrorism refers to acts dangerous to, or violent toward human life, that violate federal or state law, and that appear to be intended to intimidate or coerce a civilian population, influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion, or affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping.

Similar to the FBI’s definition, the U.S. Intelligence Community is guided by the definition of terrorism contained in Title 22 of the US Code, Section 2656f(d): “premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents” (Central Intelligence Agency, 2013). These models conceptualize terrorism as being particular actions of certain people who are categorized as dangerous. I take a different tack.

I orient to terrorism as social inter-action. This means that I take terrorism out of individuals, and empirically examine how terrorism is reproduced as such through communication, in people’s social practices. By doing this, I treat terrorism as communication. I work to develop this alternative orientation in an effort to contribute to new, applicable, and actionable interventions that are designed to counter and prevent the violence of terrorism. I consider researching terrorism as communication to be a way of informing international and domestic counterterrorist intervention. Because of this, I design my study to contribute to those ongoing practical efforts.
I set aside notions of terrorism as a pathological condition of people known as terrorists. I leave to others examinations of terrorism as a criminal and/or immoral symptom of political and social decay, as a cause for war, or as a source of chaos and uncertainty. I focus exclusively on accounts about joining IS because my aim is to learn about terrorism as a construct that is constituted *in* communication, *of* communication, and *for the purposes of* communication. By recontextualizing terrorism in communication, I investigate terrorism by analyzing accounts by and about women joining IS. In my analyses, I discuss what each of the four texts illustrates about the phenomenon that I refer to as, becoming a woman of IS.

I write about women, exclusively, to contribute to representations of and scholarship about terrorism, because women and girls continue to be either left out, or merely glossed over in research about terrorism. I study the four texts that I do because they have yet to receive the scholarly attention they deserve. This is especially the case because they are among the few publically accessible, first person accounts of women who have gone through processes of recruitment into IS.

In the following section, I introduce the premises that guide my research. I outline my theoretical commitments about communication and terrorism that inform my research approach. I then situate my project in scholarship on communication and terrorism. Finally, I describe how this project is organized.

**Research Premises**

Identity construction is an ongoing process (Beauvoir, 1949/2009; Butler, 1986). An individual is not born a woman, a citizen, or a terrorist; an individual becomes each, or all of those, and that becoming happens over time, and it happens in communication. Through and with communication, we learn how to assume identities, enact roles, join groups, affirm beliefs,
subscribe and solidify ties to organizations, pledge allegiance to entities, develop goals, and execute plans. By using a communication framework, I show how discourse is consequential because of how discourses, such as those of terrorism, classify and move bodies, change people’s perceptions of and engagement with the world, and, thus, work as social action.

Though symbolic, language has real-life, material consequences. This is evident in how linguists are recruited in politics. For instance, during political races, linguistics point out how politicians’ use of specific metaphors to describe issues can impact those politicians’ political campaigns. Certain language use “works” by reframing how audience members understand particular political issues, and this explains how particular kinds of language-in-use can influence voting trends.

To illustrate this point further, let us consider the recent work of cognitive linguist George Lakoff. When Democrats repeat certain phrases like “tax relief,” Lakoff explains, they play right into Republicans’ hands; this is because that phrase “suggests that taxes are an affliction that Americans need to be rescued from,” and “casting taxes in that light ensures that those proposing the taxes become villains, while those fighting against them become heroes” (Abadi, 2017, p. 1). As Lakoff puts it, “When you argue against the other side using their language, and quoting them, then you’re helping them [...] The ball is in their court, you’re playing on their field, and you’re trapped” (Abadi, p. 1). The point Lakoff is making is that political messaging is all about framing. This example of linguistics in real life circumstances illustrates how language in use is an integral form of social action in people’s lives because it is through language that people learn how to (or how not to) occupy roles and play certain parts in our communities. Through and with communication, we learn what it means to be a Democrat, Republican, Independent, citizen, mother, woman, and/or terrorist. In this sense, communication
is productive. Extending this notion, terrorism as communication is productive, and among the ways terrorism is productive is how it works rhetorically.

Four premises about communication and terrorism guide this project.

**First premise: Terrorism works as rhetoric.** To study communication is to investigate how we create, express, and convey our knowledge of, and attitudes toward reality, and how we accomplish all of that through our uses of symbol systems. In this project, I focus on “terrorism” reality, and I focus on the symbol systems of discourse. Studying phenomena through a communication lens means exploring the micro practices of social construction. Studying communication as doing identifies communication as agentive in meaning-making processes (Austin, 1955/1962; Butler, 1997). All language is symbolic action, and when we use language we use symbols to do things (Burke, 1966). Because of this, terrorism works as rhetorical communication because, as symbolic action, terrorism is designed to have a persuasive or impressive effect on its audience. To understand terrorism as rhetoric, then, is to recognize terrorism as communication that is wielded to accomplish a purpose with a target audience in mind.

To exemplify how terrorism works as rhetoric, let us consider a case. Certain government officials use particular messages about terrorist groups to gain their country people’s support for their decisions, for instance to go to war. In such a circumstance, language works as social action because particular messages, each of which is made and experienced through communication, function by shaping people’s realities. It is through communication that people are able to gain the support of other people to lead a country, or even alliances of countries, to war. It could be said that terrorism works as rhetoric because it is action that is orchestrated to create a response
in those who observe it. In this way, terrorism is strategic communication, and terrorism works through rhetorical acts that are recipient-designed.

I analyze accounts of and about women joining IS by focusing on how, in each of the four texts’ contexts, terrorism functions as rhetorical communication. To investigate this, I attend to how rhetorical strategies are used in the texts, and how terrorism works as dramatic or symbolic action that is intended to communicate perceptions of certain situations, acts, and actors.

Studying how terrorism is communicative means attending to how, in terrorism contexts, discourse is used to create and recreate social order/s. By “discourse,” I mean extended samples of spoken or written language, as well as interactional processes of producing and interpreting speech and writing between speaker or writer and addressee or reader, and situational contexts of language use (Fairclough, 1992). In order to attend to how discourse is used to create and recreate the social order, I examine the collaborative production of accounts in the four mediated narrative accounts of IS recruitment that I analyze.

**Second premise: Terrorism is comprised of, relies on, and accomplishes accounts.**

Terrorism is constituted *by* and *in* what Garfinkel (1967), Buttny (1993), and Scott and Lyman (1968) call accounts. At the same time, terrorism serves *as* an account of actions, events, and people. In an account, a communicator uses language to assert things, as well as to do things (Austin, 1955/1962; Burke, 1966). Terrorism serves as an account because it works as dramatic or symbolic action (Burke, 1968).

In their well-known work on accounts, Scott and Lyman (1968), as cited in Cooren, Taylor, and Van Every (2013) define accounts as “deployed in instances where social norms are violated by personal behavior to result in disapproval or sanctions” (p. 188). Scott and Lyman
define accounts as “statements made to explain untoward behavior and bridge the gap between actions and expectations,” and used in circumstances in which an action is being subjected to “valuative inquiry” (p. 46). In this project, I adopt a social accountability understanding of communication because the data that I analyze are comprised of accounts. The four women featured in the data are offering statements in order to explain what are constructed as their untoward behavior, or actions of joining, or almost joining IS.

On a larger scale, the mediated narrative accounts of recruitment that I analyze serve as accounts because they are everyday accomplishments in the maintenance and mending of social organization and order (Scott & Lyman, 1968). This is so because the texts that I analyze are sites of sensemaking.

Interviews are sites of sensemaking because accounts work as retrospective and prospective sensemaking tools. Sensemaking is “the process through which individuals work to understand novel, unexpected, or confusing events” (Maitlis & Chistainsen, 2014, p. 58). According to Karl Weick (1995), sensemaking is also a heuristic. I understand this to mean practical epistemics, i.e. knowledge that emerges in the moment. However, sensemaking is not limited to the in-the-moment work that we do to come to understand events. This is because we make sense and account for the present in light of the past, and we make sense interactionally: sensemaking is a collaboratively produced dynamic. When we encounter moments of ambiguity or uncertainty:

[we] seek to clarify what is going on by extracting and interpreting cues from [our] environment, using these as the basis for a plausible account that provides order and “makes sense” of what has occurred, and through which [we] continue to enact the
Sensemaking is about interpretation. Sensemaking is also about authoring. When we do sensemaking, we actively author events and collaboratively create frameworks we use to understand. In this way, we “play a role in constructing the very situations [we] attempt to comprehend” (Sutcliffe, 2013; Weick, 1995; Weick et al., 2005).

In addition to being sites of sensemaking, interviews are sites where individuals build accounts to work to retrospectively and prospectively maintain, as well as presently attend to possible breaches in social organization and order. As Scott and Lyman (1968) explain, social actors use accounts to explain their own and others’ unanticipated or untoward behavior to “shore up the timbers of fractured isolation [...] throw bridges between the promised and the performed, [and] repair the broken and restore the estranged” (p. 46). Therefore, those presented as interviewees and interviewers, as well as the producers and reporters featured in my data engage in accounting in an effort to offer explanations of the four women’s joining, or almost joining IS. Following Scott and Lyman’s model, this means that the women’s joining or almost joining would be the unanticipated or untoward behavior that is being placed under the microscope in and by the online news reports. To phrase this another way, when the four women joined, or attempted to join, IS, they breached the social order. Therefore, when they are featured in the mediated narrative accounts of recruitment that are presented as interviews, these four women are being held accountable for their actions. They are put in the position of providing explanations that might serve to, in some way, correct that breach, or at least acknowledge it as such.
Scott and Lyman (1968) also define accounts as what serve as “manifestations of the underlying negotiation of identities within speech communities,” as either excuses or justifications, and as socially approved vocabularies that “neutralize an act or its consequences when one or both are called into question” (p. 46). Considered in this way, the accounts in the texts I analyze are social actions that are undertaken to repair the breaches that took place. The account building that happens in each of the four mediated narrative accounts that I analyze is an attempt to bring each of the four women back into alignment in the social order. Therefore, the account building works as an attempt to help the audience see how each woman became a woman of IS, and how this happened through communication.

Like Scott and Lyman (1968), Goffman (1971) similarly recognizes the socially transformative nature of accounts. To Goffman, accounts are necessary as forms of redress when actions are no longer routinely or tacitly accounted for. Accounts, then, are offered when individuals accused of an indiscretion or crime seek to transform the meaning of their act of wrongdoing. Tying accounts to matrices of social ties, or accountability, Goffman explains that individuals build accounts to reposition an act that originally seems offensive by changing it into one that is socially acceptable (p. 109). To achieve this, the accused individual relies on what he calls remedial strategies.

In the first strategy, the accused denies or admits that the act happened and conveys that they are not responsible for and/or could not foresee the negative outcome of the act (Goffman, 1971, p. 109-112). In the second strategy, the accused apologizes by splitting themselves into two parts: a guilty part and a part that “stands back and sympathizes with the blame giving, and by implication is worthy of being brought back into the fold” (Goffman, p. 113). In the third strategy, the accused defends their actions, noting that the victim granted a request prior to the
act, and is therefore partly, if not solely, responsible for the outcome (Goffman, p. 115).

Regardless of which remedial strategy a person uses, Goffman asserts that two processes occur in these situations: the first is a restitutive process in which the victim receives some form of compensation; and the second is a ritualistic process in which the accused performs a ritual, acknowledges the social rules, norms, or values that have been broken, and realigns with or reaccepts that social order. Reacceptance into the community hinges on whether the accused accepts the social order and values that were violated (Goffman, p. 165). In my project, I attend to how, in their mediated narrative accounts of recruitment, the women featured produce their acceptances or rejections of the social order.

In addition to Scott and Lyman (1968) and Goffman (1971), Garfinkel (1974) defines accounts as “matters of fact and fancy,” “evidence,” and “good demonstration about the affairs of everyday activities [that] are made a matter of seeing and saying, observing for observation and report” (p. 17). Intrinsic to offering accounts is the acknowledgement of what should be versus what is, which brings into the fold the notion of morality, or the moral order.

For an analyst, identifying and examining an account means finding an entrance into the moral universe of breaches and redress to which the speaker orients. My analyses depend on the relationship between accounts and accountability. I work to show the various ways accounts given in the mediated narrative accounts of recruitment are designed for specific audiences, and I focus on the consequences of using certain organizations rather than others in particular communication situations. I attend to how the discourse is organized and what it is doing (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 49). I study how accounts unfold in social interaction as speakers lend their voices to the multiple ongoing conversations of accountability, and in so doing prospectively and retrospectively tie their words to their actions (Shotter, 1982; Buttny, 1993). In
my analyses, I study the discursive work done through accounts and accounting, and address how that work functions as the maintenance and repair of one’s social role.

I draw on Bartesaghi’s (2009) formulation of key facets of accountability: answerability, positioning, constraints, and transformation. Answerability is uniquely relevant to my study because it depends on the assumption that participating in society means being answerable, or accountable, to others for our words and actions. In my analyses, I show how accountability assumes answerability as the process of explaining actions, or conduct, to groups or individuals (Blatz, 1972). Throughout my analyses, I point out how speakers exemplify their awareness of the ways in which others observe them, as women of IS, and their actions, and how speakers are called to account for their actions.

**Third premise: Terrorism mobilizes various sorts of accounting, and vice versa.** I understand communication as embodied and material. Because of this, I study terrorism by attending to the diverse ways terrorism manifests socially, how discourse constitutes terrorism, and how varied symbolic forms are used in particular communication action.

I approach this project with a social construction orientation. In their reformulation of Berger and Luckmann’s 1966 work, Bartesaghi and Castor (2009) offer six propositions for a distinctly communication social construction perspective: 1) social construction is a questioning process; 2) knowledge construction is a relational process; 3) communication is constitutive and consequential; 4) social construction puts forth a realistic notion of reality; 5) discourse is material and embodied; and 6) social construction is a practical and therefore socially accountable process (p. 226). In this study, I concentrate on the functions and accomplishments of discourse, and I orient to discourse as social action. I take this approach because I believe that discourse brings about the very things it is presumed to describe (Baker, 1997).
Through discourse, seemingly natural conditions, such as what “terrorism” means or what a “terrorist” looks like, are brought into being (Tracy & Mirivel, 2009). In this sense, discourse is active, since it organizes “relations among people,” and consequential, since it concerns “the actualities of people’s lives” (Tracy, 2002; Smith, 2005, p. 25).

Terrorism is not merely a word used to describe particular violent actions. The term invokes a set of possible accounts and discourses for what it is. In this way, terrorism is an indexical (Peirce, 1932) term. Words are said to be indexical when “they directly point to their meaning” (Port, 2000, p. 1). Terrorism is an indexical word because it points to 1) those engaged in actions that become characterized as “terrorism,” as well as 2) explanations, justifications, and excuses for certain actions that work as various parties’ accounts. I argue that both of these contribute to the constitution of terrorism.

In this project, I examine terrorism as an indexical for a set of motives (Burke, 1945). By using a social accountability framework (Buttny, 1993), I show how terrorism mobilizes various sorts of accounting. To study terrorism as an indexical term, I analyze how terrorism works through diverse accounts of actions, events, and people, for example, accounts that are built and mobilized in mediated narrative accounts of women joining IS.

**Fourth premise: Terrorism works intertextually.** All discourse “is recontextualized social practice” (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 6). Social members draw upon established discourses from different contexts and genres and implement them in novel situations, and this transforms the original social practice as well as the meaning of its discourse in the new contexts. The relationship between talk and text is an intertextual one in the sense that these discourses “make their meanings against the background of other texts and things that have been said on other occasions,” and in relation to each other (Patridge, 2012, p. 11). Written texts are “traces of the
productive process” of interaction, and they serve as “cues” by shaping conversational responses (Fairclough, 2001, p. 24).

I attend to intertextuality by pointing out the mixing of different discourses, genres and styles, and “the ‘disarticulation’ and ‘rearticulation’ of relationships between different discourses, genres and styles” (Fairclough, 2011, p. 1). In my analyses, I discuss how intertextuality (Fairclough, 1992; Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Silverstein, 2003) manifests in communication about women joining IS. To accomplish this, I illustrate how the same kind of text - i.e., texts of and about the phenomenon of becoming a woman of IS - is being produced in each text, but for different purposes. I analyze how the communication constituting those texts recycles and links to former utterances and how, as this recontextualization happens, that communication takes on new meanings in new contexts (Briggs & Bauman, 1992; Bartesaghi, 2015; Bartesaghi & Noy, 2015). I study how, through terrorism’s production and (re)production across various texts, terrorism systematically maintains a universe of meaning in which it is intelligible as praxis/enactment of ideas.

In this section I introduced the four premises that guide this project. In the section that follows, I situate my project in scholarship on communication and terrorism.

On Communication & Terrorism: Reviewing the Literature

Defining terrorism. The term “terrorism” is a contested concept. Since the 1970s, hundreds of definitions of terrorism have been developed, from academic to civilian ones (Mitchell, 2012; Chomsky, 2002 in Booth & Dunne; Terrorism Research Initiative, 2012), and from government to military ones (State Department, 2012; FBI, 2012; Department of Defense, 2012). Even government agencies seldom agree on how terrorism should be defined. Since 1972, the Ad Hoc Committee on Terrorism of the 6th Committee of the General Assembly has
attempted to reach a legal definition. However, those efforts have yet to result in a universally accepted definition of the term. Even though many national and regional definitions of terrorism exist, to this day, there is no universal, legal United Nations General Assembly approved definition of the concept.

Since the 1980s, scholars have been working on developing a universally accepted academic definition of terrorism. The revised academic consensus definition featured in the table below features the latest outcome of those efforts: a definition that has resulted from three rounds of consultations among academics and other professionals (Schmid, 2011/2012). For a description of the development of the definition featured in the table, see Schmid’s edited work, *The Routledge Handbook of Terrorism Research* (2011, pp. 39-98). The volume also contains 260 other definitions that Joseph J. Easson and Alex P. Schmid compiled (pp. 99-200). I include this table to illustrate how complex and ongoing scholarly conversations about conceptualizations of terrorism continue to be, and to show how, although definitions of terrorism differ from one field or discipline to the next, communication in some form appears in virtually every definition. I use italics to highlight key instances of how communication vocabulary is employed to define terrorism.

**Table 1: Revised Academic Consensus Definition of Terrorism**

Terrorism refers, on the one hand, to *a doctrine* about the presumed effectiveness of a special form or tactic of fear-generating, coercive political violence and, on the other hand, to *a conspiratorial practice* of calculated, demonstrative, direct violent action without legal or moral restraints, targeting mainly civilians and non-combatants, performed for its *propagandistic* and psychological *effects on various audiences* and conflict parties; Terrorism as *a tactic* is employed in three main *contexts*: (i) illegal state repression, (ii) *propagandistic* agitation by non-state actors in times of peace or outside zones of conflict and (iii) as an illicit tactic of irregular warfare employed by state- and non-state actors; *The physical violence or threat thereof* employed by terrorist actors involves single-phase acts of lethal violence (such as bombings and armed assaults), dual- phased life-threatening...
Table 1: Revised Academic Consensus Definition of Terrorism (continued)

incidents (like kidnapping, hijacking and other forms of hostage-taking for coercive bargaining) as well as multi-phased sequences of actions (such as in ‘disappearances’ involving kidnapping, secret detention, torture and murder).

The public (-ized) terrorist victimization initiates threat-based communication processes whereby, on the one hand, conditional demands are made to individuals, groups, governments, societies or sections thereof, and, on the other hand, the support of specific constituencies (based on ties of ethnicity, religion, political affiliation and the like) is sought by the terrorist perpetrators;

At the origin of terrorism stands terror – instilled fear, dread, panic or mere anxiety – spread among those identifying, or sharing similarities, with the direct victims, generated by some of the modalities of the terrorist act – its shocking brutality, lack of discrimination, dramatic or symbolic quality and disregard of the rules of warfare and the rules of punishment;

The main direct victims of terrorist attacks are in general not any armed forces but are usually civilians, non-combatants or other innocent and defenceless persons who bear no direct responsibility for the conflict that gave rise to acts of terrorism;

The direct victims are not the ultimate target (as in a classical assassination where victim and target coincide) but serve as message generators, more or less unwittingly helped by the news values of the mass media, to reach various audiences and conflict parties that identify either with the victims’ plight or the terrorists’ professed cause;

Sources of terrorist violence can be individual perpetrators, small groups, diffuse transnational networks as well as state actors or state-sponsored clandestine agents (such as death squads and hit teams);

While showing similarities with methods employed by organized crime as well as those found in war crimes, terrorist violence is predominantly political – usually in its motivation but nearly always in its societal repercussions;

The immediate intent of acts of terrorism is to terrorize, intimidate, antagonize, disorientate, destabilize, coerce, compel, demoralize or provoke a target population or conflict party in the hope of achieving from the resulting insecurity a favourable power outcome, e.g. obtaining publicity, extorting ransom money, submission to terrorist demands and/or mobilizing or immobilizing sectors of the public;

The motivations to engage in terrorism cover a broad range, including redress for alleged grievances, personal or vicarious revenge, collective punishment, revolution, national liberation and the promotion of diverse ideological, political, social, national or religious causes and objectives;

Acts of terrorism rarely stand alone but form part of a campaign of violence which alone can, due to the serial character of acts of violence and threats of more to come, create a pervasive climate of fear that enables the terrorists to manipulate the political process.

As Table 1 shows, despite the absence of a universally accepted legal or academic definition of the term, “terrorism” has come to be a phenomenon toward which agencies, nations,
and international communities organize. Likewise, “terrorist” has come to refer to an individual or group treated as a common enemy of agencies, nations, and international communities. In my conclusion, I return to this revised academic consensus definition of terrorism when I address what is left to accomplish at the intellectual crosshairs of communication and terrorism.

My project is designed to contribute to interdisciplinary research on terrorism, in general, and on IS, in particular. Scholarship on terrorism and communication is extensive. This body of research includes analyses of populism and interventionism (Miscoiu, Craciun, & Colopelnic, 2008), studies of terrorism discourses in the U.S. and Morocco (Bartolucci, 2010; Bartolucci, 2014), examinations of social constructionism and terrorist discourse (Nimmer, 2011), and work concerning the need for greater understanding of communication in our current digital age environment to more effectively counter terrorism (Archetti, 2015). Scholars featured in works like Johnson and Cwiek’s 2005 edited volume discuss terrorism as a communication act, and argue that, for local, state, regional, and federal coordination of efforts and interaction to effectively manage terrorism, competent communication is necessary.

In addition to these studies, scholarly work coming out of risk communication, crisis management, policy management, and political science focuses on the rhetoric and communication of terrorism, and isolates issues to identify the difficult choices and subsequent processes that participants face as they attempt to manage terrorism (O’Hair, Heath, Ayotte, & Ledlow, 2008). Scholars like Archetti (2010) address communication and terrorism by enlarging the lens of strategic narratives to non-state actors, and by supporting the claim that narratives are central to the practice of international relations because they are used strategically to achieve desired objectives.
Scholarship on IS. Since 2014, the body of research on the so-called Islamic State (IS) has included quantitative analyses of the group’s development and relation to the organization of Islam countries (Oh, Jung, & Yoon, 2016), as well as studies addressing U.S. and global military strategies that have been used to fight IS (Johnson, 2015; Habeck, Carafano, Donnelly, Hoffman, Jones, Kagan, Kagan, Mahnken, & Zimmerman, 2015). This scholarship has also included analyses of IS as a global terrorist threat in the face of recent Paris and Copenhagen attacks (Tausch, 2015).

Works on IS and discourse, specifically, include, but are not limited to analyses of discourses of violence in cases of IS beheadings (Chehab, 2014), issues of race in IS discourse (Agron, 2015), and strategies IS uses to disseminate messages glorifying its “victories” and promising a new “Islamic State” (al-Qarawee, 2014). Literature on IS and discourse also features explorations of the propaganda and discourse that the group uses in an effort to legitimate and narrate its visions, with a particularly close focus on elements of IS’s English online magazine Dabiq (Steindal, 2015). Other studies on IS and discourse have taken the form of analyses of the performative aspects of the public speeches given by the self-proclaimed caliph of IS, Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi (Barakat, 2015), and the ways in which discourses about IS have been supported by some media outlets, such as Indonesia’s Voa-Islam, and rejected by others, such as Arrahmah (Erikha, Putra, & Sarwono, 2016).

More recent scholarship on IS and discourse has included content analyses of IS’s propaganda publications like Dabiq, and assessments of how the group exploits particular concepts like Hijrah - in Islamic tradition, Prophet Muhammad’s migration from Mecca to Medina in 622 C.E. - to attract Muslim followers to its territories in Syria and Iraq, and to push its own political and military agenda (Uberman & Shay, 2016). Additionally, this body of
literature features examinations of IS’s rhetoric, such as how the myth of the Caliph functions as a fundamental narrative that underwrites IS’s discourse, and how coming to understand IS’s rhetoric can offer insight into the group’s motives and opportunities to construct counter-narratives (Edwards, 2017). A particularly impressive number of scholarly projects have addressed how IS recruits new members, many of whom are from “the West” (Binetti, 2015; Bjørgum, 2016; Bloom, 2016a; Comeau, 2016; DeSitter, 2015; Frankl, 2016; Hoyle, Bradford, & Frenett, 2015; Peladeau, 2016; Perešin, 2015; Edwards, 2017; Huey & Peladeau, 2016; Huey, L., & Witmer, 2016; Kneip, 2016; Monroe, 2016; Musial, 2016; Nacos, 2015; Pues, 2016). Scholars like Eriksson (2016) explore discursive constructions of identities for women, such as the Self and Other, in the official and semi-official female-oriented propaganda discourse of the so-called Islamic State. This work focuses on the strategies that IS uses to control the discourse about women’s role in the so-called Islamic State, and how the group uses them as recruitment tools.

**Scholarship on women in terrorism.** Works about girls and women in terrorism includes analyses of cross-regional trends in female terrorism (Cunningham, 2003), examinations of female terrorists’ portrayals in news coverage (Nacos, 2006), and syntheses of scholarly works published before 2009 that concern women’s involvement in terrorism (Jacques & Taylor, 2009). Additionally, scholarship about women and girls in terrorism has taken the form of studies of women in al-Qaeda (Von Knop, 2007), examinations of different reasons male and female suicide bombers carry out their acts of violence (Jacques & Taylor, 2008), and introductions to new theories about the recent emergence of female suicide terrorists (Speckhard, 2008). Research on women and terrorism has also included studies concerning how to counter what has been called female terrorism (Cunningham, 2007). Scholarly work about women and terrorism continues to grow.
Scholarly literature about women in IS have taken the form of studies of women joining and traveling to IS-controlled lands (Bakker & De Leede, 2015, Cruise, 2016; Buner, 2016), and exploratory analyses of online networks that are pro-terrorist groups, including IS (Varanese, 2016; Witmer, 2016). Other publications describe how women are represented in IS propaganda (Huey, 2015), detail the ways IS’s propaganda targets women (Tarras-Wahlberg, 2016), and present case studies of women, like Roshonara Choudhry and Colleen LaRose/Jihad Jane who joined terrorist groups (Pearson, 2016; Picart, 2015). Other subsets of scholarly studies on women and IS focus on how IS treats women (Ali, 2015), and the phenomenon of “Western” women joining the terrorist group (Herlitz, 2016; Pooley, 2015; Saltman, 2016). This discussion has illustrated that scholarly literature about women and the so-called Islamic State seems abundant. Yet, studies featuring analyses of online news discourse of women who went through the processes of joining the group are limited.

In contrast to the works I address in the literature review, my project is a study of four mediated narrative accounts of IS recruitment presented as interviews. Each features a woman whom reporters have labeled as affiliated with the so-called Islamic State. By dedicating each of my analysis chapters to one of the four texts, I closely attend to the accounts built in each text, and how those accounts are offered. Finally, I discuss what patterns emerge across the data.

I begin the following section, Methods, by introducing the data that I analyze and the analytical approach I use in this project. Subsequently, in Chapter Two, Chapter Three, Chapter Four, and Chapter Five, I feature my analyses of what are presented as interviews of the four women who are said to have joined, or, in the case of one woman, almost joined, the so-called Islamic State. In the final chapter, Conclusion & Future Directions: On Terrorism as Intra-action, I review the arguments I offer in my analyses. Additionally, I articulate how studying terrorism
through a communication lens is practical and crucial at this historical moment. Finally, I address future directions to take in scholarship on terrorism, gender, and communication, as well as in application of that scholarship.

Methods

Studying social interaction is about coming to terms with how, with and through language, language users accomplish social actions: get married, decline invitations, assign gender to human bodies. According to Sacks (1992), by using close looking at the world as a base for theorizing about it, scholars are able to find things “that we couldn’t, by imagination, assert were there: One wouldn’t know that they were typical, one might not know that they ever happened” (pp. 419-20). So, when one studies language as communicative action, one studies how we go about producing what it is we produce when we interact with one another, or how we accomplish social actions and activities in and through “talk-in-interaction” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1974). In this project, I study communication as what Sacks calls “an object in its own right, and not merely as a screen on which are projected other processes” (Schegloff in LC1, p. xviii). In this chapter, to explain how this project “comes off,” which is a way that Sacks says produced by reflexively calling attention to how the orderly and coordinated production of social life is bigger than the sum of its methodological and epistemological parts, I introduce the data that I analyze through close looking at accounts, describe how I collected the data, and discuss my approach to them.

Conversation analyst John Heritage (1984) notes that in communication we create, display, and maintain the dimensions of our lives. Interaction in general and dialogue in particular are context shaped. This is a project designed to show how social interaction involved in the storytelling about women joining IS is shaped by the contexts in which the stories are told.
My analysis of interaction is designed to capture how storied accounts that are co-produced about women joining IS constitute the infrastructure of big D discourses of terrorism as well as those of gender. Since interaction connects the micro-order of everyday life to the macro-order of shared culture and social structure, interaction is in many ways “the architecture of intersubjectivity” (Rommetveit, 1976). To examine accounts about women joining IS, I use a discourse analytic lens. Such an approach acknowledges and treats discourse and social interaction as projects of intersubjectivity. I use tools from various branches of discourse analysis including multimodal discourse analysis, conversation analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, and pragmatics.

One of the tools I use is conversation analysis. Whereas conversation analysis is extremely useful for questions that require microanalysis of an utterance in a pair, for example (such as a question and an answer), the CA-perspective at times be “too narrow” in the case of questions that look beyond the complexities of a particular exchange, and instead wish to problematize the significance of the exchange against a broader social backdrop. If we wish to go beyond “this utterance here” (Wetherell, 1998, p. 388), then, as Wetherell explains, there is great benefit in adopting a more eclectic set of discourse analytic approaches, which might include CA, because the combination can prove to be much stronger than if a researcher employed one method, exclusively. To demonstrate her point from her own discourse analytic approach, Wetherell offers a discussion about a stretch of talk that involves three boys and an interviewer who are speaking about some sexual activities of one of the boys. Wetherell argues that an analysis of that talk would be “incomplete” if the analysis did not include the various “interpretative repertoires” used to “place” the boy’s activities in various ways. In other words, Wetherell asserts that the analytical approach to be used to examine that stretch of talk should
Because I align with this view, in this project I employ an eclectic set of discourse analytic approaches.

In this chapter I discuss the choices I make about what data I analyze and how I go about collecting and analyzing those data. I also describe the discourse analytic research approach that I use in my analyses of discourse featuring four women that news reporters story as having joined, or, in one case almost joined, the so-called Islamic State. Below I describe my data set, my method, and my theoretical premises.

**Data.** The mediated narrative account featuring Alex that is presented as an interview, “Flirting With the Islamic State” (Ten & Laffin, 2015), is featured in the *New York Times* article, “ISIS and the Lonely Young American” (Callimachi, 2015).

Interview Title: Flirting With the Islamic State
Interviewee: Alex (a pseudonym)
Interviewer/reporter: Rukmini Callimachi
Producers: Poh Si Teng & Ben Laffin
Interview date: June 27, 2015
Interview length: 8 minutes 7 seconds

The mediated narrative account featuring Khadija that is presented as an interview is featured in the *News.com.au* article, “ISIS: Khansa’a Brigade former fighter reveals what life is like inside the group” (Craw, 2014).

Interview title: Untitled
Interviewee: Khadija (a pseudonym)
Producer/Reporter: Victoria Craw
Interview date: October 7, 2014

Interview length: 3 minutes 51 seconds

The mediated narrative account featuring Laura that is presented as an interview is featured in the NPR report, “Europe Wakes Up To Prospect Of Female Terrorists” (October 17, 2016).

Interview title: Untitled

Interviewee: Laura Passoni

Interviewer/reporter: Eleanor Beardsley

Host: David Greene

Interview date: October 17, 2016

Interview length: 4 minutes 40 seconds

The mediated narrative account featuring of Tareena, “Tareena Shakil police interview” (wmpolice, 2015), was published on YouTube by Heart News WestMids, and was featured in the Birmingham Mail article, “WATCH: Tareena Shakil lies her way through police interview after return from Syria” (Larner, 2016a).

Interview title: Tareena Shakil police interview

Interviewee: Tareena Shakil

Producers: West Midlands Police; Birmingham Mail

Reporter: Tony Larner

Interview date: February 2015

Interview length: 5 minutes 19 seconds

Alex’s interview. In the first of my four analysis chapters, I study the interaction presented as an interview between Alex (a pseudonym) and the text’s producers, Poh Si Teng
and Ben Laffin. According to news reports, Alex is a young ISIS fan from Washington State (Singal, 2015). Other reports refer to her as a 23-year-old woman living in a rural area (Lorusso, 2015), a Sunday school teacher, a babysitter, and a lonely, young American who flirted with the so-called Islamic State and was recruited on the Internet (NYT, 2015; Callimachi, 2015).

The mediated narrative account presented as a video interview featuring Alex, “Flirting With the Islamic State” (2015), is embedded in Rukmini Callimachi’s *New York Times* report, “ISIS and the Lonely Young American” (2015). In addition to Callimachi, a reporter who has written extensively about IS for *The New York Times*, Kimiko de Freytas-Tamura contributed reporting from London, Julfikar Ali Manik contributed reporting from Bhola, Bangladesh, and Alain Delaquérière contributed research.

In my analysis of the text featuring Alex, I examine sensemaking as intersubjectivity. The idea that we study discourse to understand social reality is an idea based on the notion of the subjective orientation of social action. As Schutz (1964) explains, social action is guided by the meaning that individuals attach to their actions. Because of this, analysts study discourse in an effort to account for this meaning by attempting to understand and explain those actions. However, meaning is not merely a product of individual constraints and beliefs. The meanings that guide individual actions are, to a large degree, socially produced and shared patterns. Because of this, accounting for an individual’s viewpoint is necessary to explain social action and to attend to intersubjectivity as an essential element in the structure of the commonsense world (Schutz, 1962,1964). If communication works through intersubjectivity, then discourse relies on intersubjectivity because meaning is co-created through discourse. Therefore, by analyzing discourse, I aim to explain the meaning making processes that happen in interaction. I analyze the interaction in the mediated narrative account featuring Alex by examining the
content, extent, limits, and structure of intersubjectivity that constitute elements of the social action underway in the mediated narrative account.

To study how accounting is done in the text featuring Alex, I analyze what is presented as Alex’s interview as “interactional object” (Potter & Hepburn, 2005, p. 281) by identifying the interactional strategies used therein to highlight how language users rely on accounting as a way to act in ways that are intelligible to others. I attend to how Alex builds up herself and her action in her account of her experiences, as well as how the producers of what is constructed as Alex’s interview build up Alex and her actions in their accounts that are presented alongside, and often in opposition to Alex’s account.

In the words of Lewis (1990), “when we name things, we call them into being. We permit them to enter our consciousness but only in the garb in which we have dressed them” (p. 139). Since perceiving and noticing the visual elements of a multimodal text, like the one featuring Alex, is an initial and primary aspect of meaning comprehension processes, I attend not only to the words spoken during what are presented as interviews of the four women, but also to the nonlinguistic resources used in the four multimodal texts. The data I analyze in Alex’s text include, but are not limited to what Alex says (excerpts of transcripts of the audio of each of her turns); what the producers say (screenshots of the producers’ written turns); and the visual semiotic resources that are used (for example, how Alex is physically positioned in the video frame at various points, and images in the background of certain frames).

According to Jones (2012), one of the fundamental principles of discourse analysis is that “discourse includes more than just language. It also involves things like non-verbal communication, images, music, and even the arrangement of furniture in rooms and the spaces created by architectural structures” (p. 36). Since I also embrace this notion of discourse, I use
what Jones refers to as a multimodal discourse analytic framework for my analysis of the text featuring Alex. This means that I understand discourse as “involving multiple modes which often work together,” and I acknowledge that, “written texts rarely consist only of words, especially nowadays. They often include pictures, charts or graphs. Even the font that is used and the way paragraphs are arranged on a page or screen can convey meaning” (Jones, p. 36). Since I understand discourse as multimodal, I use a multimodal discourse analytic framework to understand “how different modes, including speech and writing, work together in discourse,” i.e. how discourse involves the interaction of those multiple modes (Jones, p. 36). To analyze multimodality in interaction, I attend to sequentiality, or “how elements are ordered in relation to one another,” and simultaneity, or “how elements that occur at the same time affect one another” (Jones, p. 37). For example, in the text featuring Alex, I focus on the contrast between the modes of (what are presented as) the producers’ turns (written, in white font color against a black background) and those of (what are presented as) Alex’s turns (spoken, in her voice).

After analyzing the text featuring Alex, I analyze the text featuring Khadija.

**Khadija’s interview.** In the second of the four analysis chapters, I analyze the mediated narrative account, presented as an interview between Khadija (a pseudonym) and senior international correspondent based in CNN’s Istanbul bureau, Arwa Damon (CNN, 2017). I study the interaction between the two participants and the accounts that they co-produce. In news reports, Khadija is described as a petite twenty-five-year-old schoolteacher who turned into an ISIS member (Damon & Tuysuz, 2014). In other news reports, Khadija is called a woman who was brought up in a not overly conservative family that ensured she received an education, who fled to Turkey leaving her family behind in Syria, and who later became disillusioned with IS’s brutality (*Al Arabiya News*, 2014). Khadija is presented as a middle-class teacher who joined
ISIS, chose to become a foot soldier in the Islamic State, fled after seeing horrors of beheading, and later revealed how she became a member of feared all-female brigade before she decided to walk away (Newton, 2014; Bienaimé, 2014).

As I analyze the text featuring Khadija that is embedded in Victoria Craw’s News.com.au report, “ISIS: Khansa’a Brigade former fighter reveals what life is like inside the group” (2014), I point out how Khadija constructs her account of her experiences joining IS as a story about her seizing an opportunity to break new ground for herself by joining IS and serving as a leader who gained and exercised authority, wielded a weapon, and intimidated and disciplined others. As I discuss, Khadija describes how the commanders of the all-women’s brigade of IS stepped out of the “woman” mold by displaying and enacting authority, power, and control, just as Khadija learned to do as a woman in the Al-Khansa’a Brigade of the so-called Islamic State.

Following my analysis of the mediated narrative account of Khadija, I analyze the text featuring Laura.

Laura’s interview. In my third analysis chapter, I study the mediated narrative account of Laura Passoni (her real name) that is featured in the NPR report, “Europe Wakes Up To Prospect Of Female Terrorists” (2016). The text, presented as an audio interview, features interaction between Laura Passoni (her real name) and NPR reporter and Paris correspondent, Eleanor Beardsley, and is hosted by NPR’s Morning Edition David Greene (NPR, 2017a; NPR, 2017b).

In news reports, Laura is described as a Belgian woman who took her four-year-old son to Syria in 2014 to join ISIS, and quickly realized that she had made a terrible mistake (Cigainero, 2016). She is also presented as a thirty-four year old mother of two small boys, who traveled to Syria but later escaped, and who wrote a book to discourage young people who may
be tempted to follow the same path (Beardsley, 2016). Other reporters construct Laura as a mother who converted to Islam, moved to Syria after falling for a man she met in a supermarket, and, since her return from ISIS controlled land, has been warning others about making the same mistake she made because life in IS turned out to be the opposite of what she was promised (Morley, 2016; Summers, 2016). Called a Jihadi bride who fled Syria, Laura has been referred to as a woman who is using life on probation as a lesson (Associated Press, 2016).

In my analysis, I focus on how Laura builds her account as a woman who was vulnerable, manipulated, and lured into IS. I use the online news report about Laura, presented as an interview of her, to point out the strategies that are used in news report accounts that treat terrorism as men’s domain, discuss how this rhetorical treatment is uniquely evident in reports that are about women in terrorism, and show how Laura’s text exemplifies reports about women joining terrorist groups like IS that construct women and girls as duped, “manipulated,” and “brainwashed” (Dearden, 2017; Hall, 2017). In my analysis I attend to notions of agency and gender, and comment on why it is important to analyze such elements in accounts like Laura’s.

Like Khadija, who describes how she chose to run away to “ugly” things by joining IS, Laura stories herself as having made the mistake of joining IS, and once she recognized it as a mistake, she returned to Europe and wrote a book for those she labels “vulnerable” to help them avoid making the same mistake she made. In my analysis of the text featuring Laura, I argue that her text functions as a consumable text because it is built as a cautionary tale. In this way, Laura’s account functions as a tool designed to prevent other women, and other members of “vulnerable” groups (to use a word from the text) from following the same path that Laura took: becoming a member of IS and traveling to Syria to serve as a group member.
Following my analysis of the mediated narrative account of Laura’s recruitment, I analyze the text featuring Tareena.

**Tareena’s interview.** In my fourth analysis chapter, I analyze the mediated narrative account, presented as an audio-video recorded interview that features Tareena Shakil (her real name) and is embedded in Tony Larner’s *Birmingham Mail* report, “Tareena Shakil jailed for six years for travelling to Syria to join Islamic State” (2016b). Included at the top of the recording, “@wmpolice” identifies the text as associated with the West Midlands Police Twitter account. Unlike the other three texts presented as interviews, Tareena’s appears to have taken place in a law enforcement facility. The interviewer in Tareena’s interview is physically absent, and presumed to be an official, or officials of law enforcement, and the questions of Tareena’s interviewer/s are edited out. However, akin to the other three texts, Tareena’s is featured on news websites that are publically accessible.

In news reports, Tareena is described as a twenty-six-year-old mother who took her toddler son to Syria and was later jailed for six years for having joined the so-called Islamic State (Cockroft, Spillett, & Gardham, 2016; Snowdon, 2016; *BBC*, 2016). She is also referred to as a British citizen who was arrested when she returned to the UK, and was convicted of being a member of the group and encouraging acts of terror on social media (*The Guardian*, 2016). In other reports, Tareena is presented as a Sparkbrook (which is in Birmingham, England) mum and British health worker who used student loan money to take her toddler son abroad to join Islamic State, returned from Syria, and lied her way through her police interview (Larner, 2016a; Morris, 2016; Fricker & McFadyen, 2016; Robinson, 2016; *DailyRecord*, 2016; Desai, 2016).

Since the interviewer is neither shown nor heard in the text featuring Tareena, I focus my analysis on the strategies and resources Tareena uses as she builds her account and presents her
story to the audience. I focus especially on how paralinguistic features work in the accounting, what strategies are used in the telling, and how Tareena relies on certain resources to offer her audience alternative ways to interpret her story about her experiences, motivations, and actions. I use “alternative” here because the context of the mediated narrative account of Tareena - at a law enforcement facility - makes possible only particular tellings, in this circumstance, confession or plea of innocence.

I base my discussion of Tareena’s text on the claim that non-verbal, and paralinguistic features contribute to the affective meaning of oral discourse, and can be used to reinforce or even contradict the verbal content of an utterance, or in this case, an entire account or interactional context (Bombelli, Soler, & Waassaf, 2013).

To offer an overview of the four women featured in the four mediated narrative accounts I analyze, I provide details about each in the table below.

**Table 2: Four Women Interviewees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age at time of recruitment</th>
<th>Country of residence</th>
<th>Occupation/s</th>
<th>Parental Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Sunday school teacher Babysitter</td>
<td>Has no children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khadija</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>School teacher</td>
<td>Has no children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Mother Supermarket worker</td>
<td>Has children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tareena</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Mother Health worker</td>
<td>Has children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Data Collection.** In 2015, 2016, and 2017, I conducted Internet searches for online interviews featuring women recruited into IS. I entered these search terms: “interview + woman + ISIS + recruit.” The results of those searches consistently led me to the four mediated narrative accounts – presented as though they are interviews – I analyze in this project. Focusing on four texts allows for a level of detail in my analyses that may not have been possible with a larger sample. Though I employ transcripts in my analyses, the data I analyze in this project are the original online news reports featuring the four women: Alex, Khadija, Laura, and Tareena.

With this sample size, instead of generalizability, or the ability to apply the findings of this study to other research settings, being a major concern, my foci are: validity, i.e. how successfully the research achieves what it set out to achieve; credibility, i.e. research that aims to show rather than tell, and that is about multivocality and “member reflections” (Tracy, 2010, p. 840); and contributing heuristically, conceptually, and practically to research on terrorism, communication, and gender. By focusing qualitative research on multivocality and member reflections, I aim to neither assume a “single true reality,” nor concern myself with testing whether I, as researcher, “got it right,” but to instead offer opportunities for “reflexive elaboration” of the results of studies (Braun & Clarke, 2013, p. 285). In other words, I design this study to serve as a project that necessarily features multiple voices, stories, and perspectives.

**Open source.** The four mediated narrative accounts of IS recruitment that I analyze in this dissertation are featured on mass media news websites and that are publically available online and free of charge. According to the U.S. intelligence community, these are “open-source” data because they come from overt, publicly available sources, as opposed to covert or clandestine ones (Open Source Solutions, Inc., 1997). My project aligns with Open Source Intelligence practices in that I collect and analyze information that I gather from public,
or open sources. I use only publicly available data because I believe that drawing conclusions about widely available, unclassified information has the potential to lead to a great deal of predictive, actionable intelligence about terrorism-related phenomena including, but not limited to, the phenomenon of women joining IS.

In addition to having chosen these texts because they are widely accessible, I selected these as my data for a second reason: they are among the most highly visible texts featuring individuals who are storied as having ties to IS. When I conducted searches for interviews of women who have been recruited into IS, these four consistently showed up at the top of the web search results pages. An impressive number of people around the world are exposed to what these text tell about the processes involved in being recruited into IS, and because of this the data have the potential to be highly influential and persuasive because of the great rhetorical power they have to change the opinions or “bend” the perspectives (Burke, 1950) of their audience members.

A third reason I chose these four text is because they are among the very few publically available online news reports circulating that feature women’s accounts of their own experiences joining, or in one case almost joining, IS.

**Multimodal.** I use a multimodal discourse analytic lens to analyze my data because a combination of different semiotic modes, like written language, music, visual images, and design elements, are used therein. Multimodality means, in a communicative artifact or event, the diverse ways in which distinct semiotic resource systems are co-deployed and co-contextualized in the making of a text-specific meaning (Liu, 2013; Van Leeuwen, 2005; Baldry & Thibault, 2006). Whereas the logic of time or temporal sequence governs the mode of written text, the logic of spatiality, organized arrangements, and simultaneity govern the mode of visual
image (Kress & van Leeuwen, 1996; Kress, 2003). This means that, when coming to understand written language, temporal sequence in which words appear in a sentence is very important because the ordering of words can completely change the meaning of a sentence. In contrast, when coming to understand, or make meaning of visual images, the position, size, and composition of the contents of images are very important. In my analyses, I address not only how written language works, but also how other modes of discourse work in context.

**Tools of Analysis.** “Discourse” can refer to anything from exchanges at the level of interaction to a unit of speech greater than a sentence, and from a cultural ideology such as “The Discourse of Racism” to constellations of ideologies (Tannen, Hamilton, & Schiffrin, 2015). Some scholars differentiate discourse with a “little ‘d’” from discourse with a “big ‘d’” (Gee, 1990), claiming that little “d” “discourse” refers to conversations, texts, and stories, while big “D” “Discourse” refers to “ways of being in the world” (p. 142). Yet, these two understandings of the term are interdependent: uses of little “d” discourses reproduce big “D” discourses that socially organize people, while big “D” discourses inform our language use in everyday communication. In my work, I rely on both understandings of discourse since I recognize that they are intertwined.

I align with a constitutive view of communication: one that acknowledges that a conversation cannot be severed from the context in which it took place (Austin, 1955/1962; Searle, 1969; Hymes, 1974; Bernstein, 1990). I align with this view because I believe that through communication we build and rebuild what we come to experience as reality (Craig, 2001). Instead of orienting to discourse as language that reflects how things are (Rorty, 1979/1980), I treat discourse as language in use, as social action (Baker, 1997; van der Berg, 2003), and as that which creates the very social structures that it is presumed to describe.
Another way to think about this is to consider discourse far more than language that is written, and far more than scientific, public, or professional communication that might be presented in text form. As language users, we reproduce discursive artifacts, animate members of distinct discourse communities, and institutionalize social structures. In this way, when we interact with each other, we use discourse together to create meaning, cultural artifacts, and even identities.

In addition to understanding discourse as language in action, I recognize that discourse is reflexive because larger social and moral norms are embedded within discourse. In this project, I analyze data about terrorism and gender to point out normative beliefs about both. To study how language is social action, I examine the discourses at play in the data.

*Discourse analysis.* The research approach I use, discourse analysis (DA), is a method and a theoretical framework. DA is the study of language in use, or the study of “the meanings we give language and the actions we carry out when we use language in specific contexts” (Gee & Handford, 2012, p. 1). Considering DA as the study of language in use is to acknowledge that language users both *mean* things, and *do* things with language. When conducting analyses, DA scholars find it important to take into account the contexts in which our data occur because, when we utter or write a sentence, that sentence has a situated meaning (Gee, 2010, 2011). In other words, forms have situated meanings in specific contexts of use.

Discourse analysis is a blend of rhetorical, linguistic, philosophical, and sociological ways of studying how human beings symbolize and enact the world that constitutes us. As a research approach, DA typically involves:

- recording interaction; transcribing the tape; repeated study of the tape; formulating claims about the conversational moves, structures, and strategies demonstrated in the interaction;
and then building an argument with transcript excerpts that are analyzed. (Tracy & Mirivel, 2009, p. 153)

I use DA to analyze the discourse of four online news reports featuring women storied by reporters as having joined, or in Alex’s case, as having almost joined, IS. I investigate how such discourse contributes to the construction of a universe in which terrorism appears, and is reinforced as, a fixed set of actions that certain people commit. I study accounts of women joining IS because I hope to draw conclusions about the meanings of “terrorism” that are taken for granted, built, and reinforced through communication in and across these distinct “terrorism” contexts.

As individuals, people do not make meaning. We make meaning as parts of social groups that “agree on, contest, or negotiate norms and values about how language ought to be used and what things ought to mean” (Gee & Handford, 2012, p. 5). This is to say that discourse analysis is analysis of language as well as analysis of practices in society. One importance of discourse analysis is the idea that, through speaking, writing, and otherwise communicating in the world, we “make the world meaningful in certain ways and not in others,” and we accomplish this by shaping, producing, and reproducing the world through language in use (Gee & Handford, p. 5). In turn, the world we shape and help build works in certain ways that then shape us, and this mutual shaping process profoundly influences people’s lives. I align with Gee and Handford who describe the aims of a discourse analyst to be “to expose to light the often taken-for-granted workings of discourse, because, like in the study of atoms, cells, and stars, there is here a great wealth scientific knowledge to be gained. But there is also insight to be gained into how to make the world a better and more humane place” (p. 5). I hope that this project will generate new ideas about how the world could be made safer.
To examine the data that are the heart of this project – the original online news report texts featuring Alex, Khadija, Laura, and Tareena – I rely on a number of research tools. I use those tools to describe how, through discourse, speaker and listeners’ structural and linguistic knowledge (grammar, lexicon, etc.) influence meanings, analyze how meanings relate to the contexts of a given utterance, and assess how pre-existing knowledge about entities and individuals involved influences meanings made through interaction. I also explore how speakers imply meanings at certain interactional moments in the data.

I strive to problematize the implicit quality of discourse and denaturalize “common sense” positions on reality, and I aim to do this by exposing these realities as “discursive constructions” (Locke, 2004, p. 32). As I examine my data, I illuminate assumptions in discourses about the phenomenon of women joining IS. In this way, I strive to show how social practices work as interactional accomplishments that constitute accounts of terrorist action (in this case, the action is in the form of women joining the so-called Islamic State).

*Multimodal discourse analysis.* The data I examine in this project are multimodal since they “convey information by means of various modes such as visual images, written language, design elements and other semiotic resources” (Liu, 2013, p. 1259). A relatively new trend in the studies of discourse analysis, multimodal discourse analysis is concerned with the communicative aspects of discourse that emerge within interaction, regardless of the forms that interaction takes in the data at hand. Because of this, multimodal DA is a uniquely useful research approach to use when examining online discourse that includes written text, images, audio, instant messages, video, and even emojis.

Using a multimodal DA approach, I examine how the various semiotic modes of each text - for example, visual, verbal, written, or gestural resources - work together to create a unified
text or communicative event. With this approach, I am able to examine the communicative aspects, elements, and strategies of discourse that feature in the interaction of my data. In multimodal DA, different perspectives can be taken, and various angles can be used to study layout, modality, typography, color, genre, discourse, as well as style (Liu, 2013, 1260). As Van Leeuwen and Jewitt (2001) note, there are many ways to do multimodal discourses analysis, including, but not limited to content analysis, conversation analysis, and social semiotic analysis. Drawing from various branches of discourse analysis, I use tools from conversation analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, and pragmatics.

**Conversation analysis.** In this project I rely on tools from conversation analysis (CA). Stubbe, Lane, Hilder, Vine, Vine, Marra, Holmes, and Weatherall (2003) define CA as:

> based fundamentally on a model of communication as joint activity (Sacks, 1984). Like dancing or joint musical performance, it rejects the typical linguistic model of communication as sending and receiving messages. In other words, it says that dialogue is not a succession of monologues. So, CA is concerned with how the jointly organized activity of talk-in-interaction is carried out, and how participants produce joint achievements such as conversational closings, storytelling, disputes, medical diagnosis, the mutually dependent roles of interviewer and interviewee, and so on. (p. 354)

Like Stubbe et al., I apply elements of several DA models as relevant to my research objectives. Instead of aligning my study with one branch of discourse analysis or another, I take a synthetic approach to DA, taking advantage of what several have to offer to the study of language in interaction. To analyze my data, I rely on a combination of discourse analytic tools including, but
not limited to multimodal discourse analysis, conversation analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, and pragmatics.

I align with conversation analytic research because I agree with the subfield’s premise: “various features of the delivery of talk and other bodily conduct are basic to how interlocutors build specific actions and respond to the actions of others” (Hepburn & Bolden, 2013, p. 1). I employ some CA ways of representing talk and other ways of communicating that capture the rich subtlety of participants’ delivery. When I transcribe spoken data, I work to capture what is said (the words spoken, for example) as well as details about how things are said (interactants’ visible behaviors, for example). To do this, I use CA transcription practices because they are based on the assumption that “no order of detail in interaction can be dismissed a priori as disorderly, accidental, or irrelevant” (Heritage, 1984, p. 241).

I use CA to show what participants in interactions treat as relevant, but that orthographic representation may miss (Hepburn & Bolden). Since transcripts are necessarily selective in the details that are represented in them, I do not treat the transcripts of my data as replacements for those data. In addition to relying on the transcripts that I generate, I frequently return to the original data to enrich my analyses.

What we perceive to be our reality is produced through interactions between people, objects, and environments. Because of this, written and spoken modes of communication are only two of a diverse range of modes involved in producing meaning and experience (Pirini, 2017). To examine modes like gesture, gaze, composition, and layout, analysts use multimodal discourse analysis approaches to study social interaction and meaning as multimodal, i.e. as produced with and through multiple modes. Among these approaches to DA is interactional sociolinguistics, which uses DA to study how language users create meaning through social
interaction, and is concerned with qualitative analysis undertaken to interpret what participants might be intending to convey in everyday communicative practice (Gumperz, 2015, p. 309). When doing interactional sociolinguistics, researchers assume that information about contextual frames is communicated as part of the processes involved in interacting. I use interactional sociolinguistics, in particular, in order to be as precise as possible when I detail what happens in certain interactions I examine. By doing this, I work to make stronger claims about what might be intended when a participant gestures or makes an utterance, for example.

As a social encounter, an interview is productive communication because it “occasions the construction of accounts” (Mann, 2016, p. 51). Instead of being a neutral conduit, source of distortion, or elicitation of an interviewee’s pre-existing thoughts or experiences, an interview is an interactional object (Potter & Hepburn, 2005, p. 281). In my analyses, I treat the segments as situated, contextualized talk and analyze the texts as accounts that reflect the circumstances of their production. For example, I examine how what are presented as turns are constructed, how accounts are built in and through those turns, and the features of the units that comprise them.

Before analyzing the data, I transcribed by using an adaptation of Jefferson’s widely used interdisciplinary notation system for transcribing vocal conduct in talk-in-interaction (Jefferson, 1984/2004; Schegloff, 2007; Markee, 2015; Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; CA Tutorial, 2016; & E-Source, 2017). The table below lists the notation symbols that I used during transcription. The right-hand column lists the meanings of those symbols. Jeffersonian transcription conventions build on “familiar forms of literary notation (underlining for emphasis, capital letters for volume, arrows for pitch movement, and so on), which makes learning transcription conventions relatively straightforward” (Hepburn & Bolden, 2013, p. 2). This transcription system is uniquely helpful because it gives researchers a uniform way to communicate. I used these conventions to
transcribe the data because they allowed me to attend to what words are used, as well as how they are deployed. For example, I use symbols in my transcripts to identify where in the interaction emphasis is placed, volume and/or tone change, parts of words are stressed, elongated, or softened, and points at which a speaker is cut off before arriving at an intonationally, grammatically, and pragmatically possible point of completion (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974).

For each text transcript, I used a different level of detail to capture certain features. I based the level of transcription on the practices of social action, the subtleties in how speakers deploy utterances, and the paralinguistic features employed in the data. In general, I used what Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) refer to as an intermediate level of transcription. I treat transcription as Ochs (1979) does: transcriptions serve as researchers’ data, and transcription is a selective process that reflects theoretical goals and definitions (p. 44). In the appendix I offer full transcripts of all four texts that I analyze.

Table 3: Transcription System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notation Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning of Notation Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>Falling (final) intonation (not necessarily the end of a sentence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>Stretch of the preceding sound or syllable; the length of the row of colons indicates the length of the prolongation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>Talk between carrots is delivered more slowly than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; &lt;</td>
<td>Talk between carrots is delivered more quickly than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>An abruptly ended (cut off) utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!</td>
<td>Strong emphasis, with falling intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓ or ↑</td>
<td>Sharp rises or falls in intonation or pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° °</td>
<td>Talk between degree signs is quieter than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA</td>
<td>Talk in capital letters is louder than the surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>One-tenth of a second pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>Intervals or pauses between utterances (timed in tenths of a second)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>One second pause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conversation analysis provides researchers with a method for analysing in detail how “participants jointly construct the interaction and at the same time constitute the context, including participants’ identities” (Stubbe, Lane, Hilder, Vine, Vine, Marra, Holmes, & Weatherall, 2003, p. 358).

**Interactional sociolinguistics.** The founder of interactional sociolinguistics, Gumperz (2015), explains that conversational analysts set out to be as precise as possible when detailing what happens in interaction, and through these practices CA scholars have shown the world what turn-by-turn sequential analysis can teach us. Scholars use interactional sociolinguistics because they hold the view that sequential analysis that CA offers cannot, at least on its own, account for situated interpretation. When scholars use interactional sociolinguistics, they study procedures of interaction as well as the inferencing involved in that interaction. In interactional sociolinguistics, the analytical problem extends from determining what is meant to discovering “how interpretive assessments relate to the linguistic signaling processes through which they are negotiated” (Gumperz, p. 312). This means that participants in an interaction are always engaging in assessing the communication of their co-participants, and
those assessments “take the form of hypotheses that are either confirmed or rejected in the course of the exchange” (Gumperz, 2008, p. 218). By attending to those assessments, an analyst using an interactional sociolinguistic approach focuses on members’ procedures (as a CA analyst would), yet also focuses on inferencing.

Interactional sociolinguistics builds from a CA approach because it uses a speaker-oriented perspective and asks:

what it is speakers and listeners must know or do in order to be able to take part in a conversation or to create and sustain conversational involvement. By formulating the basic issues in this way, the focus shifts from the analysis of conversational forms or sequential patterns as such to the necessarily goal-oriented interpretive processes that underlie their production. (Gumperz, 1992, p. 306)

According to Gumperz (1992), interactional sociolinguistics taps into those goal-oriented interpretive processes through contextualization cues, or constellations of surface features of message form “by which speakers signal and listeners interpret what the activity is, how semantic content is to be understood and how each sentence relates to what precedes or follows” (p. 131). According to Gumperz, a contextualization cue is “any feature of linguistic form that contributes to the signalling of contextual presuppositions” (p. 131). For instance, such a cue might be rising intonation that signals a need for encouragement (Gumperz, p. 147). Another example of such a cue would be switching between certain pronouns to signal how one might wish “to be seen on the dichotomy between power and intimacy” (Ostermann, 2003). A third example of a contextualization cue would be non-verbal behaviour, like laughter that signals humor (Kotthoff, 2000). In general, contextualization cues work by activating and retrieving
necessary background knowledge “so that a contextually appropriate process of inference can take place” (Wilson, 2004, p. 2).

The discussion above illustrates how interactional sociolinguistics deals with interaction, or communicative practice, as an ongoing process of negotiation (Schiffrin 1994). Using the approach, analysts draw inferences about what participants intend to convey, and the ways participants monitor how their own contributions are received. Participants in interaction engage in negotiation processes in the sense that they attend to one another’s communicative acts. This refers to not merely the words spoken, but also how the words are spoken and the body language that is used in certain moments. Participants do more than attend to their co-participants’ communicative acts; they also respond to them in ways that are contingent on what their interactional goals are, and how their co-participants are orienting to them, in turn, at any given moment during the interaction. In interaction, participants achieve their communicative goals by speaking and by attending to the meaning making processes and the taken-for-granted background assumptions that underlie the negotiation of shared interpretations (Gumperz, 1999, p. 454). An interactional sociolinguistics researcher analyzes semantics of the individual units that form utterances, but also participants’ shared interpretations about speech, including culturally framed and interactively constituted speech events, the norms, the beliefs, and the values of the communities (Gumperz & Hymes, 1972).

An interactional sociolinguistics approach is particularly helpful in my study because it allows me to examine more than the turns, utterances, and sequences of talk. The approach allows me to study what inferences are drawn, what speech events unfold, what negotiations are constantly being made in interaction, and how all of this takes on different shapes, moment by moment.
Pragmatics. In my analyses, I also draw on pragmatics, the study of how linguistic signs, words, and sentences are used in particular situations. Levinson (1983) defines pragmatics as the study of the aspects of meaning and language use that are dependent on the speaker, the addressee, and other features of the context of utterance. Pragmatics is the branch of linguistics that encompasses “speech act theory, conversational implicature, talk in interaction and other approaches to language behavior” in philosophy, sociology, linguistics, and anthropology (Mey, 1993; Mey, 2001). In general, pragmatics concerns how, through language use, meaning is negotiated and constructed in certain contexts of interaction.

In my analyses, I draw on pragmatics when I attend to how each woman explains her actions, assesses the actions of others, and in so doing crafts her account by characterizing individuals featured in the account in strategic ways. Though we use language to “construct cohesive accounts” of our behavior and attitudes, our accounts often show contradictions regarding our attitudes and behaviors (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). I point out when this occurs in my data, and I discuss what these moments of accounting show about how terrorism works as communication practice. Tools that I use from pragmatics include speech act theory (Searle, 1969; 1975; 1976) and conversational implicature (Grice, 1975).

In pragmatics, speech act theory is a part of DA rooted in Austin’s (1955/1962) notion of performative utterances. Using speech act theory, I examine the shape and function of an utterance in context. In addition to investigating what certain utterances perform or enact, I attend to how the utterances are deployed to influence audience members. In conjunction with speech act theory, I draw on the pragmatics tool of conversational implicature.

Implicature refers to what is suggested, though not expressed in or by a particular utterance. Studying conversational implicature is particularly helpful when analyzing texts
presented as interviews that feature individuals accused of being terrorists because what can be outwardly stated in such contexts is often limited. For example, particular utterances made during a police interview could have quite serious legal consequences. Because of this, a speaker might rely on implicature to *implicitly or indirectly*, instead of *explicitly, make* a point. I examine implicature in the discourse I analyze by pointing out what in the discourse by and about women joining IS implies, but does not outwardly state, and how that is achieved.

**Feminist.** In this project, another important tool of analysis that I use in conjunction with discourse analysis is a feminist research frame. This is a feminist research project for several reasons.

First, it concerns gender because it focuses on the everyday experiences and viewpoints of women (Fonow & Cook, 1991). I research experiences of women, as well as how those experiences are communicatively constructed. I focus on the accounts built by and about women because I consider it necessary for more research to be about women and women’s statuses in our communities (Grbich, 2007; Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2002).

Another reason this research project is feminist is my commitment. I am committed to inquiry that documents aspects of reality in the making and takes a personal, political, and engaging stance with the world (Kumar, 2011). In mediated narrative accounts of IS recruitment, those associated with terrorist groups tend to be presented as less-than-human. To reference Bruneau’s (2016) study of what motivates monstrous acts:

> Historically, dehumanization has accompanied some of the darkest chapters in human history. During colonization, slavery, genocide, and war, depiction of the other side as uncivilized brutes or animals has been commonplace. We see this type of dehumanizing rhetoric from terror groups today — not only are we, the ‘infidels,’ referred to as ‘pigs’ or
'dogs,' but we are viewed as undifferentiated and therefore collectively responsible. The rhetoric in western democracies about disliked Muslim groups and terrorists is nearly identical: Iranians, Hamas and ISIS have been depicted in the mainstream media as rats, beasts, snakes or vermin in need of extermination. (pp. 13-16)

When we dramatically dehumanize others, we make ourselves capable of atrocious acts (Smith, 2011). I work in my analyses to humanize the four women featured in what are presented as interviews of them, and about their joining IS.

A third way I take a feminist approach in this study is by designing it to lead scholars to ask new, important questions about terrorism, communication, and gender, and in particular about how, through interactional contexts like those of the texts I examine, practices of exclusion, marginalization, and distortion are employed. By asking new questions, maybe scholars might sensitize ourselves to the “faceless and nameless who have been buried beneath the weight of officially sanctioned history,” and by doing that relearn how to “keep watch for a past which as never been present to us in the form of a Grand Narrative” (Kearney, 2005, p. 184). Mine is a study of cases that remain under-theorized in terrorism scholarship: individual women who have joined, or almost joined the terrorist group, IS. I work to carefully study the words, pauses, tones, and gestures of four women who, like the “ghosts and specters who have been exiled from the annals of official narrative history” (Kearney, p. 184), have remained under-featured in terrorism and communication scholarship.

A fourth way this study is feminist is that I conduct my research in an effort to contribute to social change by raising awareness that might inform specific policy recommendations (Reinharz, 1992). In this project, I focus on the accounts built about women joining IS because I believe that projects rooted in personal accounts of women have the potential to help us better
understand the conditions of the women who co-construct those accounts. Such understanding is necessary for those conditions, and similar ones to be changed in helpful ways. As a feminist scholar, I engage in social research to contribute to the welfare of women as well as to contribute to knowledge (Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2002; Reinharz, 1992). Like other feminist researchers, I strive to contribute knowledge that makes a difference in the world (Taylor, 1998, p. 358). Ideally, with more studies that focus on personal accounts of terrorist recruits, how we understand what is involved in people’s joining such groups can shift in beneficial ways. Therefore, research endeavors like this project have the potential to help recalibrate the strategies currently being used to prevent and intervene during terrorist recruitment processes.

**Transparency.** In this project, I use discourse analysis as a method of transparency. By this I mean that I use DA as a way to hold myself accountable for the project I develop and offer the world. Reflexivity is a set of practices that researchers use “to reflect upon, examine critically, and explore analytically the nature of the research process” (Fonow & Cook, 1991, p. 2). To engage in reflexivity, I work to consider and explicitly discuss the relationship between my field of research and my position in it. Since social construction research involves examining how members inhabit the social world that we create through interaction, I work to show in my study how this applies to the interaction involved in research processes. Since I recognize that my analyses and discussions are my own accounts of these data, I exercise reflexivity and transparency by outwardly stating, for instance, that my project is but one interpretation of the data I analyze.

Discourse analysis requires “a deeply reflexive approach to recognize the rules of formation, and to understand the patterns of power relations, through ‘self-conscious analytical scrutiny’” (English, 1994, p. 82). Because of their reflexive nature, discourse analytic approaches
invite methodological questions about how researchers can practice and demonstrate reflexivity. The position of the researcher needs to be acknowledged early on in the research processes, and this is important because such acknowledgement will help the research audience understand the choices made (Sharp & Richardson, 2001, p. 203). In an effort to be self-conscious in my research practices, at all stages of this project I take steps to be self-aware about the roles I play in data collection, analysis, and writing processes, as well as the ontological universe to which my research contributes. For example, I understand and treat transcription as theorizing, not as objective or separate from theorizing (Ochs, 1979/1999; Bucholtz, 2001; Bucholtz, 2007). I understand the process in this way because I acknowledge that transcription is never neutral, but is instead a selective process that reflects a researcher’s theoretical goals and definitions. Concurrently, whatever shows up on a transcript constrains what analyses can be done as well as what generalizations can be made from those analyses.

To critically consider my roles as data gatherer, analyst, and discussant, I ask certain questions about my data and the approaches that I use throughout the research process: What is my research agenda? What project am I trying to accomplish through my analyses and discussions? What are my justifications for conducting such a study? What populations might my research influence? How might what I write on these pages influence those populations? How the decisions I make about the scope of my data collection, the analyses I present, and the discussions I write influence others?

A researcher can never be separated from the discursive formations in our fields. Furthermore, our work always has the potential to influence the ways that knowledge in our academic areas is framed, as well as the discourses that are produced and reproduced. Because of this, transparency and reflexivity must entail more than taking into account our positions as
researchers and the positions of our research participants, and then transparently writing about those positions in our research practice (McDowell, 1992, p. 409). Researchers must go beyond this because “there is no prior reality or unified identity to gain access to or be created by research” (Gibson-Graham, 1994, p. 214). This means that researchers must remember that social interaction, including the social interaction that is involved in research processes, of course, is about intersubjectivity: a research context, the relationships between researcher and researched are contingent and relational. By attending to how I, as researcher, interact with the data I analyze, as well as those featured in the data, I work to be transparent about my positions, about how and why I utilize the research tools that I use, and about how my research choices might influence the study findings as well as the possible implications of those findings. As Richardson (2001) reminds us, “discourse theory puts the spotlight on the boundaries of thought and action. Using these tools reflexively is an attempt to first notice how these boundaries are established and maintained, and then to notice the effects of this closing down process” (p. 354). By carefully studying data, an analyst aims to identify what discourse is being used to do, or what social action is in the works. Additionally, by attending to how that social action is underway - how participants engage in communication to jointly accomplish the social action on the table - boundaries are put in place that prevent other social actions from being accomplished, and such that the potential for other social actions is extinguished. Through my research process, I attend to such matters to illustrate and honor the intersubjective nature of DA scholarship.

**Sensemaking.** In addition to working to be transparent at each phase of the research process and using a feminist frame, I employ a sensemaking frame in my analyses. In, through, and with communication, language users - discourse analysts, included - make meaning together
and collaboratively build our world. In this way, accounts, such as those built in news stories, for example, work as the substance and locus of sensemaking:

   And a good story, like a workable cause map, shows patterns that may already exist in the puzzles an actor now faces, or patterns that could be created anew in the interest of more order and sense in the future. The stories are templates. They are products of previous efforts at sensemaking. They explain. And they energize. And those are two important properties of sensemaking that we remain attentive to when we look for plausibility instead of accuracy. (Weick, 1995, p. 61)

To bring meaning to our experiences, we make retrospective sense of our experiences. To try to understand what is going on in moments of uncertainty, individuals do sensemaking by extracting and interpreting cues from our environment, using those cues as the basis for a plausible account that provides order and thus makes sense of what occurred, and continuing to enact the environment through our account (Brown, 2000; Maitlis, 2005; Weick, 1995; Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2005). Through sensemaking, individuals author situations, and play our own parts in building the very circumstances that we attempt to comprehend (Sutcliffe, 2013; Weick, 1995; Weick et al., 2005), as well as the frames we use to understand those circumstances. In each of the four texts I examine, participants engage in sensemaking processes to understand the novel, unexpected, or confusing events being discussed therein (Weick, 1995; Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). In each case, those events are the women’s joining, or almost joining the so-called Islamic State.

   I hold the view that, to study discourse is to study social action, and the meaning individuals attach to our actions guides social action (Schutz, 1964). Meanings are socially produced, and sensemaking, including interpretation and authoring, happens in interaction, in
how we are social together. Because of this, I focus my analyses on what social actions unfold in the mediated narrative accounts. I do this by studying where and how, in my data, “questions are asked, truth claims are negotiated, and realities are co-constructed (Krippendorff, 2011, p. 134). In the four texts I analyze, I attend to the sensemaking that is done through accounting that unfolds in the interaction, such as in the turns of conversation, including in images presented as turns.

In conversations, such as in mediated narrative accounts presented as interviews, a great deal happens:

physical, biological, cognitive, linguistic and sociological realities are created and take hold of the imaginations of diverse communities whose members listen to, live with, and enact these conversational realities. (Krippendorff, 2011, p. 134)

As a condition of our existence, humans are constituted in a unique togetherness that involves interactively coordinated speaking, and during that speaking we are:

constantly reminded that our engagement with each other has a history that precedes our participation in it and this history inevitably resonates in ongoing conversations. (2011, pp. 134-135)

Language users interact with one another through conversation, through account building that we do in certain communication contexts. Through our participation in conversations, we co-construct our realities. With this interactional frame I approach the data that I analyze in this project.

In the following chapter, I aim to demonstrate the need for scholars in our digital age to continue developing new ways of studying multimodal texts. Another goal is to invite the reader along as I trek through the at-times turbulent interaction between Alex and the producers of the
mediated narrative account of IS recruitment presented as an interview of Alex. Beginning with a close study of the text featuring Alex, the analyses I offer in this project are designed to show how, even though each of the four mediated narrative accounts of IS recruitment is designed for its own purpose and has its own, unique context, an overall moral account of terrorism is being constructed through the texts presented as interviews of women of IS. That moral account of terrorism leads to understanding terrorism as the production and consumption of terror.

In the following chapter, I offer a close analysis of the mediated narrative account of IS recruitment that is presented as a video interview of Alex. I attend to the interaction that animates the multimodal text. I illustrate for readers how multiple accounts can be offered at once in the same interaction, and how they can compete with one another, at times intimately rubbing up against each other, while at other points violently vying, tooth and nail, for narrative autorité.
Chapter Two, Alex:

Terrorism as Interaction

Joining a terrorist organization is an act that is not immediately, if ever, intelligible, or comprehensible to others. Because of this, one’s joining needs to be storied such that the act is rendered understandable, in some way, to others. The focus of this chapter is the account of IS recruitment that is presented as an interview of Alex (a pseudonym), “Flirting With the Islamic State,” that is embedded in the New York Times news report, “ISIS and the Lonely Young American” (Callimachi, 2015) and is produced by Poh Si Teng and Ben Laffin. Since in the text the accounts of Alex and the producers are presented to the audience alongside and in opposition to each other, I analyze the interaction that unfolds.

Since my overall aim is to show how terrorism is produced and consumed in communication, I open my analysis by examining how the online news report about Alex works as, and through interaction. To develop the notion that terrorism is produced and consumed in communication, ultimately, with my analysis of the mediated narrative account of IS recruitment that features Alex, I investigate how terrorism is constituted in the interaction between the producers and Alex. I attend to the ways in which the interaction in text results in the production of a certain narrative: Alex is constructed as having been lonely and flirted with IS. I point out how the strategies the producers use undermine what are presented as Alex’s turns and ultimately work by conveying a certain message about terrorism: that anyone, at any time, can be recruited into a terrorist group. I open with my analysis of the text featuring Alex because it adds to our
 insights about becoming a woman of IS by pointing out how terrorism is mobilized through interaction.

In this chapter, I accomplish three tasks. First, I show how interactionally produced accounts are sites for the construction of terrorism. Second, I address how accounts about joining groups like IS, in particular, and terrorism, in general, are constructed as apparently unintelligible moral acts. Third, I examine how, in mediated narrative accounts of women being recruited into the so-called Islamic State, women who have, or have almost joined the organization are constructed as untrustworthy, unreliable narrators.

**Title: “Flirting”**

The title of the eight-minute seven-second mediated narrative account of Alex is “Flirting With the Islamic State,” and the text is featured at the very beginning of Callimachi’s *The New York Times* report (2015).
Syntax. Syntactically, the title of the mediated narrative account - “Flirting With the Islamic State” - includes no agent, or acting subject. Leaving the agent out obscures who or what is carrying out the flirting action. Without an acting subject, the title appears to leave up to interpretation the identity of the party being accused of “flirting with the Islamic State,” and leave unaddressed what “flirting with” a terrorist group might entail. As the first word of the title, “flirting” is immediately made the focus of the account about to unfold. “Flirting” is also the subject of the video title, and signals notions of romance, sex, and courtship.

Instruction & Evaluation. The producers use the title to, immediately, tell the audience how to interpret. The title is the instruction, the frame, and the evaluation of the account, and this
evaluation is made even before the account is produced. By calling Alex’s joining “flirting,” the producers offer the audience an interpretive frame with which to understand the story to come. In this way, the audience is given a set of directions to follow as in the interactional task to which we are assigned: coming to understand Alex’s joining (since her joining is presented as the subject of the mediated narrative account). From the start, the audience is informed about what is going to happen in the mediated narrative account: we will be offered a fleshed-out version of Alex’s (almost) joining IS.

While the title of the mediated narrative account never explicitly names Alex as the person engaging in the flirting, through implicature (Grice, 1975), we understand her as the agent of flirting. Additionally, since the text is embedded in a report about Alex, the audience is introduced to Alex as the interview subject who is charged with building an account to explain her “flirting with the Islamic State.” The word, “flirting,” serves as a term of evaluation, characterizing Alex as a narrator who is romantically fickle, immature, and potentially unreliable. Even before the first line of the mediated narrative account, Alex is presented as a morally questionable character. This establishes the guiding question of the mediated narrative account presented as an interview: Who is accountable in this interview about Alex and her joining? If Alex is not to be trusted, whose version of events should we, as the audience, believe? From the beginning, the producers use strategies to recruit the audience into the undermining that they carry out: eclipsing Alex’s version of events with their own and troubling the notion of narrative truth in the first place.

The title also creates juxtaposition between “flirting” (innocuous and even playful action) and “with the Islamic State” (a group that is dangerous and violent). This problematizes the entire truth of the account, addressing “flirting,” i.e. fickle, alongside IS, a quite serious terrorist
organization. This epitomizes how the work of the producers subverts their account, i.e. their own version of events: conveying the message that terrorism cannot be accounted for effectively because terrorism makes no sense.

**Caption: The Conversations May Provide Clues**

Along with the title of the text, the context of it makes evident to the audience that accountability is the interactional fuel that is propelling the mediated narrative account of Alex. Literally sandwiching the video interview screen, the title and caption serve as audience appetite-whetting devices. Framing the screen, they set the scene for the interaction that is about to unfold.

**Figure 2: Screenshot of Alex’s Interview Caption**

While the title of the mediated narrative account presented as an interview, “Flirting with the Islamic State,” introduces Alex’s flirting as the subject of the text, the caption of the text introduces “the conversations” that unfolded between “a young woman in rural Washington state and a British man with ties to radical Islam” as the subject of the mediated narrative account featuring Alex.

**A British man as morally questionable.** In addition to introducing Alex to the audience as morally questionable, the producers present the “British man” as morally questionable. They accomplish this in two ways. First, they immediately describe him in the caption as having “ties to radical Islam.” Additionally, they create a juxtaposition between his being “British” (neutral or positive connotation) and his being someone with “ties to radical Islam” (negative connotation), presenting the man as a citizen of a country allied with the United States: he is constructed as a terrorist who is hiding in plain sight.
**The conversations as reportable.** The producers characterize the conversations the British man is said to have been having with Alex as reportable because they describe them as having the potential to serve the public by “provid[ing] clues about how ISIS recruits new members around the world.” In narratives, reportability has to do with the fact that telling a story about one’s experience requires the narrative to carry enough interest for the audience to justify its telling. Otherwise, “an implicit or explicit ‘So what?’ is in order, with the implication that the speaker has violated social norms by making this unjustified claim” (Labov, 1997, p. 405) that the story was worth telling. Ochs and Capps (1996) make a similar point, noting that narratives, especially narratives of personal experience characteristically revolve around “an unexpected or troubling turn of events,” in other words goings on that make the narratives stories that are tellable, i.e. reportable (p. 26).

With the caption of text featuring Alex, the producers construct the story about to be told as *tellable* for two reasons:

1. It is a story about the conversations between a man with ties to radical Islam and a young woman in rural Washington, and those conversations are presented as how Alex almost joined IS.

2. The conversations matter because they can serve as clues to help the public figure out how IS recruits new members.

Alex’s (almost) joining is the most reportable event in the text because it is “the event that is less common than any other in the narrative and has the greatest effect upon the needs and desires of the participants in the narrative (is evaluated most strongly)” (Labov, 1997, p. 406). Alex’s near joining answers to the implicit “So what?” question, i.e., “Why should this story be told?” The audience is immediately informed that the story of Alex’s near recruitment is to be understood as
an illustration of how IS successfully and regularly recruits new members around the world. The caption asserts that the conversations between this “young woman in rural Washington state” and “British man with ties to radical Islam” are “clues” about how IS recruits new members, and therefore, should be used to better understand how IS gains new members.

Establishing relationship between producers, Alex, Faisal, & audience. The title and caption of the text establishes an ambiguous relationship between the producers, Alex, Faisal, and the audience. This is accomplished in three ways:

1. Alex, as “flirter,” is not to be trusted.

2. Faisal, as “a British man,” is terrorist passing as a British citizen, and therefore not to be trusted.

3. Since Alex and Faisal’s conversations are characterized as representative of the interaction that constitutes how individuals come to be recruited into IS, calling them useful because they offer “clues” about recruitment positions the audience as co-investigators, or detectives on the hunt to collect evidence to solve the case: how does someone end up joining IS?

Through context and implicature, the producers and audience are positioned as co-investigators. Concurrently, Alex and the British man - thus far unnamed, though later called Faisal - are positioned as candidate new IS recruit and IS recruiter, respectively. This establishes interactional tension between the players in this text.

Illusion of Accountability

The producers follow their assertions with what are presented as Alex’s turns as contributions to the production of the mediated narrative account. This creates the illusion that the online news report that features Alex is an interview, i.e. is a text organized in question-
answer format. However, no questions are asked. By using this strategy, the producers give the audience the sense that an interview is being cooperatively accomplished turn-by-turn. This dynamic works by leading the audience to presume that mediated narrative account of Alex’s IS recruitment is constituted by an account that is being co-produced in interaction. The producers’ strategy of presenting the text as though it takes this form creates the illusion of accountability. This structure shows the audience that Alex appears to be offering her account, and the producers seem to take their turns, as is expected in an interview. Yet, as I show, what are presented as the producers’ turns undermine and ironize the enterprise in which they are engaged: presenting Alex’s account of almost joining the so-called Islamic State.

Alex: “They Told Me”

The mediated narrative account opens with a silhouette of Alex. Her face is obscured, and she appears to be sitting or standing in in the dark with a window behind her. Eerie music plays in the background as Alex comes into view, rocking back and forth as she begins her story.

Figure 3: Screenshot of Alex’s Silhouette
To open the text, the producers feature Alex (“A” in the transcript) narrating how her IS recruitment began. In her first utterance, Alex commences a list, announcing to her audience:

1. A: The first thing they told me was I was not allowed to listen to music.
2. Um the sec-in thing they told me is like how to pray ((nods))
3. They did tell me that it is a sin t- to live- to stay in non-Muslim lands
4. if you have a chance, to make- to go to Muslim lands
5. (0.3)
6. because, why would we stay in a land of disbelievers and doubters?

Alex embarks on her account by telling her audience how the recruiters “told” her what to do and not do. Alex uses the ambiguous, third person pronoun, “they,” without an antecedent, leaving open to interpretation the identities of those telling her how to behave. The obvious implication is that those telling her how to behave are IS affiliates.

**Reported speech.** Reported speech is often used when a speaker recounts speech acts of others, points out events in interaction, and expresses relations, like purpose or reason (Larson, 1978, pp. 1-2). In this excerpt, Alex describes the events as IS affiliates “telling” her how to act: to not listen to music (line 1), how to pray (line 2), and what qualifies as a “sin” (lines 3-6). Additionally, Alex expresses relations by conveying to her audience that she was the listener, while the IS affiliates were the “tellers” in their interaction.

Another way this excerpt shows how Alex expresses relations is how she immediately taking on the vocabulary of the IS affiliates with whom she was communicating online. Alex includes herself as an IS affiliate when she uses the plural pronoun, “we”: “because, why would we stay in a land of disbelievers and doubters?” (line 6).
This indirect speech serves as a strategy that instills “prevailing social order and its normative perspectives” (Tannen, Hamilton, & Schiffrin, 2015, p. 732). The social order Alex instills is represented by the practices of IS affiliates she points to in the excerpt. For example, in line 3, Alex notes what is treated as a “sin” in her new community. In line 6, Alex uses “disbelievers” and “doubters” exemplifying labels used therein. Finally, in lines 1 through 4, Alex describes the actions that encouraged in her new community.

Alex’s use of reported speech paints a picture for the audience. It conveys the specific social order that IS affiliates taught her, including what they deem appropriate actions of a person who is Muslim, and relays the communicative process through which IS affiliates worked (through online talk) to integrate Alex into the community.

Repeating “told.” When analyzing embedded speech acts, two socio-cultural contexts must be taken into account: the first is the primary communicative situation, and the second is the communicative situation in which the speech act originally occurred in its performative form (Fitzmaurice & Taavitsainen, p. 115). On the primary pragmatic level, in lines 1 through 6, Alex carries out the locutionary act: declaration (Searle, 1975). Yet, indirectly, Alex’s report could be categorized as a different speech act type: a performative (Fitzmaurice & Taavitsainen, 2007). The first context of Alex’s speech is the mediated narrative account, presented as a video interview in which Alex offers her declaration. The second context of Alex’s speech is the original event, i.e. when Alex was engaging in online communication with IS affiliates.

In the primary communicative situation that is Alex’s mediated narrative account presented as an interview, Alex reports to her audience, declaring that the IS recruiters “told” her three things:

1. that she was not permitted to listen to music (line 1)
2. how to pray (line 2)

3. that it is a sin to stay in non-Muslim lands (line 3)

In the second context, i.e. when Alex was engaging in online communication with IS affiliates, Alex includes herself in the group of IS members by referring to the group members as “we.” The *illocutionary speech act*, “because, why would we stay in a land of disbelievers and doubters?” functions as a *commissive*, i.e. a speech act that commits a speaker to some future action (a promise, oath, etc.). As a commissive, Alex’s utterance illustrates that she and the IS affiliates consider the U.S. a “land of disbelievers and doubters,” and because of that offer justification for IS affiliates choosing to leave such non-Muslim lands to live in Muslim ones.

Variations of “told” show up in all three opening lines of Alex’s account. It is interesting to note how narrative analyst and former FBI special agent Schafer (2010) divides what he calls Communication Words into three key categories that are useful when considering Alex’s uses of “told.”

### Table 4: Shafer’s Categories of Communication Words (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition:</th>
<th>Conversational Words:</th>
<th>Argumentative Words:</th>
<th>Inquisitive Words:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Represent subtle nuances in conversations</td>
<td>Indicate that the conversation is adversarial</td>
<td>Indicate that one person attempts to acquire information from another person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples:</td>
<td>“talk” “discuss” “tell” “said” “spoke” “chat” “converse”</td>
<td>“confront” “argue” “shout” “testify”</td>
<td>“ask” “inquiry” “query” “request” “muse”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Shafer’s scheme, a Conversational Word like “talk” points to the dynamic between conversation participants as one-way, where one party is dominating the conversation.
In contrast, a word like “discuss” suggests that a two-way, give-and-take kind of conversation is unfolding. Like “talk,” the Conversational Word “told” implies a “one-way verbal exchange wherein the speaker dominates the conversation” (Schafer, 2010, p. 65). In the opening excerpt, Alex’s use of the Conversational Word “told” functions as her assessment of the communicative situation in which the speech act originally occurred (instances are in bold font).

1 A: The first thing they **told** me was I was not allowed to listen to music.
2 Um the sec-in thing they **told** me is like how to pray ((nods))
3 They did **tell** me that it is a sin t- to live- to stay in non-Muslim lands
4 if you have a chance, to make- to go to Muslim lands

Alex’s use of variations of “told” three times in this opening sequence - (“told” in line 1, “told” in line 2, and “did tell” in line 3) - could signal Alex’s evaluation of the IS affiliates’ interaction with her as the affiliates dominating the conversation when they conversed with her online.

Using “told” (twice) and “did tell” (once), Alex retroactively characterizes her account of the communication with IS recruiters as one-way verbal exchange, casting the IS recruiters as leaders of the interactions, while casting Alex as passive, not agentive.

**Producers: “Alex,’ 23, Started Chatting Online”**

Following what is designed to look like Alex’s first turn in the interview, the producers insert a text comment, in the form of a declarative, that casts Alex as active, and agentive.

Undermining Alex’s interactional goal of telling the audience her version of events, the producers reinforce the point that Alex is not to be believed, presenting Alex as an untrustworthy narrator. The producers introduce Alex to the audience by announcing that she “started chatting online with” IS sympathizers, while concurrently visually showing Alex not chatting online:
Mode. Whereas Alex offers her account in her own voice and face-to-face (lines 1-6), when the producers evaluate Alex, offering a post-facto account of what Alex did, the producers present their account in writing, exclusively, in the form of white, typed font against a black background. This difference in mode adds another layer to the text. Like an institutional text, the producers’ account is stripped of personal style, name, face, or style that would serve to humanize, or soften it. In this way, the mode of the producers’ account casts it as impersonal, strictly business, fact-based, and seemingly unbiased. The producers’ communication is presented as though it is imposed from above, omniscient, and authoritative. This constructs the producers’ account as potentially less contestable, and as more authoritative, plausible, and credible than Alex’s. A much more human account, Alex’s is offered in a meek tone of voice, with shy, reserved, and timid body language (she rocks back and forth, for example). Alex’s rising intonation signals uneasiness, and speech hearable as weak, lacking power and authority, and indicating low confidence (Lakoff, 1975/2004). In conjunction with Alex’s upspeak (at the end of the declaratives in lines 11 and 12, for instance), Alex’s use of conjunctions in false starts (“but” in line 12, for example), and repetition (“it was also” in line 12, for instance) contribute to
presenting Alex as tentative and submissive. Taken together, these elements cast Alex as lacking confidence, and perhaps as suspect, constructing her reporting as potentially less reliable, especially when compared to the producers’.

**Agency.** In their introduction of Alex – “‘Alex,’ 23, started chatting online with sympathizers of the Islamic State in August” (00:34, Teng & Laffin, 2015) – the producers describe Alex as initiator of the conversations that she had with IS affiliates. By presenting Alex as having commenced communication with “sympathizers of the Islamic State,” the producers offer the audience an account that contrasts with the one Alex previously offered. Whereas Alex constructed herself as an innocent, passive student of IS affiliates, the producer construct her as the active, agentic subject who catalyzed the interaction with the IS sympathizers.

The producers accomplish their goal, partially, through syntax. As the subject of the sentence, Alex is positioned as active agent. Alex’s age follows. Subsequently, the verbal phrase “started chatting online” is used to inform the audience that Alex initiated the chatting “with sympathizers” of IS. Finally, a specific time during which this chatting activity unfolded is reported. This specifies the circumstances of Alex’s action. As an independent, or main clause - it has a subject (“‘Alex,” 23”) and predicate, (“started chatting online with sympathizers of the Islamic State in August”) and makes sense on its own - it expresses an “ASSERTION, that is, it expresses a CLAIM that the speaker/writer is making” (Gee, 2005, p. 55, emphasis in original). Because of its form, a sentence like this comes off to the audience as a fact. However, the sentence is, in fact, working as a claim that the producers are making about Alex: that she initiated her recruitment. By building Alex up in this way, the producers present her to the audience as at least partially to blame for her nearly joining IS.
By including when Alex started chatting with IS sympathizers, the producers use a story-telling device: they foreground temporal circumstance in the assertion. Quite common in newspaper reporting, foregrounding temporal circumstance gives the story a temporal orientation. “Like a story, newspaper reports are packaged in such a way as to provide information in an entertaining or captivating way” (Teo, 2000), however, unlike a story, a news report must at the same time be seen as a “factual, objective report of what actually happened; otherwise, their credibility as a newspaper would be seriously undermined” (Teo, p. 36). Because of this, in news stories, certain strategies, like foregrounding temporal circumstance, are used to present an event, or action in entertaining, intriguing ways, but also in ways that blur lines between fact and fiction.

To recap, in an effort to establish credibility with the audience, the producers make their story seem like a factual, objective report of what actually happened by offering the audience an evaluation of Alex. They accomplish this by assigning her agency, by using independent clauses like their opening line, and by employing a mode quite different from Alex’s casual, human one. The strategies the producers use undermine Alex’s “doing.” With them, the producers invite the audience to make sense of Alex’s almost joining by attending to their constructions of Alex and her joining (instead of to Alex’s constructions of herself and her joining). From the very beginning of the mediated narrative account, the producers instruct the audience to morally evaluate the interaction that goes on as “flirting,” i.e. as questionable and/or morally problematic. This leads the audience to necessarily morally evaluate Alex as a narrator, which leaves us orienting to her as an unreliable reporter, since, as the producers have conveyed, she flirts with IS and even initiated her recruitment.

Alex proceeds by describing how she lives in isolation and boredom, and that she remedies her loneliness by building community online.
Alex: “I’ve metten my friends on the Internet”

7 A: I live in, like, a modular home
8 with my grandparents
9 and it’s in the middle of nowhere.
10 If we lived in the city we could walk wherever we wanted
11 and here- it was a lot better in a lot of ways because it was safer
12 but it was also- because it was also safer it was a lot more boring
13 (3.0)
14 (. ) I’ve metten my friends on the Internet. I have more community
15 with them than I have with people in my own community

In this excerpt, Alex informs the audience that she engages in online communication with people who are initially strangers because she is responding to her life circumstances. Alex tells the audience that she goes on the Internet to connect with others to build herself a more “livable” life (Butler, 2004).

**Morally accountable.** Interaction is a committed enterprise in the sense that speaker-hearers have expectations and responsibilities, and therefore we hold one another morally accountable (Goffman, 1967), and accounts like Alex’s are morally laden because they concern how an individual, or individuals should have acted in the past, how they should act now, and how they should act in the future (Goffman, 1959). From line 7 through line 15, Alex presents herself as morally accountable to her audience by offering the audience details about her life. By offering this account, Alex strives to meet the presumed interactional expectations of her audience: that she will build an account about her near recruitment. Her account is moral discourse because it involves “a moral judgment, a judgment of ‘ought’ by the actor” or one who
is offering the account (Boyd, 1986, p. 45). This excerpt shows how Alex works to reveal to her audience that she ought to be online because that is where she finds friends, connection, and community. Alex’s account is morally laden because Alex explains her online relationships by telling the audience that she has “community” with her “friends,” something someone ought to do, even if that needs to happen online. Additionally, as Scott and Lyman (1968) and Buttny (1993) explain, an account’s purpose is always to supply a reason for actions, behaviors, and choices. In this excerpt, Alex offers what Scott and Lyman and Buttny refer to as a rationale for her actions, choices, and behaviors. She supplies the audience with this reason for her actions: because my face-to-face living situation is a lonely one, I go online to create relationships with others, and I was on the Internet trying to do just this when I was communicating with IS affiliates. From line 14 to line 15, Alex states, “I’ve metten my friends on the Internet. I have more community with them than I have with people in my own community.” In this highly edited online news report text, a choice was made to leave “metten” in the text. It could be said that the producers’ inclusion of Alex’s use of “metten” (instead of “met,” for example) in the text casts Alex as imperfect, as flawed. In contrast, had the producers featured Alex using “met,” for instance, perhaps Alex would have been presented as a more polished speaker. In lines 7 through 15, Alex addresses the question, “Why would a young woman go online, communicate with someone who has ties to a group like IS, and nearly join that group?” Alex’s answer is: to find friends and community.

Producers: “She posted questions about the group on Twitter”

After Alex describes herself as someone who seeks community online, the producers respond by, yet again, undermining her. This time, they achieve this by reminding the audience that she was the party who initiated the interaction with IS affiliates, and therefore, the producers
reinforce the point they have been making all along: that the audience should not consider Alex a trustworthy narrator.

**Reassigning agency.** The producers, again, present Alex as agentic, declaring:

![Figure 5: Screenshot (1:11)](image)

As this exemplifies, two contrasting accounts are being offered about Alex and her near recruitment into the so-called Islamic State. The producers’ utterance, featured in the screenshot above, announces that, in response to American journalist James Foley being killed, Alex initiated communication online by seeking information about IS. In the visual, Alex is lying on her back with her feet up, and she is on her cell phone. This visual suggests that Alex is engaging in the action of “post[ing] questions about” IS online, and perhaps she engages in that action unlikely places (in the image above, she looks like she is resting in an industrial sized pipe that has been discarded somewhere in Alex’s neighborhood). This visual might work by presenting Alex’s online interaction with IS affiliates as mundane, as so unremarkable that she even engages in that interaction on her cell phone, sitting cross legged with her legs propped up, and in a public space where anyone could just walk by. This contributes to painting a picture of
terrorist recruitment as process that could happen to any ordinary American, and that could happen at any time, anywhere, and even on any device.

This reminds the audience about what was previously announced - that Alex “started chatting online with sympathizers of the Islamic State” (Teng & Laffin, 2015, 00:34). It also offers the audience details about how Alex went about that “chatting.” The producers inform the audience that she accomplished the act by “post[ing] questions about the group on Twitter” (Teng & Laffin, 2005, 1:11). The ordering of the phrases is key here. As Gee explains:

Normally, in English, dependent clauses follow independent clauses - thus, [the sentence ‘Though they were both narrowly confined to the privileged classes, the Whig and Tory parties represented different factions’] might more normally appear as: ‘The Whig and Tory parties represented different factions, though they were both narrowly confined to the privileged classes.’ In sentence 1 the dependent clause has been fronted (placed in front of the whole sentence). This is a statement about form. Such fronting has as one of its functions that the information in the clause is thematized (Halliday, 1994), that is, the information is treated as a launching-off point or thematically important context from which to consider the claim in the following dependent clause. This is a statement about function. (p. 55, brackets and emphasis in original)

This kind of fronting is used in the producers’ turn featured in the screenshot above. The dependent clause “After James Foley, an American journalist was beheaded by the Islamic State,” is positioned before “she posted questions about the group on Twitter.” Functionally, such fronting treats the information in the dependent clause, “After James Foley, an American journalist was beheaded by the Islamic State,” as the launching-off point, or the thematically important context from which to consider the claim in the following clause, “she posted
questions about the group on Twitter.” The fronting in this case is done for an information focus, but also for a temporal purpose: to establish sequence. In effect, this sentence organization constructs a particular sequence of events: first, IS beheads James Foley, an American journalist; and second, Alex goes on Twitter and posts questions about IS.

Only one minute into the mediated narrative account, the producers have twice announced to the audience that Alex initiated communication with IS, presenting Alex as agentic. Three questions are central to the concept of agency: What is an action (versus an ‘event’, a ‘happening’ or a ‘state’) (see action theory)? Whose action is it (including who can be held responsible for it)? Is it meaningful and morally ‘good’ or ‘bad’? (Bamberg, 2016). This means that addressing agency requires attending to what constitutes an action, to whom an action is attributed, how an action is made meaningful, and whether an action is deemed “good” or “bad.”

With and in accounts, speakers make choices that signal different perspectives, and those choices also serve by positioning selves and others in terms of more versus less agency, dynamism, and affectedness. For example, speakers can downplay or underscore certain characters’ (including their own) involvement in events that they are narrating. Through these choices, speakers create evaluations and stances regarding who is morally right, or at fault in what social situations. Just sixty seconds into the text, Alex is constructed as morally “bad” because: first, Alex is storied as having initiated communication with IS sympathizers, and because; and, second, she posted questions about IS on Twitter soon after IS committed the violent act of beheading the American journalist, James Foley. Interactionally, “After James Foley, an American journalist was beheaded by the Islamic State, she posted questions about the group on Twitter,” functions as an attempt to one-up Alex by recasting her communicating online with IS sympathizers as an act
that Alex actively carried out (agentically), and at an inappropriate time (during a time that was
sensitive for the U.S. since it was shocked by the recent event of IS beheading Foley).

Though Alex and the producers’ accounts differ, both are integral to the generation and
preservation of the moral and social order, and this is because accounts are used to make sense of
discrepancies that present the potential to threaten the social order (Garfinkel, 1967; Goffman,
1971). We see a tension in Alex’s case, a discrepancy that threatens the social order: a seemingly
innocent, young woman babysitter and Sunday school teacher from rural Washington was almost
successfully recruited into the terrorist group, IS. Accounts are related to motives because they
often answer an implicit question regarding a speaker’s intentions, motives, or reasoning (Mills,
1940). The implicit question that Alex and the producers’ accounts address is: “Why would a
young woman go online and communicate with someone who sympathizes with IS?” As the
table below illustrates, thus far two candidate answers to this question have been offered.

**Table 5: Implicit Question & Candidate Answers in Alex’s Interview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>Candidate (producers’) answer:</th>
<th>Candidate (Alex’s) answer:</th>
<th>Suggesting:</th>
<th>Suggesting:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Why would a young woman go online and communicate with sympathizers of IS? | **Account built about Alex as having:**  
• been intrigued by the Foley incident;  
• wanted more information; and  
• been seeking it out through online dialogue with IS affiliates. | **Account built about Alex as having:**  
• been using the Internet as a community-building tool;  
• been using the Internet as a way to garner friends; and  
• been using the Internet as a means of learning about current events, including what happened to Foley. | Alex was conversation initiator and information-seeker, suggesting that Alex is at least partially to blame for her near-recruitment into IS. | Alex was an active Internet user since using the Internet was Alex’s way of building community, suggesting that Alex is not to blame for her near-recruitment into IS. |
In the two accounts built in this mediated narrative account presented as an interview, Alex’s motivations diverge. Even by the end of the text, the accounts remain unreconciled.

**Alex: “So I Could Understand Why”**

Detailing how her communication with IS commenced, Alex announces that she went online to find others who could educate her.

16 A: I was lookin for people who agreed with what they were doing so
17 I could understand why they were doing it
18 and it was actually really easy to find them

In these lines, Alex offers the audience a justification for having being online, announcing that her intent was to better comprehend the context at hand. Instead of accepting or aligning with Alex’s construction of herself as someone looking to “understand why” IS was doing what it was doing, the producers, yet again, undermine what is underway, this time constructing Faisal as a character in the story who is just as untrustworthy as Alex.

**Producers: “They chatted for hours every day”**

Using another declarative, the producers announce:

![Figure 6: Screenshot (1:27)](image-url)
Introducing a new character into the story, “a man” (previously mentioned only in the caption), the producers provide his full name, including his first name and his surname, which marks formality and signals distance (Taiwo, 2010, p. 29), but also contributes to the production of a factual account.

By reporting that Alex and the man “chatted for hours every day,” the producers underscore the frequency of Alex and the man’s communication. Using the imprecise quantification, “hours every day,” the producers leave to the audience’s imagination exactly how many hours per day Alex and Faisal chat online.

The ambiguity surrounding the kind of “messages” they were exchanging, coupled with the ambiguity surrounding how much time they spent communicating on a regular basis present Alex and Faisal’s relationship to the audience as an intense (in that they speak with one another frequently), yet questionable (in that little has been revealed about Faisal) one. After the producers introduce Faisal to the audience in this way, Alex offers the audience her own introduction of Faisal, referring to him by his first name, a convention that signals intimacy, congeniality, and informality (Taiwo, 2010, p. 29), and labeling him her friend (line 21). Whereas the producers present themselves as authorities charged with the task of fact-production and audience informant, they cast Faisal as a suspicious character who is in an inappropriate relationship with Alex. In so doing, the producers distance Faisal from the audience, establishing a dichotomy wherein the producers occupy the role of transparent reporter hero, while Faisal and Alex occupy the roles of shady character villains who are morally questionable, thus not to be trusted.
Producers: “He is 51 and is married.”

**Widening the interactional gap.** The producers’ formal, impersonal way of describing Faisal overshadows Alex’s characterization of him as a friend (line 21), as someone emotionally close to her. By reporting to the audience information about this man’s place of residence, age, and marital status, the producers present him to the audience via demographic information:

![Figure 7: Screenshot (1:32)](image)

Commonly offered in this order, the information the producers offer about Faisal is what one might expect to find in an institutional report. The U.S. Census Bureau for the Bureau of Justice Statistics, for example, conducts The National Crime Victimization Survey, and in that survey respondents are to provide information about themselves, including age, sex, marital status, and place of residence (*BJS*, 2017). By presenting Faisal Mostafa in this way, the producers describe him as though he is a statistic. By using institutional language to introduce this new character in the story, the producers contribute to widening the interactional distance between the audience and this man. Concurrently, in her account, Alex’s use of his first name and calling him her friend contribute to lessening the interactional gap between the audience and Faisal.
When the producers describe Faisal (screenshots at 1:27 and 1:32), two visuals are included: a child’s playground, and Alex shoeless, in a hoodie sweatshirt, with braided hair, sitting cross-legged on her bed in her bedroom. The images contribute to setting the scene by presenting Alex in a childish way, and in a private space, photographed from behind, as though someone, unbeknownst to her, is gazing at her.

![Figures 6 & 7: Screenshots (1:27 & 1:32)](image)

The second image is suggestive as well, indexing a peeping-Tom male gaze and unaware female object dynamic.

The producers’ use of a playground and bedroom as backgrounds suggests that the relationship between Alex and Faisal is inappropriate, akin to a grooming relationship dynamic that might defile places presumed innocent (such as a playground or bedroom). What also colors their relationship as indecent is the producers’ reporting of his age (as fifty-one) and marital status (as married), compared to the producers’ earlier reporting of Alex’s age, twenty-three (Producers’ First Turn, Teng & Laffin, 2015, 00:34) - and living arrangements (living with her grandparents). The picture the producers are painting for the audience is one of a middle-aged, married man living in England who spends (countless) hours chatting online with an unmarried, young woman, Alex, on a daily basis.
A disjunction exists between the words of the producers and the visuals that are presented. This image/text disconnect contributes to the tension that builds in the account, leaving the audience suspicious and unsure about what, exactly, is going on. This contributes to the argument the producers are building: that terrorism, in general, is an unaccountable phenomenon, and that joining a terrorist group, like IS, is an unintelligible moral act.

**Producers: “Your a nice person with a beautiful character”**

Extending this characterization of Alex and Faisal’s relationship, the producers present an excerpt of online talk between them. In the top left-hand corner of the screen, Faisal’s profile picture shows a man with dark hair and dark eyebrows, a book obscuring most of his face.

![Flirting With the Islamic State](https://example.com/flirting-the-islamic-state-screenshot)

**Figure 8: Screenshot (1:36)**

Reproducing Faisal’s message to Alex, the producers showcase the kind of interaction Alex and Faisal have online. In the message the producers include, Faisal compliments Alex and uses a casual register common in social media communication: he uses “your” and “ur” (instead of “you’re”), lacks punctuation on both lines, and his leaves “Muslim” lower cased. By including this, the producers convey to the audience that Faisal and Alex use a casual register together, that
he compliments her, and that his intentions are not all together clear. Visually, the obscuring of half of his face in the image of him contributes to this construction of Faisal as a morally questionable character.

Whereas Faisal’s messages are in common social media discourse - lacking punctuation, including conventionalized alternative spellings, mixing Arabic and English, etc. - the producers’ messages are in complete, grammatically correct sentences. This exemplifies how the producers construct themselves as authorities and reliable reporters engaging in “fact producing” by offering the audience accurate, reliable characterizations of Alex and her joining, as well as characterizations of Faisal that should be trusted. Since the audience has only the producers to fall back on, the producers take the lead in constructing not only Alex and her joining, but also Faisal.

**Producers: “seek knowledge always”**

Collectively, the three messages reproduced below suggest that Faisal played the following roles in Alex’s life: advisor, listener, and provider who encourages her to seek knowledge and question (by not being a “blind sheep”), someone who carefully attends to their exchanges (he tells her that he will “explain later”), and an individual who offers her money if she needs it (as long as she “keep[s] it quiet”).
Figure 9: Screenshots (1:48, 1:53, & 1:58)

Whereas these messages present Faisal’s relationship with Alex as relatively innocent and multifaceted, the producers proceed by offering the audience additional information about Faisal. In so doing, they provide his ominous backstory, effectively characterizing him as further morally suspect.
Producers: “Faisal was twice acquitted of bomb plots in Britain”

Despite Faisal’s having been acquitted and having had his lawyer explain why he had explosives in his home, the background information about Faisal that the producers offer constructs Faisal as dangerous (criminal), and absolutely disreputable.

Producers: “pls could you send me a delivery address”

After providing the audience with these reports about Faisal’s past, the producers include the following message that Faisal sent Alex.

Figure 10: Screenshots (2:07 & 2:19)

Figure 11: Screenshot (2:26)
In addition to including background information about Faisal that presents him as suspicious, the producers offer the audience the message above that exemplifies several elements of Faisal’s communication with Alex:

1. Faisal makes requests of Alex: He asks Alex for a delivery address so that he may send her “items” in the mail (see Figure 12).
2. Faisal’s style of communicating with Alex is a casual one: He uses lowercased letters throughout his messages, including the first word of a sentence (see Figure 12). He also uses abbreviations like “ur” instead of “you are” or “you’re” (see Figure 9).
3. When speaking online with Alex, Faisal mixes Arabic words with English ones (see Figures 10 and 12).

Furthermore, this message illustrates Faisal asking Alex to send him a delivery address so that he may send her “items” by mail, thus extending contact between online bodies and object into the material world of offline ones.

**Alex: “It’s very normal like friendship”**

In contrast to the producers’ characterization of Faisal as dangerous and potentially criminal, Alex proceeds by describing their relationship to the audience, using all positive, platonic terms like “normal,” “friendship,” “mentor”:

24    A:    It’s very normal like friendship. Like in real life if you were to go to a
25          coffee shop.
26          He was like, my mentor. ((looks down))

Instead of focusing on aspects that could be construed as rendering them incompatible: their age difference, his being married, his living in a different country, and his history of accusations, arrests, and suspected criminal activity (aspects the producers underscore), Alex presents her
relationship with Faisal as a friendship-mentorship, which is actually supported by the speech acts in Faisal’s messages (see Figure 10). She characterizes their friendship as a “normal” relationship that ought to exist, akin to how she constructed going online to connect with others as a “normal” practice that ought to take place.

Producers: “Alex converted to Islam, taking a vow on Twitter”

In addition to informing the audience that Faisal instructs Alex about praying, the producers announce to the audience that Alex converted to Islam on social media. As the producers report this to the audience, they visually depict Alex in the background, kneeling on a mat on a carpeted floor, and facing away from the camera.

The image presents the audience with yet another disjunction between text and visuals: Alex sitting on the carpeted floor with her fingers spread beside her. Yet again, a disconnection between image and text adds to the dilemma of how to interpret of the interaction. Whereas Alex is described as having converted to Islam online, via Twitter, this image merely shows her kneeling or sitting on the floor, with her fingers spread out beside her. It is possible that Alex is engaging in ritual prayer, but the background visual does not clearly align with what is conveyed by the written words shown in the foreground. This reinforces the argument that terrorism an
unaccountable phenomenon, and joining a terrorist organization is an unintelligible moral act for which one cannot account.

**Producers: “Faisal’s communications mirrored recruitment instructions”**

The producers offer the audience a declaration that crystalizes the argument that they have been building throughout the text:

![Figure 13: Screenshot (4:08)](image)

With this declaration, the producers clarify the point they are making: that Faisal Mostafa is an Islamic State recruiter *because* his communication is similar to IS manual communication (therefore, he is not to be trusted), that Alex is his potential new recruit who “flirts” with him online (therefore, as flirter, she is not to be trusted), and that the interaction between them constitutes IS recruitment communication. Once more, the background image - this time of Alex’s kitchen - is completely unrelated to what is noted in the written text. This exemplifies: 1) how the process of joining a group like IS is so ambiguous, unintelligible, and morally suspect that is cannot be effectively explained, or justified, and 2) that recruitment can happen to the most unsuspecting of “normal Americans.”
Alex: “I don’t know if I know the truth about thuh Islamic State”

Immediately after the producers categorize Faisal and Alex’s interaction as recruitment communication, Alex offers the audience her assessment of IS. She concludes her statement by confessing that she does not think she knows the truth about the group:

A: I don’t think that thuh Islamic State is as bad as everyone says- I think that their atrocities are exaggerated. hh I think that um ((sniffs)) I think that they brought stampility- stability to the land, umm I think that, it might be one of the safest places to live in the Middle East.

I don’t know if I know the truth about thuh Islamic State.

If we understand the interactional context as a context in which Alex has the opportunity to admit wrongdoing, confess, or seek forgiveness - in so doing coming clean to the audience - then the context functions as an invitation. Thus, it gives Alex the opportunity to confess. Instead of effectively confessing to her audience - by showing in her account regret, embarrassment, or shame about having played a part in her almost-recruitment into IS (as the producers convey she did) - this excerpt shows Alex publicizing her sympathies for IS: noting that IS’s atrocities are exaggerated (line 35), bluntly stating that she appreciates what the group has accomplished by having brought stability and safety to the land (lines 36-37), and revealing her uncertainty about “the truth” about the group (line 38). The excerpt above constitutes Alex’s rejection of the invitation she is extended (contextually), driving home the point that Alex is not to be trusted, that she is an unreliable narrator, and therefore that the audience should align with the producers’ version of event.
Producers: “I just knew from a married man this wasn’t appropriate”

**Moral evaluation.** Immediately after Alex admits to her audience that she is not sure if she knows that truth about the group (lines 34-38), the producers introduce a new character in the story, Alex’s grandmother. As Alex’s parental figure suspicious of Faisal Mostafa, Alex’s grandmother is presented as protective of Alex. In the conversation between Alex’s grandmother and Alex that is showcased, the producers effectively illustrate how Alex’s grandmother plays the role of Alex’s caregiver who is determined to bring Alex back into the realm of what is socially acceptable. The producers present Alex’s grandmother as moral evaluator who worked to hold Alex (and Faisal) accountable.

First, the producers feature Alex’s grandmother’s account about how she became aware of Alex’s relationship with Faisal. Then, they feature Alex’s account about how she responded to her grandmother’s involvement.

39  G: You know- I became aware of it when she started receiving gifts and I just knew from a married man this wasn’t appropriate- I don’t care where in the- on Earth he lived.

42  (0.5)

43  A: Initially she wasn’t very upset- she just said don’t do it again .hh an:d, nn, so I, did it again. But to-ow ata different a:ddress so I wouldn’t get caught.

46  (1.0)

47  G: An I tried tellin her this man was grooming her.

48  (0.5)

49  A: Yeah- he’s still my friend (even if) I can’t talk to him. ((rocks back and forth))
In response to Alex’s grandmother categorizing Faisal and Alex’s relational dynamic as a grooming one (line 47), Alex reasserts that he is her friend (line 49). In so doing, Alex attempts to eclipse the image of Faisal’s relationship with Alex as an inappropriate one (line 39-41, 47) with the image of him as her friend (line 21, 24, 49). By referring to Faisal as her “friend” multiple times (such as in line 49), Alex resists the producers and her grandmother’s characterizations of her relationship with him as anything less morally questionable than friendship or mentorship.

**Alex: “My therapist said that I’m emotionally immature”**

Alex continues to show resistance when she builds her account about disobeying her grandmother by continuing to communicate with Faisal. Again, Alex’s grandmother is subscribed the role of Alex’s moral guide, the person working to pull Alex back from the IS ledge. Again shown rocking back and forth, Alex states:

50 A: My therapist said that I’m emotionally immature. I make 
51 decisions without thinking. It affects me like similar the way 
52 A.D.H.D. affects people. An I don’t react the way I want to or should.

Reporting the speech of her therapist, Alex characterizes herself in expert terms as emotionally immature (line 50), impulsive (lines 50-51), and not in control of her reactions (line 52). When she reports her therapist’s speech about her, Alex relies on what she presents as expert assessments, effectively rendering her at least in part unaccountable for her actions as well as her own account. In addition to characterizing herself as disobedient (lines 44-49), Alex further constructs herself as emotionally incapable of making sound decisions, and therefore as not to be held responsible for having been almost recruited into IS (lines 50-52). The producers, too,
extend their characterization of Alex as an unreliable narrator. In addition to having been labeled a flirt, Alex is being constructed as mentally ill.

While excuses attempt to sever the connection between words and actions, justifying something means taking “responsibility for the action,” but denying that it has the negative quality that others may attribute to it (Buttny, 1993, p. 16; Tedeschi & Riess, 1981, p. 281). In her accounting, Alex engages in justifying her actions. One instance of this is when Alex mentions that Faisal is her friend several times early in the mediated narrative account as well as in her final utterance. Another instance is when Alex announces that Faisal is her mentor (line 26). Yet another instance is when Alex notes that she uses the Internet to build community (lines 14-15), and finally when Alex describes how IS is not as bad as the group is made out to be: “I don’t think that thuh Islamic State is as bad as everyone says- I think that their atrocities are exaggerated” (lines 34-38). In addition to constructing her actions as excusable by reporting the speech of her therapist - and in so doing presenting herself as not responsible for her actions - Alex constructs her actions as justifiable by telling the audience about her interactions with Faisal and her other actions.

In Alex’s case, almost joining a terrorist group is not a justified, morally appropriate, or justifiable action. Yet, even if joining IS is not a warranted action, Alex constructs her nearly joining IS as an excusable act because she presents herself as not blameworthy since her therapist has labeled her as emotionally incapable of making sound decisions. There are basic criteria for distinguishing justifications from excuses (Greenawalt, 1986). Whereas warranted action is the central feature of a justification, Greenawalt explains that nonresponsibility is the central feature of an excuse (p. 91). So what are we to make of this double negation of epistemic
grounds? A narrator who is not to be trusted, because she is mentally ill and a flirt, is accounting for unintelligible actions.

**Producers: “Alex’s grandmother told her to stop talking to Faisal”**

After Alex reports to the audience her therapist’s description of her, the producers report to the audience that Alex’s grandmother requested that she end her communication with Faisal.

![Figure 14: Screenshot (5:44)](image)

Earlier in the text, the producers included December as the month during which Alex converted to Islam. Similarly, at this point in the text, the producers include February as the month during which Alex’s grandmother told Alex to stop speaking with Faisal. By offering the audience a timeline of the events that led to Alex’s almost joining IS, the producers establish a temporal narrative of events, which casts the events they report as believable, and them, as reporters, as reliable.

**Producers: “The night after this interview, she contacted Faisal again”**

In the form of an announcement, the producers report:
In addition to informing the audience that Alex ignored her grandmother’s instruction, the producers inform the audience that Alex recommenced communication with the presumed IS-recruiter, Faisal.

**Producers: “really miss you loads”**

Seemingly out of the blue, the producers then insert another message Faisal previously sent to Alex. As in the other examples of Faisal’s communication with Alex that the producers feature, Faisal’s casual tone (his omission of “I” when telling Alex that he “really miss[es her] loads”) and casual style (his lower-cased lettering) are showcased. Yet, this message differs from the others in that it includes two emojis, a film quotation, and “lol.” Furthermore, the message is unique in that it is about Faisal creating an intimate relationship with Alex.
Emojis. The two emojis characterize the message’s tone as a lighthearted one. In both instances, the emoji faces used function as expressions of the sentiments conveyed by the linguistic elements preceding them. In the first instance, when Faisal states that he “really miss[es Alex] loads,” the crying face emoji expresses sadness. In the second instance, when Faisal uses “lol” as an assessment of the film quotation he included previously, the smiling face emoji expresses amusement. Whereas the emojis are used to convey divergent sentiments (first, Faisal expresses sadness, and second, he expresses happiness), the inclusion of emojis characterizes the tone of his message as casual.

Pop culture reference. In addition to the use of emojis, Faisal’s inclusion of a quotation from the popular romantic drama film, Remember Me (2010), serves as Faisal’s way to relate to Alex by referencing a piece of popular culture with which she is presumably familiar.

lol. Finally, Faisal’s use of “lol” keep the tone of his message light and friendly. While “lol” is a term that was originally used to mean “laughing out loud,” it now serves as “a marker of empathy, pragmatic particle,” and way of signaling basic empathy between participants (McWhorter, 2013).
Together, the use of emojis, popular film reference, and “lol” construct this message as an attempt that Faisal is making to get closer to Alex. By including this in the mediated narrative account of Alex’s near recruitment, the producers extend their construction of Faisal as someone working to lure, groom, and becoming closer to Alex by any means available, which effectively constructs him as a suspicious character who persists in his efforts to remain in contact with Alex, “whatever it takes…” (to use Faisal’s words). The illocutionary force of this message is in how it serves as a romantic, intimate one between Faisal and Alex.

**Alex: “I waz jus saying goodbye”**

At the end of the text, Alex explains to the audience why she started communicating with Faisal again. The producers bring Alex back into the narrative fold, reminding the audience that this mediated narrative account is Alex’s. As if to demonstrate how weak Alex’s account is, the producers showcase her rebutting. Opening her account with a denial, Alex then quickly reframes her interaction with Faisal from “talking to him” to “jus saying goodbye”:

55  A: I’m not talking to him anymore- I waz jus saying goodb[ye]

56  G: [No]

57  you’re not- you jus scared me this morning when you told me that you

58  talked to im again. I wouldn’t mind. I’ve given it a lot of thought

59  of talking to im.

This excerpt shows Alex offering the audience a justification for her reconnecting with Faisal: noting that her aim was just to say goodbye to him (line 55). Overlapping Alex’s speech (as indicated by the brackets), Alex’s grandmother immediately rejects Alex’s explanation (line 56), announcing that she decided to use a different strategy: to directly speak with Faisal on Skype.
During Alex’s grandmother’s conversation with Faisal, Alex’s grandmother brings the communication to a close by telling him to: “Respect my wishes, leave her alone and all will be fine. (5:35 PM).” Alex’s grandmother then blocks Faisal on Skype, preventing him from continuing the conversation with her.

**Producers: “Alex and Faisal resumed communication following this interview”**

As the mediated narrative account featuring Alex comes to a close, Alex has a final opportunity to give the audience the expected happy ending, i.e. the “correct” response to the invitation. The text’s context invites an acceptance of the invitation in the form of Alex’s admission of guilt, apology, confession, or expression of shame or regret. Instead of Alex taking that route, the producers report to the audience that Alex disregarded her grandmother’s advice, announcing to the audience:

**Figure 17: Screenshot (8:00)**

The construction of the producers’ declaration featured above is notable because it is among the few times in the mediated narrative account in which Alex is *not* presented as the singular acting, agentic subject. A few minutes earlier in the text, the producers announce, “The night after this interview, she contacted Faisal again” (6:01), presenting Alex as active, agentic, and initiator of the contact. This shift from Alex alone, to Alex and Faisal, in the final turn, reminds the audience
that the text is about “Flirting with the Islamic State” (as the producers’ title suggests), and flirting is a collaborative activity, a joint accomplishment. By announcing that “Alex and Faisal resumed communication,” the producers implicate both individuals as agents in the online communication that is the action, exemplifying how recruitment interaction is jointly accomplished. Syntactically, the final turn shown in the screenshot above presents Alex and Faisal as co-conspiring agents who continue to carry out the action of interacting with one another through what the producers have defined, according to one IS recruitment manual, as IS recruitment communication. Because Alex is twice reported as having recommenced communication with Faisal - the man constructed as her friend, groomer, mentor, educator, matchmaker, and religion teacher - the mediated narrative account featuring Alex ends by leaving the audience to assume that Alex’s “grooming” (line 47) likely continued.

With this final report of Alex’s actions, the producers show the audience that Alex’s grandmother failed the task of bringing Alex back into the realm of what is socially acceptable. Alex’s continuing to communicate with Faisal, even after her interview, evidences that, even though Alex’s grandmother tried holding Alex and Faisal accountable for their actions, she did not succeed. By including this excerpt, the producers point to Alex’s grandmother’s failure, which is, in fact, the failure of making sense of the account.

**Terrorism as Mobilized through Interaction**

As Bakhtin (1981) reminds us, we come to know the world through the representations we make of it. In the mediated narrative account featuring Alex, the audience comes to know Alex through the representations the producers make of her. By offering these representations, the producers engage in fact building about Alex and her almost joining IS: the “fact” that Alex as terrorist recruit, the “fact” that Faisal as her terrorist recruiter, and the “fact” that their
interactions on social media and otherwise is terrorist recruitment communication. Practically, analyses like this contribute understanding how discourse functions in terrorist recruitment communication contexts because, through close analysis of interaction, what is taken to be fact - that a woman like Alex might join IS because she is groomed, or because she is trying to find friends, and/or because she is mentally ill, for example - can be seen as the product of a series of conversational strategies.

Fact building happens through “politics of representation” (Holquist, 1983; Shapiro, 1988; Mehan & Wills, 1988; Mehan, 1996). In the mediated narrative account featuring Alex, we see how tensions between voices in accounts are smoothed in fact production and consumption, and how social “facts” are constructed through discourse through “attempts to capture or dominate modes of representation” (Mehan, 1996, p. 253). As Mehan explains, the politics of representation describe circumstances in which those who hold certain perspectives and are in conflicts that are being waged in and through discourse employ strategies to invite or persuade others to join their side, and/or to silence opponents by attacking their perspectives. In the competition over the meaning of ambiguous events, people, and objects, if the attempts work:

if they are successful, a hierarchy is formed in which one mode of representing the world (its objects, events, people, etc.) gains primacy over others, transforming modes of representation from an array on a horizontal plan to ranking on a vertical plane. (Mehan, p. 253)

In the mediated narrative account of Alex’s recruitment, the producers’ version of reality wins out, while the one Alex constructs for the audience takes its place on the lowest rung of the representational ladder.
As the co-accounting unfolds in the text about Alex, the producers task the audience with making sense of the disjunctions and inconsistencies, the lack of connection between the visuals and the written words in the accounts, for instance. This contributes to the argument the producers build, but never explicitly state: that terrorism is an unaccountable phenomenon.

The mediated narrative account of IS recruitment presented as an interview of Alex teaches us that in accounts built in and through online news reports, joining terrorist groups, in particular, and terrorism, in general, are constructed as unaccountable phenomena and unintelligible moral acts, and those who join, or almost join are constructed as individuals who are unworthy of having their accounts about their own experiences win out in online news report contexts. From this mediated narrative account of Alex’s near recruitment, we learn that, while online news reports might, at first glance, seem to be offering turn-by-turn interviews of individuals like Alex, producers of those reports can undermine and ironize the enterprise in which they appear to be engaged. In Alex’s case, while the ostensible aim of the text was to present Alex’s experiences almost joining IS, at each turn, the producers thwarted Alex’s interactional goal: to offer the audience her own, viable account of her experiences. The producers constructed her as an unreliable reporter, and in so doing they made sure that their account was the only viable one left for audiences to embrace.

Furthermore, Alex’s interview makes evident that, in such accounts about women joining IS, women who have joined, or almost joined are constructed as untrustworthy, unreliable narrators: those who flirt, are mentally ill, and/or disregard the advice of authority figures, to recall a few constructions of Alex. Through these constructions, producers of online news reports – news story producers, reporters, and writers – offer audiences directions, informing us that we are to orient to the stories those women tell as not to be believed. This treatment of women of IS
directs audiences to understand terrorism an unaccountable phenomenon, and joining a terrorist group an unintelligible moral act.

The mediated narrative of Alex’s almost joining IS exemplifies how the dialogic process of recruitment is collaborative and both participants actively contribute to the interaction that can lead to transformation (i.e., joining a group). In the words of Freire (1970/1999), “if it is speaking their word that people, by naming the world, transform it, dialogue imposes itself as the way by which they achieve significance as human beings. Dialogue is thus an existential necessity” (p. 69). As Alex’s case illustrates, terrorist recruitment is far from a unidirectional process of brainwashing a passive recipient. Joining a group like IS and constructions of such joining rely on collaboration and works through joint meaning making. Why does this matter? It is easy to dismiss accounts of terrorist recruitment by characterizing terrorist recruits as passive, naïve, and easy-manipulatable targets, and terrorist recruiters as active, highly skilled brainwashing experts. However, Alex’s case exemplifies how certain accounts of terrorist recruitment present recruitment communication as a joint activity in which all parties participate. It is difficult to discount accounts of terrorist recruitment that feature dynamics of interaction, and explanations of untoward behavior that remain in tension with one another throughout the interaction. As Bakhtin (1993) puts it, “truth is not to be found inside the head of an individual person” for it is “born between people collectively searching for the truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction” (p. 110). The interaction is participatory, and is a shared project designed and constantly redesigned to achieve connection. I invite scholars to study mediated narrative accounts presented as interviews, like Alex’s, as dynamic sites of social interaction where “ideas, facts, views, details, and stories are collaboratively produced by interviewee and interviewer”
(Mann, 2011, p. 8), regardless of how formalized, restricted, or standardized a given interview context may seem.

In the following chapter, I study the strategies that Khadija and the individual presented as her interviewer use as they build accounts about Khadija joining and serving as a member of IS. I focus, especially, on the double bind (Bateson, Jackson, Haley, & Weakland, 1956) dynamic, arguing that it is a uniquely helpful frame through which to study accounts about what it is to be a woman in relation to what it is to wield a gun, discipline others, have authority, and serve as a leader in an all-women’s brigade of a terrorist group.
Chapter Three, Khadija:

Women in Terrorism, Doubly Bound

In the previous chapter, I showed how terrorism is produced and consumed in communication by examining how the account of Alex’s IS recruitment works as and through interaction. In this chapter, I analyze the mediated narrative account of IS recruitment that features Khadija, a woman news reporters describe as a schoolteacher turned member of IS’s all-women’s brigade. Shifting from a focus on interaction, I attend in this chapter to how terrorism is produced and consumed in communication because of how mediated accounts of women who join IS construct them as doubly bound: in a dire situation if they join such a group, and in a dire situation if they do not.

In this chapter, by using the notion of the double bind (Bateson, Jackson, Haley, & Weakland, 1956), I analyze the account of IS recruitment presented as an interview with Khadija to accomplish three aims. First, I extend the argument I make in the previous chapter that features my analysis of Alex’s case, arguing that, in addition to being studied as interaction, terrorism should be studied through a gendered lens. Second, I build the case that the double bind can be used to understand circumstances of joining terrorist groups. Third, I argue that, when constructing women joining IS, these metanarratives teach cautionary tales that, while palatable to audiences – because they present joining a terrorist group as a futile effort to improve one’s life circumstances – are insufficient to understand women’s joining.
In 2016, Deborah Tannen wrote that a double bind is far worse than a straightforward damned-if-you-do, damned-if-you-don’t dilemma because a double bind requires one to obey two mutually exclusive commands, and anything one does to fulfill one violates the other:

Women running for office, as with all women in authority, are subject to these two demands: Be a good leader! Be a good woman! While the qualities expected of a good leader (be forceful, confident and, at times, angry) are similar to those we expect of a good man, they are the opposite of what we expect of a good woman (be gentle, self-deprecating and emotional, but not angry). (p. 1)

Tannen wrote this in a *Washington Post* article called, “Our impossible expectations of Hillary Clinton and all women in authority,” published on February 19, 2016. At the time, Tannen was discussing the double bind in relation to the expectations of Hillary Clinton, yet these words ring true for countless women living in different circumstances all around the world. Even in 1995, writers like Kathleen Hall Jamieson argued that catch-22s often block women from success, yet such dynamics can be overcome. With potent accounts of the many ways women have beaten double binds, Jamieson explores society’s interlaced traps and restrictions and examines interviews with women from all walks of life to present how those women persisted.

The analysis I offer in this chapter focuses on the interaction between participants: the individual presented as interviewee, Khadija, and *CNN* reporter, presented as interviewer, Arwa Damon. In my analysis of Khadija’s account of joining and serving as a member of IS, I focus on how Khadija constructs what it is to be a woman in relation to what it is to be a leader in the all-women’s brigade of IS: someone who wields a gun and has the authority to discipline, intimidate, and punish. In my discussion of Khadija’s construction, I address how the “double bind” (Bateson, Jackson, Haley, & Weakland, 1956) works as a helpful lens through which to consider
how interlocking gender-role expectations and stereotypes constitute double bind dynamics for women like Khadija. I discuss how the double bind dynamic is uniquely applicable to women in circumstances like Khadija’s because effects of gender-role expectations and interlocking gender stereotypes contribute to the seemingly impossible, damned-if-you-do-damned-if-you-don’t circumstances that women are forced to navigate.

Entrée: Interviewing Khadija

Reporters describe Khadija as a petite twenty-five-year-old who turned into an ISIS member, was brought up in a not overly conservative family that ensured that she received an education, fled to Turkey leaving her family behind in Syria, and later became disillusioned with ISIS’s brutality (Damon & Tuysuz, 2014). Other reporters refer to Khadija as a woman who defected from ISIS after she chose to become a foot soldier in the Islamic State, as a former elementary schoolteacher who became a member of Islamic State’s all-women’s Al-Khansa’a Brigade that patrols the streets and enforces an Shariah law, and as a middle-class teacher who joined ISIS, fled after seeing horrors of beheading, and later revealed how she became a member of feared all-female brigade before she decided to walk away (Al Arabiya News, 2014; Bienaimé, 2014; Kafanov, 2016; Newton, 2014).

The three-minute fifty-one-second-long mediated narrative account of Khadija that I analyze is embedded in the News.com.au report, “ISIS: Khansa’a Brigade former fighter reveals what life is like inside the group” (Craw, 2014). Senior international correspondent based in CNN’s Istanbul bureau, Arwa Damon, serves as Khadija’s interviewer (CNN, 2017). Unlike the text featuring Alex, the text featuring Khadija is located more than ten lines below the title of the article in which it is embedded. On the article website, Khadija’s is the second video featured. It
follows a thirty-four-second-long video, captioned “woman secretly films life under ISIS,” that takes up the first third of the screen.

![Video Screenshot](image)

**Figure 18: Screenshot of Khadija’s Video Interview Placement (Craw, 2014)**

The mediated narrative account featuring Khadija opens with a dramatic in-text disclaimer. Akin to the producers’ use of written text in the mediated narrative account of Alex,
the producers of the mediated narrative account of Khadija employ white font against a black background to present audiences with a warning that fills the screen for five seconds.

![Screen capture of disclaimer as preface of Khadija’s interview](image)

**Figure 19: Screenshot of Disclaimer as Preface of Khadija’s Interview**

Before the mediated narrative account even begins, the audience is warned that the report about to follow “includes graphic content.” This immediately signals to viewers that what will be featured warrants a disclaimer because it is “graphic,” implying that it will be particularly violent, sexual, or both. The inclusion of this disclaimer effectively colors the content of the interaction as inappropriate for certain populations, the implicit message being that audience members should only share the video interview with others at their own discretion. Casting the mediated narrative account of Khadija’s recruitment, from its outset, as warning-worthy suggests to the audience that the content of the text is in some way illicit, unsettling the audience before the first word of the mediated narrative account is even presented.
Once the disclaimer disappears, we hear reporter-interviewer Arwa’s voice as the camera zooms in on Khadija’s face. With only her voice, Arwa (“A” in the transcript) paints a picture of her interviewee, Khadija (“K” in the transcript).

**Beneath the Veil**

1. A: Beneath the veil is a young heart-shaped face,

2. eyes filled with guilt and turmoil under perfectly sculpted brows.

Setting the scene, the individual presented as Khadija’s interviewer, Arwa Damon, draws the audience’s attention to what is only partially visible in the mediated narrative account presented as a video interview, Khadija’s face behind a veil (line 1), and reports to the audience that Khadija’s eyes are “filled with guilt and turmoil” (line 2). With this introduction, Arwa tells us she can see behind Khadija’s veil, and instructs us, as viewers, to take her knowledge as privileged in-sight.

As well, Arwa informs the audience that the story about to unfold is one about a woman who wears a veil and who is experiencing guilt and turmoil; by implicature, the audience is led to assume that these emotions are the result of the experiences Khadija is about to recount. With these opening lines, Arwa relays that our narrator-to-be is a woman who is only partially visible to us, and who has “perfectly sculpted brows” (line 2). This description of Khadija’s eyebrows as perfectly sculpted illustrates the reporter’s perceptiveness, calling the audience’s attention to a very fine, though still imperceptible (to the audience) detail about her interviewee’s face that demonstrates the care the interviewee takes to present herself in a certain fashion.

In these first few lines of the text, the use of two prepositions, “beneath” (line 1) and “under” (line 2), contribute a great deal to the scene that is being set. As the audience is informed that the storyteller is experiencing guilt and turmoil, we are presented with imagery of
concealment. That imagery casts the mediated narrative account as interaction undertaken to
excavate, to draw back a curtain from, in order to reveal to the audience darkness, something
unexpected lurking in the shadows. Contributing to this imagery is that Khadija’s face is partially
shrouded, leading the audience to presume that Khadija’s story has also been obscured.

The setup of Khadija’s account makes evident that “tellings are bounded material. That
is, they do not usually appear randomly in interaction (though that is possible) or without any
contextual or interpretive framing” (Prior, 2015, p. 56). Khadija’s telling is an account that is
embedded in talk. Talk comes before her account, talk comes after it, and talk constitutes it.
Khadija’s telling is located in the interaction that makes up the text, and like other tellings, her
telling is accompanied by contextual and interpretive framing accomplished through several
features.

During the mediated narrative account, Khadija’s voice is technologically altered. Instead
of featuring Khadija’s voice, in so doing transparently offering her story in her voice, the
producers of the text modify it and dub it over with another voice that translates her story into
English. The translation of Khadija’s words and alteration of her voice are features of the text
that contribute to the metanarrative of obscurity that comes to characterize the text’s context, as
well as to the foreignness and lack of intelligibility of Other. Adding another layer of opacity to
the mediated narrative account is the way Khadija’s story is presented as an exclusive insider’s
view, or exposé of one woman’s tale about joining and living as a member of IS. Khadija’s
mediated narrative account is presented as a one-of-a-kind kind of narration. This constructs
Khadija as an unreliable narrator and renders the phenomenon of “becoming a woman of IS” as
mysterious and murky, even after the audience hears Khadija’s account, for the audience is made
aware that hers is but one tale.
Collectively, these features of the text that are evident quite immediately set the scene for Khadjia’s narrative and instruct the audience about how to interpret the account that is about to unfold. In this way Khadjia’s telling is accompanied by contextual, interpretive framing (Prior, 2015). Khadija’s account is prefaced with cues that come from the text’s context, the environment in which her account is embedded. This is different from other kinds of accounts, or tellings that are prefaced by explicit cues that signal to the teller that a telling is being offered. A speaker might, for instance, signal those boundaries lexically and explicitly by offering a preface like, “I am going to tell you a story now.”

With the opening two lines, Arwa offers the audience instructions through which to interpret Khadija’s account to come. As Condren (2014) explains, “when two or more interpretive options” flowing from a given utterance are possible at the same point in a text, ambiguity arises because a plurality of simultaneously available interpretive options are generated from a single locus (p. 179). Even before Khadija takes her first turn in what is presented as an interview, the interviewer mobilizes the first moments of the interaction by instructing the audience to expect that the interviewee is plagued with negative feelings. This preface conveys to the audience that the story ahead is one recounted by a narrator who has likely determined that she is at fault. By introducing Khadija to the audience as having “eyes filled with guilt and turmoil under perfectly sculpted brows” (line 2), Arwa signals to the audience that Khadija’s telling is about to be “launched,” and signals to both teller and recipient that the telling is “relevant” (Prior, p. 56) because Khadija’s telling is designed to answer the question: what, exactly, has filled Khadija’s eyes with “guilt and turmoil” (line 2)?

Self-Portrait

Following Arwa’s preface, Khadija commences her account:
At the start I was happy.

I was carrying a gun. It was something new. I had authority.

I didn’t think I was frightening people. But then I started asking myself, “Where am I? Where am I going?” I could feel the tides dragging me some place ugly.

To tell the audience about her feeling of authority in carrying a gun, Khadija uses the stance marker, “I didn’t think” (line 5) as a resource in the course of interaction. Variations of “I think” have “an inherent downgraded stance marking quality” (Landgrebe, 2012, p. 112). When employed as a stance marker, the phrase “I think” (and its variations) is often used in types of activities with a task-oriented goal, namely in which participants are expected to establish mutual agreement (Landgrebe, p. 112). Considered in this way, Khadija’s use of “I didn’t think” (line 5) functions as her revealing to the audience that she is aware that carrying a gun can frighten people, and at the time Khadija did not orient to it in that way. Khadija evidences this by associating her feeling of being happy (line 3) with her new experience having authority and being able to carry a gun (line 4).

In lines 5 and 6, Khadija informs the audience that she began asking herself questions. In so doing, she was engaging in reflexivity, or “turning back” her experience upon herself (Steier, 1995, p. 70), considering how her actions might influence others. As Khadija explains, her reflexivity led her to experience “tides dragging [her] some place ugly” (lines 6-7). Initially, for Khadija, having had the opportunity to wield a weapon and feel in control were empowering. yet once these experiences came to mean something different, something negative to Khadija, she found herself at crossroads.
Whereas in lines 1 and 2 the interviewer introduces Khadija to the audience, from line 3 through line 7, Khadija introduces herself by immediately storying her experience as a woman of IS. She expresses to the audience that she found happiness in her new position and admits that she later determined that she was frightening people. She explains that, once she realized this, she brought herself to reevaluate where she was and what she was doing as a member of IS. However, instead of following this pronouncement with more details of how she proceeded with her reevaluation, Khadija’s sequence quickly breaks off at this point in the text.

**Teacher Turned Member**

In conjunction with the obscurity and opacity conveyed by the visual of an obscured face (line 1) and spoken description of eyes filled with guilt and turmoil (line 2), Arwa’s reintroduction of Khadija accomplishes several things.

By reintroducing Khadija to the audience, the Arwa pursues “other business” (Bamberg, 1997, p. 12). Assuming an evaluative stance in the interaction, Arwa presents the audience with a report of basic demographic information about her interviewee. When Arwa lists Khadija’s age and occupation prior to joining IS she furnishes for the audience a succinct characterization of Khadija. Yet, she does this before the audience has a chance to assess for ourselves who Khadija was and who she became. Thus, by reintroducing her interviewee, Arwa characterizes Khadija by casting her in a particular light in the audience’s eyes:

8 A: Twenty-five-year-old Khadija not her real name is a former

9 elementary school teacher turned member of the feared

10 female ISIS Al-Khansa’a Brigade in Raqqa.

Arwa’s reintroduction of Khadija has impressive rhetorical power. Even before the interviewer and interviewee are featured interacting with one another on screen, the interviewer portrays
Khadija by announcing her age, noting that her real name is not being made public, and identifying her as someone who used to teach children in the safe haven of an elementary classroom (line 9), and disclosing that she later became one of the most highly ranked leaders of a terrorist group known for its brutal violence and a commander who regularly wielded a lethal weapon. This casts Khadija’s account to come as nightmarish because her pre- and post-IS lives are constructed as stark opposites, suggesting to the audience that even a teacher responsible for shaping the minds of children can become one of the most highly-ranked members of IS. Khadija attributes her empowerment, happiness, and sense of fulfillment to her stint serving as an IS leader, not to her stint as an elementary school teacher, a job many might presume to be emotionally fulfilling.

Without preface or explanation, the phrase “not her real name” is inserted in the middle of the sentence that begins in line 8 and ends in line 10. As an alternative, the interviewer could have easily used a different structure by redistributing his information by dividing it up into smaller, more easily digestible pieces for the audience. For example, this could have taken the form of a series of discrete sentences: one sentence could have announced this person’s age, a second could have indicated that her legal name is being replaced with a pseudonym (and justification for this choice), a third could have reported that she used to be an elementary school teacher, a fourth could have noted that she became a member of IS, and a fifth could have indicated her current status, occupation, and/or avowed identity after she left IS. Instead of organizing the information in this way, in lines 8 through 10 Khadija is characterized in a cursory way, and in a way that glosses over how who she was in the past related to who she became, and who she supposedly is. According to Garfinkel and Sacks (1970), Heritage and Watson (1980), and Heritage (1985), this kind of formulation involves summarizing, glossing, or
developing the information provided by the conversational partner. In a news interview, for example, a participant might use such a formulation to avoid taking a personal stand on a topic. Alternatively, such a formulation can be used “to collaborate with, resist, or challenge what an interviewee has to say while maintaining the stance of formal neutrality” (Heritage, 1985, p. 114; Jucker, 1986, p. 133-134). In lines 8 through 10, the interviewer’s formulation is used to resist, or challenge what Khadija, as interviewee, has just conveyed to the audience about herself and her experience as an IS member. The interviewer maintains the stance of formal neutrality, and this she does by including Khadija’s age and former occupation, but then proceeding with an oversimplification of the person Khadija made have been, the one she may have become, and the one she may be now. The interviewer’s reintroduction of Khadija effectively invites the audience to collude with the interviewer by accepting the interviewer’s cursory characterization of the interviewee, instead of considering Khadija’s experience and identity as potentially more nuanced and complex.

Therefore, lines 8 through 10 operate on two levels. On the first, the interviewer accomplishes an intersubjective check by summarizing for the audience who Khadija is. Additionally, the interviewer re-describes Khadija’s talk to align it with the goals of the setting that the interviewer established (Prior, 2015, p. 139). The interviewer accomplishes this aligning by recasting Khadija’s talk as relevant because it serves as an account that explains how a young woman elementary school teacher could end up joining a terrorist group and serving as one of their most important leaders.

**Patrolling**

The mediated narrative account proceeds with Khadija describing how her fellow IS all-women’s brigade members carried out their jobs:
11 K: We’d patrol the streets. If we saw a woman who was not wearing
12 the proper Sharia clothing, we’d grab her. Sometimes they’d
13 be lashed.

As Khadija recounts how she and other brigade members regularly disciplined other women on the street, she uses the collective pronoun “we,” twice in line 11 and once in line 12. In lines 11 and 12, Khadija recounts how she and her fellow women IS brigade members would discipline women who were not following sharia law according to IS stipulations. Instead of stating that that she and her brigade members lashed these women, Khadija reports: “sometimes” those women would “be lashed” (lines 12 and 13). Whereas in lines 11 and 12, Khadija uses “we” as the subject when she confesses that she was among those who were patrolling and grabbing, in lines 12 and 13, Khadija fails to clearly connect the action verb “lash” to a subject. Instead, the structure of the phrase “sometimes they’d be lashed” takes the form of a report about a common practice that is known to take place in IS controlled territory. By not clearly identifying the lashers, Khadija grammatically distances herself from the violent act that “sometimes” (line 12) transpired. Passive voice verbs hide the agent of a sentence, and in such cases, passive voice conceals “the perpetrator” (Riener, 2015, p. 100). In lines 12 and 13, the use of passive voice to report how the women would be lashed downplays the part that Khadija might have played in carrying out those lashings.

Khadija’s formulation illustrates caution about how she is describing her experience as an IS member. This exemplifies how a text in the form of an interview is an interactional space that is highly charged and where stakes are managed and inoculated (Potter, 1997). In interaction, participants are concerned with questions of stake because people treat each other as having vested interests, desires, motives, and allegiances (as having a stake in some position or other),
and this is of course a problem if one wants one’s version of events to be heard as authoritative and persuasive, factual, not interested or biased but the simple, plain, unvarnished truth (Potter, p. 157). Khadija manages to describe for the audience the kinds of disciplinary actions IS members carry out. Yet, through her descriptions, she is attentive to the ways those descriptions might be heard. One way Khadija manages what Potter calls stake is how she inoculates against the appearance of having taken too much of an active role in carrying out the violent lashings that certain women experienced (lines 11-13).

**From a Part of Something Great to Displaced by Violence**

Arwa, as interviewer, then summarizes and characterizes Khadija’s talk, recounting Khadija’s speech (that the audience is not permitted to hear on our own):

14 A: She speaks longingly about the start of the Syrian Revolution, the
15 elation of being a part of something great. But then came
16 the violence, displacing her family multiple times.

Instead of including Khadija’s words about the Syrian Revolution and violence, the interviewer offers the audience her assessment of Khadija’s words on the subject. Characterizing Khadija’s tone as one of longing, the interviewer reports to the audience that Khadija associates elation with the experience of feeling as though one is a part of “something great” (line 15). In addition to feeling as though she had authority because she carried a gun (lines 3 and 4) and participated in the disciplining of other women (lines 11-13), Khadija is storied as having been elated to be part of a “great” collective effort at the time the Syrian Revolution began (lines 14-15). Thus far, Khadija’s account has been marked by positive experiences she had as a woman of IS since, as such, she had the chance to command, discipline, and intimidate others. In addition to this,
Khadija is presented as having experienced the beginning of the Syrian Revolution as positive since it led to her feeling that she was “part of something great” (line 15).

Whereas in lines 5 and 6 Khadija explains that she came to realize that she was frightening people and beginning to question her actions as a member of IS, in lines 15 and 16 Khadija is described as having found herself at another important turning point. With syntax similar to that of lines 5 and 6 - by commencing with the conjunction “but” - the interviewer announces, “But then came the violence, displacing her family multiple times” (line 15-16). These lines feature an acknowledgement that there was violence. However, through syntactic inversion, the sentence fails to clearly state the agent, the human actor(s), i.e. who carried out this violence, or object, i.e. against whom this violence was carried out. Just as was the case in lines 12 and 13, structural ambiguity (in terms of agent and object) in lines 15 and 16 makes this interactional moment more about the violence (the action) that is common in IS controlled areas, than about those involved in the violence (the actors, or even those acted upon).

**Something to Run to**

Khadija proceeds by describing the violence that led to her family’s displacement:

17 K: Everything around us was chaos: Free Syrian Army regime barrel bomb strikes wounded clinics blood. You wanna tear
18 yourself away to find something to run to. My problem was I ran
19 away to something uglier.
20 I ran away to people - this Tunisian - who lured me into the
21 Islamic State.
The disjointed clauses in lines 17 and 18 mirror the chaos Khadija reports. When Khadija then explains that she felt she wanted to tear herself away “to find something to run to,” she uses “uglier,” a variation of the term “ugly” that she uses in line 7.

In both instances, the term is used ambiguously. Connoting unattractiveness and lack of beauty, “ugly” is a word not typically expected to describe the acts, ideas, or members of a terrorist group. In context, “ugly” indexes the pain, destruction, and carnage to which Khadija refers (lines 17-18) but may also index something less readily visible: Khadija’s resistance and subversion as a woman who stepped out of the social confines that delimited what was appropriate, expected, and/or permissible for her. Khadija challenged gender expectations by not only being a woman who was “frightening people” (line 4), but also being a woman who was exercising authority (line 5), wielding a gun (line 5), and patrolling and carrying out disciplinary action against others (lines 11-13). “Ugly” provides a downgraded alternative for what could be characterized as violent or brutal, and Khadija was enacting “ugly” by doing a great deal more than merely doing as she was told, as women are so often taught to do.

After describing the violence and casualties of the Syrian Revolution, Khadija recounts having wanted to tear herself away from the destruction by finding something to run toward. Yet Khadija admits that she “ran away to something uglier” (lines 19-20). She then identifies her problem as her having chosen to run away to a Tunisian man who “lured” her into IS (line 21). Khadija first uses the term “lure” to describe her dynamic with the Tunisian man (line 21). Frequently used in news articles, including mediated narrative accounts presented as interviews, about girls and women joining IS, “lure” in this context assigns agency. When “luring,” one party baits the other party to commit an act, while the other party, as unknowing victim, is manipulated, ensnared, or duped.
Meeting Online & Moving to Raqqa

Arwa proceeds by outlining the steps that led to Khadija’s joining IS, starting Khadija’s online communication with a Tunisian man:

23 A: They met online when curiosity drew her to ISIS social media pages. He told her that he was coming to Raqqa that they could even get married. So she convinced her family to move there. Her cousin Umm Abdullah was already married to an

26 ISIS fighter and a member of the Al-Khansa’a Brigade.

In line 23, the interviewer explains that this Tunisian man and Khadija “met online” when Khadija was on IS social media pages, noting that “curiosity” is what drew Khadija there. Syntactically, “curiosity” is in the subject position and acts on the object, Khadija. Curiosity is presented as the magnetizing force that “drew” (line 23) Khadija to IS social media pages where she met and communicated with the Tunisian man as he romantically pursued her. Curiosity is constructed as the catalyst of the reaction that ensued. The audience to assume that this duo’s romance led to Khadija joining IS. From this point, Khadija’s account develops into more than a story about a woman empowered by joining the so-called Islamic State. Khadija’s story is also one about a woman who met a man, and through romantic pursuit she became a member of a group to which that man and her cousin already belonged.

In mediated narrative accounts of women being recruited into the so-called Islamic State, women are often described as having been vulnerable, brainwashed, and manipulated, and because of that, their recruitment was successful. For example, in the text featuring Alex, Alex’s grandmother describes Faisal as having groomed, or sexually preyed upon Alex. In line with this, Khadija uses the word “lure” (line 21) to describe how the Tunisian man communicated with her.
Yet, during recruitment communication, IS recruiters co-collaborate in social media interaction with women who are potential recruits. If these women’s online interaction with IS members is one-on-one communication that these women seek, what might be happening, rhetorically, when terms like “vulnerable,” “brainwashed,” “manipulated,” “lured,” and “groomed,” are used?

One possible answer to this question might be that it is simply too unnerving for audiences to accept the notion that a young, former elementary school teacher might go online to seek connection and/or empowerment, find both with members of a group like IS, join that group, and even find happiness and fulfillment by being an IS leader (as Khadija’s account evidences). Such words might be deployed because it is hard to accept a story about a young babysitter and Sunday school teacher going online to find friends and community, finding both with members of a group like IS, nearly joining that group, and continuing to communicate with IS affiliates online because she does not want to lose her new friends (as Alex’s account evidences). Labels like “predator,” “prey,” and “groom” work by unilaterally blaming IS recruiters for recruitment, constructing IS recruiters as predators, and women recruits as unaware victims duped into becoming prey. This dynamic and blame pattern is a comfortable one for audiences because it is familiar. However, interactions like the mediated narrative accounts of Alex and Khadija warrant closer examination, for it is through interaction that accounts are built. Through interaction and intersubjectivity, individuals come to join and serve as members of terrorist groups. The elements at play in the interaction of the phenomenon of women joining terrorist groups undoubtedly and necessarily unveil the darkness that constitutes it. To return to our business, let us continue to closely examine the features of these accounts, and what those features are used to do in context.
A Leader, Not an Ordinary Woman

This is how Khadija describes her initial visit to the brigade’s headquarters:

28 K: Umm Abdullah took me to the brigade’s headquarters in the Siah
29 Hotel in Raqqa. She introduced me to the commander, Umm
30 Rayan. She had a very strong personality. Her features were very
31 sharp. She gave you the sense that she was a leader, not an
32 ordinary woman. Umm Rayan is Tunisian. But, it’s Umm Hamsa, a
33 Syrian, who was in charge of carrying out the lashings.

In this account, Khadija creates categories for certain individuals to occupy. By virtue of membership, members of a culture use categories to comprise part of the central machinery of organization (Sacks, 1992). Categories are inference-rich since a great deal of knowledge that a society member has about their society is stored in terms of these categories. This is evident in Khadija’s account, particularly in how she uses categories to illustrate how the two all-women’s brigade leaders she describes challenge what it means to be a woman, subverting traditional, conventional, and binary gender roles and expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Not an ordinary woman” category</th>
<th>“Ordinary woman” category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very strong personality</td>
<td>not a very strong personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very sharp features</td>
<td>not very sharp features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gives you the sense she is a leader</td>
<td>does not give you the sense she is a leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Khadija describes the Tunisian commander, Umm Rayan, she notes that the commander gave off the sense that she was a leader, not just “an ordinary woman,” that she had
a very strong personality, and that her features were very sharp (lines 29-32). As I show in the
table above, through this practice Khadija sets up contrasting categories of characters in her story.

**Female, But Not a Normal Female**

After describing Umm Rayan, Khadija reports that a Syrian woman, Umm Hamsa, was in
charge of carrying out the lashings (line 33). As is evident below, by describing Umm Hamsa in
this way, Khadija effectively extends her contrasting categories.

34 K: She’s female, but she’s not a normal female. She’s HUGE. She has
35 an AK, a pistol, a whip, a dagger, and she wears the niqab.

Khadija’s characterization of Umm Hamsa includes this leader’s gender presentation. In her
account, Khadija adds characteristics to both of the categories she previously establishes. She
conflates “ordinary woman” with “normal female,” and ascribes to this category qualities that
include not being huge, not having an AK, not having a pistol, not having a whip, and not having
a dagger. Likewise, she conveys that the category of “abnormal female” refers to qualities
including being huge, having an AK, having a pistol, having a whip, and having a dagger.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Not an ordinary woman”</th>
<th>“Ordinary woman”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very strong personality</td>
<td>not a very strong personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very sharp features</td>
<td>not very sharp features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gives you the sense she is a leader</td>
<td>does not give you the sense she is a leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Not a normal female” category</th>
<th>“Normal female” category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>being huge</td>
<td>not being huge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having an AK</td>
<td>not having an AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having a pistol</td>
<td>not having pistol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having a whip</td>
<td>not having a whip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having a dagger</td>
<td>not having a dagger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The tables above depict how, by analyzing each commander, Khadija sets up a dichotomy that is gendered. As opposed to sex - i.e., what is so often assumed to be biological facticity - gender, like “woman,” is an historical idea (de Beauvoir, 1949/2009). Gender is the cultural interpretation, or signification of the presumed facticity of sex. Whereas to be “female” might be thought of as a facticity, it is a facticity that has no meaning; in contrast, to be “a woman” is to have had to “become a woman” (de Beauvoir, 1949/2009). Butler (1988) explains this by describing how compelling a body to conform to an historical idea of “woman” means, “induc[ing] the body to become a cultural sign” (p. 522).

In her account, Khadija evidences Butler’s (1988) point. Through the dichotomy Khadija establishes, Khadija illustrates how to be “woman” means to be bound by forms of obedience. The tables above depict how “obeying” in this context comes in the form of women subscribing to what we are socialized to believe is permissibly feminine personality traits and facial features, as well as lack of leadership qualities, body sizes, and not wielding weapons. Butler goes on to explain that this obedience, this compelling a body to conform to the current historical idea of “woman,” is a historically delimited possibility, and therefore the never ending project of becoming a woman is a sustained and repeated corporeal one (p. 522). This is also evident in Khadija’s account, as I go on to show.

**Joining as gender resistance.** On the surface, Khadija’s descriptions of Umm Rayan and Umm Hamsa identify these two individuals as gender non-conformists. Khadija categorizes them as “not ordinary women” and “not normal females” (lines 31-31 & line 34). By establishing the dichotomy of “ordinary women”/“normal females” and “not ordinary women”/“not normal females,” Khadija identifies for the audience how these two individuals, who occupy leadership roles, resist the project of what Butler (1988) refers to as compelling their bodies to conform to
the historical idea of “woman.” Evident in the second column of the tables above, Khadija’s category of “ordinary woman”/“normal female” includes individuals who do not have a very strong personality, who do not give off the sense that they are leaders, and who are not huge. Considering these category possibilities, by becoming a woman of IS - and especially one in such a brigade and one high in the leadership ranks - one could find empowerment through the sheer act of escaping the confines of what is permissible for a woman in her respective society. Thus, by serving as commanders, leaders, and disciplinarians, women in the all-women’s brigade - epitomized by its leaders, Umm Rayan and Umm Hamsa - subvert the system. They do this by refusing to compel their bodies and performances to conform to the historical idea of woman. The woman categories that Khadija establishes in her account illustrate how women of IS, like the commanders, could be seen as women who actively resist becoming materialized into obedience to a historically delimited possibility (Butler, p. 522). Through her construction of categories - “not an ordinary woman”/“not normal female” and “ordinary woman”/“normal female” - Khadija illustrates for the audience these individuals’ resistance to society’s effort to restrict, control, and discipline them as “women.”

Continuing in this vein, Khadija’s account leads us to wonder if to join IS’s all women’s brigade is to seize an opportunity to abandon “ordinary woman” membership, and to instead become “not ordinary women”/“not normal females” (lines 31-31 & line 34). While a brigade member may have a body that has parts that are female, as a brigade member, she is expected to perform, and is even rewarded for performing authoritatively, patrolling, acting as a disciplinarian, intimidating others, taking up space, and wielding and presumably using weapons. Becoming such a woman of IS, in this sense, is to become an extra-ordinary woman, since doing this requires that one break out of the traditional, conventional roles and behaviors that are
expected of women. Therefore, for women and girls, joining a group like IS could mean refusing, resisting, and disregarding what is conventionally, historically expected of women and girls in their respective social order/s.

If this is the case, becoming a woman of IS is an act of gender resistance. If one message women and girls receive from IS recruits is that women of IS are not only permitted, but even expected to carry guns, daggers, whips, and AKs, and exercise authoritative leadership, that is a message that appeals because it offers women and girls a much-desired way out of a gender system that, in the U.S., for instance, rewards women for accepting our fate as submissive, docile, obedient, passive, taking up little space, and meek, and disciplines women who resist, refusing to accept this fate. This means that, as Khadija teaches us, for the women in IS’s all-women’s brigade, being a “good woman” means being “a good leader.” To return to Tannen (2016), being a good leader entails having qualities expected of a good leader: being “forceful, confident and, at times, angry, which are similar to those expected of “a good man,” therefore, “the opposite of what we expect of a good woman (be gentle, self-deprecating and emotional, but not angry)” (p. 1). Ultimately, the phenomenon of girls and women joining IS in order to become a member of this different, empowering kind of category of woman must be treated differently. As Khadija’s case shows, the phenomenon of becoming a woman of IS is far more intricate than girls and women being brainwashed, tricked, or duped because they are merely gullible, witless, and/or naïve. Efforts to prevent recruitment of girls and women warrant serious reevaluation, for the phenomenon is coming into focus as naming one’s world, and then transforming it (Freire, 1970/1999) in gender resistant ways.
Running From & Toward Violence

After Khadija describes the leaders of the brigade, the interviewer tells the audience about an IS office that specializes in arranged marriages for foreign fighters, and about how many of the marriages are forced. Khadija goes on to explain that, in addition to a woman in the all-women’s brigade having the authority to discipline others (lines 11-13) and wield weapons (line 4), women of IS are always potential victims of sexual violence, rape, and abuse:

39 K: The foreigners are very brutal with women, even the ones they marry. There were cases where the wife had to be taken to the emergency ward because of the violence— the SEXUAL violence.

According to Khadija’s account, women in IS-controlled territory are constantly at risk of being victimized or revictimized. This is important to note because, if a woman leaves her home country where she is marginalized as a woman in an effort to seek empowerment in IS-controlled territory, yet in that new circumstance is at risk of being victimized, then her act of resistance, i.e. her leaving home to join a group like IS, has great potential to backfire. In her account, Khadija informs her audience that, for a woman living in IS-controlled territory, the ever-present prospect of being sexually violated may counterbalance, or outweigh the empowerment that could result from her new experience as a woman of IS, even if it might involve having authority, wielding a gun, and disciplining others.

Following the descriptions of sexual violence against women and violent scenes storied as being rampant in IS-controlled territory, Khadija describes her reaction to her commander’s news about having found Khadija a man to marry:

47 A: Then her commander Umm Rayan said she’d found her a Saudi husband.
K: I said, “ENOUGH.” After EVERYTHING I had already seen, and all the times I had stayed silent, telling myself, “We’re at war. And then, when it’s over, it will all be rectified.” But after THIS, I decided, “No. I have to leave.”

It was the prospect of marrying a man who could have been violent against her that finally led Khadija to leave IS. The thought that she might be beaten and/or sexually assaulted by a man with whom she was to be set up was frightening enough to Khadija that she decided to leave her post as a leader of the all-women’s brigade, and leave IS. In the mediated narrative account, Khadija has been presented to the audience as a woman who left her life as an elementary school teacher (line 9), aimed to become a part of something she considered “great” (line 15), and initially enjoyed doing something new, carrying a gun, and having authority (line 4). However, Khadija’s story concludes with her ultimately choosing to leave the new, empowered life she created for herself to avoid potentially being sexually assaulted, raped, abused, and/or killed by a man her commander decided would be her husband.

Khadija’s case illustrates that conditions in both environments - in recruits’ homelands as well as in IS-controlled territories - have the potential to render both lives intolerable, and therefore not livable (Butler, 2004). As Khadija’s account evidences, the new life that women of IS like Khadija might envision and attempt to create can likely become just as unlivable as the life those women might be attempting to escape. From the beginning, and until the end of the mediated narrative account, Khadija’s circumstance is constructed as a no-win, double bind (Bateson, Jackson, Haley, & Weakland, 1956) situation: by staying home, Khadija and women like her may remain marginalized, and by joining IS they are likely to be marginalized, even if that marginalization comes in different forms.
Another (Old Self) Portrait

At this point in the mediated narrative account, Arwa offers the audience additional guidelines to follow when interpreting Khadija’s account.

53 A: This is the first time she tells anyone her story. She escaped just
54 before the U.S. led coalition airstrikes began. Her family also fled
55 Raqqa, but are still in Syria. She desperately wants to be her old
56 self.

Bringing the mediated narrative account to a close, the interviewer implies that, as her first audience, we are special, and perhaps even lucky, because this mediated narrative account is supposedly “the first time [Khadija] tells anyone her story” (line 53). The interviewer also expresses that, because she avoided the airstrike violence because she left in the nick of time, Khadija is lucky. In addition, because Khadija’s family members still live in Syria but she does not, Khadija is lucky. In lines 53 through 55, the interviewer aligns the audience with Khadija. This is accomplished by inviting the audience members to consider ourselves grateful because Khadija is at our disposal because she is no longer in Syria, because she avoided the violence of the airstrikes, and because she chose to share her story, especially for the first time. Continuing to align the audience with Khadija, the interviewer announces that Khadija “desperately wants to be her old self” (lines 55-56).

As if completing her sentence, Khadija extends the interviewer’s final assertion by offering the audience an image of this version of herself:

57 K: A girl who’s happy, who loves life and laughter. I
58 want to be like that again.
Khadija’s concluding reflection illustrates her recognition that her transformation into a woman of IS was not ultimately successful. By expressing to the audience that she “desperately” desires to be her “old self” - a self that is happy, loves life, and loves laughter - Khadija brings her telling to a close by admitting to her audience and interviewer that she is not happy, that she no longer loves life, and that she no longer loves laughter. Ultimately, this evidences the failure of Khadija’s project of transformation, and the strategies she employed to achieve it.

As I argue in my analysis, Khadija builds her account of her experiences joining IS as her seizing an opportunity to break new ground for herself by becoming a high-ranking woman of a powerful group, and in that role exercising authority, wielding a weapon, and intimidating and disciplining others. Yet, by the end of the account, Khadija’s assessment of her experiences takes a turn. Garfinkel (1974) defines accounts as “matters of fact and fancy,” “evidence,” and “good demonstration about the affairs of everyday activities [that] are made a matter of seeing and saying, observing for observation and report” (p. 17). Intrinsic to offering accounts, is the acknowledgement of what should be versus what is, i.e. the notion of the moral order. This idea is most evident in the mediated narrative account of Khadija.

When faced with an account to examine, an analyst is granted entry into the moral universe of breaches and redress to which the social actor building the account orients (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 49). As Khadija ties her words to her actions, she builds her account prospectively and retrospectively (Shotter, 1982; Buttny, 1993) by explicitly describing how serving as a leader of the IS all-women’s brigade is an action of great consequence, and a gendered one at that. Her account is chockfull of interactional work undertaken to maintain and repair her social role. Khadija opens her account by telling the audience her story as one about a
woman who found empowerment, authority, and fulfillment in a new world, a world in which she was able to wield a weapon, discipline others, and intimidate, all while performing woman.

In interaction, key facets of accountability - such as answerability, positioning, constraints, and transformation - are at play. Answerability depends on the assumption that to participate in society means to be answerable, or accountable to others for our words and actions. When Khadija agreed to offer her account in a mediated news report, presented as an interview of her, she allowed herself to be answerable to society for her actions, i.e. her joining and serving as an IS member. In this way, Khadija’s accountability assumes her answerability as the process through which she explains her actions and conduct to her audience (Blatz, 1972). As a speaker, Khadija exemplifies her awareness of the ways in which others observe her and her actions, and she does this by admitting to the audience that she was not “fixed” by her transition from teacher to IS member.

Khadija performs her role effectively: she offers the audience a story of a woman still lost, a woman left unsatisfied by her choices, and, as a consequence of this account of her recruitment – presented as an interview – a woman whose mistakes are on the record forever. In this sense, Khadija’s account, like those of the other three women, functions as a form of perpetual punishment. Despite how effectively, in the women’s respective mediated narrative account of their recruitment, each woman may recast her offensive actions as socially acceptable ones (Goffman, 1971, p. 109), these women will always exist in the position of being of held accountable for their breaches: the accounts of these women’s recruitments will live on because they are posted online.
Terrorism as Gendered: Women, Joining, & the Double Bind

Though, at the end of the mediated narrative account featuring Khadija, Arwa announces that this is the first time that Khadija tells anyone her story (line 53), the double bind dynamic that Khadija experienced - women failing to build and maintain a better life for themselves because of the gendered conditions in the environment they abandon as well as the one they enter - is a pervasive one. Accounts like Khadija’s convey a great deal about the phenomenon of women and girls becoming members of groups like IS because such accounts lead us to consider that some of these individuals are looking beyond their current life conditions for something better. By engaging in online communication with members of terrorist groups, women like Alex and Khadija take steps to actively make what they expect will be a new, better, and brighter life possible for themselves. However, like Khadija, those women, at some point along the way, may realize that their new circumstances are just another version of the ones they left behind: in a that a double bind dynamic.

According to Bateson et al. (1956), the first condition of a double bind is that it involves two or more people: one of those individuals is the “subject,” and the others are the subject’s superiors/figures of authority. In Khadija’s case, Khadija is the subject of her circumstance, and the IS leaders (as well as the man she almost married) are the figures of authority.

The second condition of a double bind is that it is a repeated experience for the subject, and therefore it cannot be resolved as a single experience. Like any other woman, Khadija’s experience is not a single one, for her former life was a series of experiences, just as her new life as an IS member was a series of experiences. Her repeated experience - i.e. living as a woman - in both circumstances differed in some ways but remained the same in others; in both locations, her experience of woman-ness was a repeated one.
The third condition of a double bind is a primary injunction imposed on the subject that takes one of these forms: (a) “Do X, or I will punish you”; (b) “Do not do X, or I will punish you”; (c) Both (a) and (b). As Bateson et al. (1956) explain, punishment is a combination of the withdrawing of love and/or the expression of hate and anger and/or abandonment resulting from the authority figure’s expression of helplessness. The punishment, for all women, depends on context. The punishment for women who do not “do women appropriately” at times comes in the form of gender policing (Butler, 1990): for example, the enforcement of normative gender expressions on an individual who is perceived as not adequately performing, through appearance and/or behavior, the sex they were assigned at birth. For instance, if, hypothetically, before joining IS, Khadija did not perform “woman” the way she was expected to, she was policed and disciplined, perhaps in the form of gender policing. Considering this as form (a), Khadija was doing X (X being performing woman according to society’s expectations), yet she was punished for doing X. This is because having qualities expected of a “good leader” - being forceful, confident and, at times, angry - are those associated with being a “good man,” while being a “good woman” means the opposite: being “gentle, self-deprecating and emotional, but not angry” (Tannen, 2016, p. 1).

Considering Khadija’s case in the frame of form (b), in her new life with IS, Khadija was again threatened with punishment. In that new circumstance, she was not doing X (“X” being performing “woman” the way she was expected to) - in the sense that she was performing “not an ordinary woman”/ “not a normal female” in that she was serving as a leader of the all-woman’s brigade of IS. Her punishment for this performance manifested as the threat of sexual violence, torture, physical abuse, and/or death (lines 39-41).
The third condition Bateson et al. (1956) note as being necessary for a double bind to occur is a secondary injunction imposed on the subject and conflicts with the first at a higher and more abstract level. For example, a subject must do X, but must “only do it because they want to,” and this injunction need not be expressed verbally. For a woman, a secondary injunction might take the form of being gentle, being submissive with, and catering to everyone else, regardless of how everyone else might treat her. The stipulation is that women do these things only because we want to, however. If the first injunction is that a woman must be gentle, submissive with, and cater to everyone else, regardless of how others treat her, it is understood that, if she does not do these things, she will be punished in society, for instance, by being called a “bitch,” being labeled a “ball breaker,” being demoted at work, or being socially ostracized. The double bind dynamic arises because she is put in a position of being expected to “want” to do X (i.e., perform “woman” according to society’s expectations).

A tertiary injunction imposed on the subject prevents the subject from escaping the dilemma (Bateson et al., 1956). Extending the example above, a woman is taught to “be gentle, self-deprecating and emotional, but not angry” (Tannen, 2016, p. 1), and regardless of how others treat her. If she does this, at times she will be rewarded for fulfilling society’s expectations of a woman (she might be invited to work parties because she is demure, for example). While at other times, she will be punished for fulfilling the same exact expectations (she gets overlooked for promotions at work because she does not advocate for herself for fear of stepping on others’ toes, for example). In this dynamic, a woman is constantly at odds. The tertiary injunction she faces constantly prevents her from escaping her dilemma: her being, or in de Beauvoir’s (1949/2009) terms her constant “becoming,” woman. Khadija’s tertiary injunction prevents her from escaping her dilemma: at home, as an elementary school teacher, she is unfulfilled as a
woman, yet the same ends up being true when she becomes one of the most highly ranked women in the so-called Islamic State’s all-women’s brigade. In both circumstances, Khadija faces the threat of punishment (even if the punishment takes different forms) for not fitting the gender expectations imposed on her.

As Khadija’s case has exemplified, the essence of a double bind is two conflicting demands - each on a different logical level - neither of which can be ignored or escaped (Bateson et al., 1956) that leaves the subject torn both ways because, whichever demand the subject attempts to meet, the other demand cannot be met. For a double bind to be effective, the subject must be unable to confront or resolve the conflict between the demand placed by the primary injunction and that of the secondary injunction. As a woman, one is often unable to confront or resolve the conflict between the demand placed by the primary injunction and that of the secondary injunction. In one circumstance, a woman might finally recognize that, as a woman, her current life is not livable (perhaps she realizes she has no purpose, she is lacking authority, and/or she has few or no opportunities to serve as a leader, for example); though, as a secondary injunction, she must meet society’s expectations of her as a woman by continuing to live her unlivable life - continuing to have no purpose, no authority, and no opportunities to serve as a leader - because she wants to meet those expectations. My analysis addressed how Khadija faced injunctions on both fronts: on one hand, she was to perform “woman” by doing and being all of the things a woman is expected to do and be, though the other hand, even if performing “woman” made her miserable, she was to enact that performance because she wanted to enact it. Ultimately, as her final lines indicate, Khadija was in a no-win. In her concluding turn, Khadija effectively comes clean to the audience about her feelings of dismay that she is right back where she started: unhappy, not loving life, and not laughing (line 57). This shows that Khadija does
not assess her actions as successful, and that her joining and serving IS did not prove to be her panacea.

In this chapter, I employed the double bind as a frame that is useful to understand circumstances of women joining terrorist groups. In a dynamic of, “I must do X, but I cannot do X,” women like Khadija are caught between a rock and a hard place. The mediated narrative account of Khadija’s recruitment brings to light the bog that is the double bind situation because her case illustrates how, for women and girls, joining IS can mean abandoning their old life and replacing it with a new, more exciting one with a brighter future brimming with authority, filled with weapons, and chockfull of purpose. Retreating from their old life into a life of terrorism, thus, serves as a coping strategy.

In this chapter I argued that Khadija’s case exemplifies how women joining groups like IS, like women and men in general, are disciplined into subscribing to rigidly defined gender roles, and through this disciplining, they can be forced into double bind situations: conditions in which one fails regardless of what action one takes in a situation. While the gender belief system “guides our perceptions of and interactions with women and men” (Unger, 2004, p. 226) and offers a road map for our interactions with others, they can be quite limiting. For instance, research on subtle sexism demonstrates the innumerable ways in which even well intended gender-stereotypic beliefs limit women (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995; Tougas, Brown, Beaton, & Joly, 1995); research on women in nontraditional roles, for example, highlights the challenges women face when breaking new ground (Unger, pp. 226-227); and research on gender nonconformity and masculine ideology highlights how boxing men into gender roles can have extremely negative consequences (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993a; Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993b; Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1994).
The lives that women like Khadija are promised, like the leadership role that Khadija occupied in IS’s all-women’s brigade, might leave them wishing they never left their old lives behind. The solution can never be to simply hope to turn into happy “life and laughter” loving (line 57) versions of themselves. As Khadija’s case illustrates, such transformations or attempts at them can leave much to be desired.

A great deal will be possible if analysts consider the stories, narratives, and accounts about these women the business of transformation of self, of attempting to create for themselves a way out of their own, unique double bind circumstances at home. To begin developing new counterterrorist intervention strategies, we should continue to carefully, diligently study the stories these women tell about how they work to realize the new lives with which they are enticed, the stronger, unbound versions of themselves they are encouraged to dream up, chat about online, and even travel to new lands to fashion.

In the chapter that follows, I shift from the double bind to the notion of women of the so-called Islamic State as damsels in distress: weak and having joined the group because they are vulnerable and passive.
Chapter Four, Laura:

Terrorism as Rhetoric

The following excerpt comes from English author and humorist, P. G. Wodehouse’s novel, *A Damsel in Distress*, published in October of 1919:

In the Middle Ages, for example, this girl would have been a damsel; and in that happy time practically everybody whose technical ratings as that of damsel was in distress and only too willing to raise the formalities in return for services rendered by the casual passer-by. But the twentieth century is a prosaic age, when girls are merely girls and have no troubles at all. Were he to stop this girl in brown and assure her that his aid and comfort were at her disposal, she would undoubtedly call that large policeman from across the way, and the romance would begin and end within the space of thirty seconds or, if the policeman were a quick mover, rather less. Better to dismiss dreams and return to the practical...” (p. 38)

As in the Wodehouse’s novel, the focus of this chapter is the damsel in distress as a frame to examine the construct of women of IS. I discuss the mediated narrative account of Laura’s recruitment as a story about a woman who is presented as a damsel who was in distress, and as a result, was vulnerable to IS recruitment.

Thus far, I have argued that mediated narrative accounts about women joining IS tell audiences several, and at times quite conflicting stories about the phenomenon. I have shown that this happens intertextually, i.e. as the texts borrow from and refer to each other as, for instance,
accounts of women who did not know any better, as stories of individuals who were merely looking for connection and purpose, and as narratives concerning series of unfortunate events that led to these women going through IS’s online recruitment processes. In the online news report about Alex, Alex was presented as having gone online to build community and find friends, as having fostered a relationship with a presumed IS affiliate, and as having nearly joined the group and moved to IS controlled territory. The report about Alex was framed as a cautionary tale about a lonely, young woman who went on the Internet where she was almost recruited into IS by a man who “lured” and “groomed” her. Yet, we learned that the picture of the phenomenon of women joining IS is not as clear as online news report discourse might lead us to believe.

In the mediated narrative account of IS recruitment presented as an interview of Khadija, I showed how Khadija is initially built up as having found empowerment, authority, and happiness when she became a leader in the all-women’s brigade of IS. Khadija’s case taught us that living as an IS member did not ultimately offer the empowerment or purpose Khadija sought: life pre-joining as well as life post-joining were, in their own ways, unlivable. In the previous chapter about the case of Khadija, I show how terrorism is produced and consumed in communication by arguing that, in addition to being studied as interaction (as I argue in my analysis of Alex’s case), terrorism should be studied through a gendered lens. I show how, when constructing women joining IS, mediated narrative accounts of IS recruitment teach cautionary tales that present joining a terrorist group as a futile effort to improve one’s life circumstances.

In this chapter, I extend the notion that terrorism works through mediated narrative accounts of women joining IS that teach cautionary tales. By analyzing the text featuring Laura – described in online news reports as a woman whose partner abandoned her, who met a man
online, and who brought her son with her to join IS – I argue that accounts of becoming a woman of IS work as rhetoric that is designed to prevent other vulnerable people from being recruited. I argue that mediated accounts of women joining IS work as rhetoric of terrorism because such reports naturalize certain ideologies of terrorism. I also argue that, when constructing women joining IS, such texts employ tropes like damsel in distress to make women’s joining more palatable to audiences, evidencing reporters and producers’ construction of women in terrorism as aberrations, since terrorism continues to be treated as men’s domain.

In my analysis of the online news report featuring Laura, I examine how talking about others is complex discursive work inasmuch as people “use relational terms to move others in and out of categories depending on their discursive goals” (Tracy & Anderson, 1999, p. 222). In everyday cases, the descriptions people offer of others are rarely challenged. Yet, selected reference terms and particular constructions are far from neutral choices; in fact, they are often quite strategic. This is uniquely so when those being described are storied as being affiliated with terrorist groups. In this chapter I aim to open “a space between what actually happens in an exchange and what could happen in a future exchange of a similar type,” and I take a rhetorical discourse approach, which means that I use a vocabulary that “treats problems as something to reflect about (dilemmas) and people as agents who make choices (strategies)” (Tracy & Anderson, p. 222). To employ a rhetorical approach, means to treat communication as strategic, as moves deployed ably or poorly, for practical and moral ends, and I acknowledge that the meaning of talk depends on who is talking, what goals the talker has, and where the talk takes place.

When men join a terrorist group, accounts about their joining are seldom reports about their having joined because they were lured, duped, or naïve (see Omer, 2014; Weiss, 2015;
Engel, Plesser, & Connor, 2016), whereas when women join a terrorist group, accounts about their joining often take such form (Christodoulou, 2017; Dearden, 2017; Bloom, 2018, Huffington Post). What might be learned from this divergent treatment of individuals joining terrorist groups? I argue that, in the text, Laura is built up as having been lured into IS because she was vulnerable and manipulated. I argue that the mediated text featuring Laura exemplifies accounts of women who join IS as accounts of women as damsels in distress, as weak, and as having joined because they are vulnerable. I discuss why accounts of women joining terrorist groups might be so often built up as ones about women having been taken advantage of or brainwashed, when the same is not the case for accounts of men joining such groups. I consider what might it mean that, in cases in which recruits are women, passivity and lack of agency are assumed to play leading roles in the women’s joining.

Laura’s account is a story of redemption. Akin to Khadija, who describes how she chose to run away to “ugly” things by joining IS, Laura stories herself as having made a mistake by having joined IS, and once she identifies what she did as a mistake, she returns to Europe and writes a book for those she deems “vulnerable” to help them avoid making the same mistake she made. Laura’s account is made a consumable text because it is designed as a cautionary tale as well as a tool forged to prevent other vulnerable people from following in Laura’s footsteps. I address the moral accounting that is undertaken, i.e. what is presented as having happened, what is presented as having ought to have happened, and what is presented as what should happen for others in the future. I will show how Laura builds her account as a rhetorical move because, as she explains, she describes her experiences in public forums in an effort to teach others a lesson. By offering her account as such a warning - designed to prevent others from making same mistakes she made - Laura aims to effectively absolve herself in the eyes of the audience, turning
her untoward action (her having joined IS) into a commendable, or at least more palatable one in the eyes of the audience. I do this by investigating how the account of Laura’s IS recruitment, presented as an interview, serves as a way to explain Laura’s “unanticipated or untoward behavior” (her having joined IS) in order to “repair the broken and restore the estranged” (Scott & Lyman, p. 46), which is constructed as her redeeming herself by 1) offering her what is presented as an interview, and 2) offering the world the book she wrote about her experiences to convince others to not make the same mistakes she made.

According to Goffman (1971), accounts work as forms of redress when actions are no longer routinely or tacitly accounted for; Laura’s account is built to transform the meaning of her act/s of wrongdoing. Laura builds her account by repositioning the actions she took (by joining IS and traveling to IS-controlled territory with her child) that originally seem offensive, changing them into ones that are socially acceptable (Goffman, p. 109). By the end of her mediated narrative account, Laura has crafted an account that characterizes her actions as noble ones: she admits that she joined IS, brought her child with her to Syria, and served the group when they were there, but then she reports that, since her return from IS, she has publicized her experiences in an effort to educate others, to raise awareness about what she and other women go through when joining and serving IS, and to prevent other “vulnerable” people from making the same mistakes she made.

Entrée: Interviewing Laura

The mediated narrative account of Laura is a four-minute forty-second-long radio interview, the audio of which is featured in the NPR report, “Europe Wakes Up To Prospect Of Female Terrorists” (2016). Like Khadija’s, the text featuring Laura includes an interviewee
News reporters describe Laura Passoni as a Belgian woman who took her four-year-old son to Syria in 2014 to join ISIS and realized quickly she had made a terrible mistake (Cigainero, 2016); as an individual who traveled to Syria but later escaped and wrote a book to discourage young people who may be tempted to follow the same path (Beardsley, 2016); and as a woman who converted to Islam, moved to Syria after falling for a man she met in a supermarket, and since her return has warned others about making the same mistake she made (Morley, 2016). Still other reports describe Laura as a Jihadi bride who fled Syria and who is using life on probation as a lesson (Associated Press, 2016), and as a mother who converted to Islam, moved to Syria to live under ISIS after marrying a Muslim, and reveals that life in IS was the opposite of what they promised (Summers, 2016).

The prospect of female terrorists. The host, David Greene, opens the text by setting the scene:

1  D:  Now let’s turn to another topic that has come up in this campaign, and
2   that’s terrorism. The terrorist attacks in Paris and Brussels over the
3   past two years were carried out by men who were citizens of
4   France and Belgium and who had been radicalized by ISIS. In the
5   most recent attempted attacks, several women including a teenager tried to
6   blow up a car filled with gas canisters in central Paris. Europe is now
7   waking up to the prospect of female terrorists. NPR’s Eleanor Beardsley
8   met a woman who ISIS radicalized. She has now returned to Belgium-
9   and we should warn you, there are parts of this story that could be
In conjunction with the title of the text featuring Laura, “Europe Wakes Up To Prospect Of Female Terrorists,” David’s introduction (lines 1-11) paints a picture of the status of terrorism in Europe. After generalizing, by using France and Belgium to represent the entire continent of “Europe” (line 4), David describes Europe in a notable way. He says that Europe is “now waking up to,” (lines 6-7), implying that Europe is finally coming to terms with “the prospect of female terrorists” (line 7). By stating that Europe is “waking up” to that prospect, David downgrades what could have been arranged as a quite direct report: women are terrorists and have been committing acts of terrorism. This downgrading is notable because the report that follows David’s introduction features exactly what he falls short of directly reporting: a woman from Europe joined IS and served as a member of the terrorist group.

Labeling a phenomenon “prospective” casts it as a possibility, or as having some likelihood of being the case. As van Dijk (1993) explains, discourse is not coherent merely at the level of subsequent sentences, for discourse displays overall global coherence by the topics that are defined for longer parts of a text or talk, or for discourse as a whole (p. 112). Thus, David commences the text by establishing what is to be addressed in the interaction about to unfold. He offers what van Dijk calls the topics, the semantic macrostructures that identify what a text is about, and those:

play a fundamental role in the production and comprehension of discourse. Thus the topic is the information that is best recalled of a text, and hence also plays a primary role in influencing the audience. (pp. 112-113)

David establishes the topic of the text as the prospect of female terrorists, and this functions as the information that is to be best recalled of the text about to unfold. When David uses the term
“prospect,” his downgrade introduces the audience to the report as rhetoric of investigation; the news report about to unfold is constructed as a sort of inquiry. This presents the mediated narrative account about Laura’s joining IS as a story about a woman who might, or might not (it is, after all, “prospective) be a terrorist, and therefore tasks the audience with the job of determining this. David’s introduction instructs the audience to interpret the report to follow as one about the prospect of female terrorists, instead of as a report about a woman’s experiences joining IS, being a group member, and returning to Europe to contribute to efforts to prevent others from joining the group. With the introduction, David frames Laura’s story for the audience as an invitation: audience members are being asked to establish for themselves how “prospective” the notion of female terrorists even existing is. Since Laura’s is the one account offered, we are to base our determination on Laura’s story. In this sense, the host’s introduction exemplifies how the text provides “instructions for its interpretation as well as for its authorization of its facticity” (Smith, 1978, p. 23). David’s introduction functions as guidance the audience is to use to interpret the text that is presented as an interview.

David’s introduction typifies how, in online news reporting, strategies are used to resist labeling women and girls terrorists. Throughout the history of modern terrorism, women have served as leaders and followers of terrorist organizations, yet regardless of this, mediated narrative accounts of IS recruitment continue to “depict women terrorists as interlopers in an utterly male domain” (Nacos, 2006). The introduction of Laura’s interview shows how online news reports continue to treat the idea of a terrorist who is a woman as a pill too hard to swallow, and because of this the idea continues to be contested and resisted. This resistance manifests is the ways interview hosts like David frame stories as chances for audience members to consider the possibility (or, “prospect,” in this case) of a terrorist being a woman.
Warning. Another element illustrating online news reports’ treatment of women terrorists as unpalatable is the use of warnings that are designed to prepare the audience for material characterized as unsettling, such as those provided at the beginning of the texts featuring Khadija and Laura. When reporters offer audiences online news reports about men who have joined IS, such warnings are rarely, if ever included. For examples, see Newsweek interview with “Sherko Omer” (Omer, 2014), The Daily Beast interviews with “Abu Khaled” (Weiss, 2015), and NBC interview with “Mo” (Engel, Pless, & Connor, 2016). This exemplifies online news reporters and producers’ treatment of violence, threats to security, and terrorism as primarily men’s domains, and women’s involvement in political violence as incompatible with such presumed-to-be masculine phenomena. In conjunction with this divergent treatment, instead of being labeled as combatants or terrorists, women who commit acts of political violence or terrorism are labeled in online news reports as “female combatant,” or “female attacker,” or “woman terrorist.” The use of markers like “woman” or “female” highlights these individuals’ gender before their actions; that their gender is qualified at all speaks volumes about how unpalatable women’s engagement in political violence, generally, continues to be (McFeeters, 2017). These examples illustrate a discursive tension that points to a dynamic in which men are rhetorically treated as inside, and women outside of the bounds of the terrorism. This dynamic helps explain why accounts of women in terrorism take the form of vulnerable girls (as in Alex’s case), or duped, preyed upon women who are damsels in distress (as in Laura’s case) who become victims of terrorist recruiters.

Like the warning screen that lasts for the first five seconds of the mediated narrative account featuring Alex, David announces to the audience of text featuring Laura, “we should warn you, there are parts of this story that could be disturbing to some listeners” (lines 9-10).
The inclusion of such warnings exemplifies how mediated narrative accounts of women being recruited into groups like IS continue to produce the phenomenon of women and girls as terrorists as too aberrant to move past, at least not without some kind of a trigger warning. Therefore, evident in both production and consumption contexts, women and men are rhetorically treated differently. This matters because online news reporters’ apparent resistance to the account that women are terrorists effectively prevents the general public from having sufficient opportunities to even be made aware of the history, and extent of the phenomenon.

David’s opening identifies recently attempted terrorist attacks as those that prompted Europe’s realization - the continent’s “waking up” to - the “prospect” of terrorist women existing (line 7). Such identification might suggest the message that, because women were involved in those terrorist attacks, the concept of “terrorist” might need to include women. Though the title of this news story, “Europe Wakes Up To Prospect Of Female Terrorists,” makes a general claim about an entire continent’s status on terrorism, this claim is being based on one person’s experience having served as a member of one terrorist group, since the text focuses exclusively on one woman’s account of joining and serving as a member of IS.

**Convert & Joiner**

After David warns the audience that we might be disturbed by what is to follow, reporter Eleanor Beardsley (“E” in the transcript) commences the interaction by describing Laura (“L” in the transcript):

12  E:    Bonjour.
13  L:  (Tout d’un coup)
14  E:    I met thirty-four year old Laura Passoni in a Brussels hotel. She
15    grew up in a Catholic family in the Belgian town of Charleroi. She
converted to Islam at the age of sixteen because she liked the
religion and her best friend was Muslim. Later, Passoni
married a Muslim man and everything was fine, until her
marriage collapsed.

Eleanor offers the audience context for the mediated narrative account, reporting where the
interview with Laura took place (line 14). Eleanor then provides background information about
her interviewee, noting the religion in which Laura was raised (Catholicism), the location of her
upbringing (in a town in Belgium), and the fact that Laura converted to Islam when she was a
teenager. Eleanor informs the audience that Laura converted from Catholicism to Islam for two
reasons: sixteen-year-old Laura “liked” Islam, and sixteen-year-old Laura’s best friend was
Muslim (lines 16-17).

As Steinberg and Monahan (2009) explain, adolescence is a time of increasing
susceptibility to peer influence because adolescents tend to behave in ways that indicate
increased conformity to their friends with respect to misbehavior as well as in matters that are
not antisocial (in styles of clothing, tastes in music, etc.); individual conformity in any situation,
however, is a joint product of the pressure to conform and the capacity of the individual to resist
the coercion. This makes evident that behaving like one’s friends in order to be more like them is
common for sixteen-year-olds, and such behavior could in some cases be characterized as
developmentally appropriate. Laura’s conversion to Islam is, in this way, constructed as not
aberrant, but quite developmentally appropriate behavior.

Eleanor subsequently informs the audience that after Laura became a Muslim, she later
married a fellow Muslim. All was “fine,” Eleanor explains, until Laura’s marriage collapsed (line
19). Eleanor builds up this marriage collapse as a catalyst, leaving Laura at crossroads. In
conversion and joining narratives, individual converts frequently offer narrative accounts of their transition into their respective groups. Converts offer these stories by creating “a rational basis for their involvement” in the organization, effort, or activities of the group (Blee, 1996). Narratively, converts accomplish this by retrospectively constructing their initial participation in the goings-on of the group as “the outgrowth of dramatic personal transformation” (Blee, p. 689).

In her study of women members of racist groups in the U.S., Blee explains that when organization members reflect on their earlier life - their lives prior to their involvement in the group/s - they often describe their current commitments as active organization members as “the result of a single sensational event or series of events through which their personal goals and beliefs became fused with the agendas of the [organization’s efforts and/or] movement” (p. 689). In these life histories, the accounts of personal transformation frequently take the form of conversion stories that are akin to accounts of individuals who have been converted to certain religions and/or sobriety (Blee, 1996; Bearman & Stovel, 1993; Brereton, 1991; Cain 1991; Goldberg 1990; Hart 1992). In such life narratives, self-transformation is underscored. In the mediated narrative account of Laura’s joining, Laura’s marriage collapse (lines 18-19) is reportable because she offers it as the sensational event in her life that led to her personal goals and beliefs fusing with IS’s agenda, and therefore the marriage collapse functions narratively as a key moment of Laura’s dramatic personal transformation.

**Abandoned, Depressed, & Vulnerable Dreamer**

The following segment begins to show how Laura’s narrative is a co-construction. Eleanor and Laura build up a version of Laura together, and in so doing they co-construct her identity as damsel in distress. Immediately after Eleanor informs the audience that Laura experienced a collapse in her marriage (lines 14-19), Laura offers her account of what happened
in her life before joining IS (Laura’s voice is dubbed by another woman’s, offering a French to English translation):

L: My husband met another woman and left me, and abandoned his little boy. I went into a deep depression, and that’s when I met the recruiter. I was vulnerable, and he played on that. He told me I could be a nurse and help the Syrian people. He told me I could start my life all over again. He made me believe in dreams.

Initially, Laura reports to Eleanor and the audience that her husband met another woman, and then left her (lines 21-22). After a micro pause (line 22), Laura adds that, in addition to having “left” her, her husband “abandoned his little boy” (line 21-22). In line 22, Laura recounts how, in response to her husband leaving them, she went into a deep depression.

The notion of agency is evident in this segment of Laura’s account. Thus far in the text, Laura has been built up as having taken action once: she converted to Islam at the age of sixteen (line 16). Also, Laura’s husband has been described as having taken action: he met another woman, left her, and abandoned their young child (lines 21-22). Laura proceeds by introducing a new character into her story, the IS recruiter. Like Laura and her husband, the recruiter is presented as having taken action. Laura explains that when she met him, she “was vulnerable,” and “he played on that” (line 23). The recruiter did this by telling her that she could “be a nurse and help the Syrian people” and that she could start her “life all over again” (lines 23-25). As Laura’s explains, after her husband left her and their little boy, Laura “went into a deep depression,” and being in that state rendered her “vulnerable” enough to be recruited by the IS recruiter. When Laura describes how the recruiter “played on” her vulnerability, she assigns the recruiter agency in her recruitment process. She characterizes his communication with her as his
having taken advantage of the situation: she asserts that her depressed state left her vulnerable, suggests that he knew that because he “played on” it (line 23), and therefore he used her vulnerability to his and IS’s advantage.

In her account, Laura divides her recruitment into sequential steps:

1) the recruiter played on her vulnerability by offering her a new and improved picture of herself: as a nurse who would help the Syrian people” (lines 23-24);

2) the recruiter offered her the opportunity to start her life all over again (lines 24-25); and

3) the recruiter made her believe in dreams (line 25)

As Laura explains, the recruiter provided her with the chance to contribute by helping others, to start fresh by beginning a brand new life in a new place, and to have a chance to make such a dream come true.

**Radicalized After Personal Trauma**

After Laura describes her having joined IS by communicating with a recruiter when she was experiencing difficulty in her life, Eleanor takes the floor. She educates the audience about one way in which recruitment efforts are being countered, reporting about a place in France where experts counsel young people who are seemingly being influenced by IS’s messages:

27 E: Behind these heavy locked doors, at an unpublished address, in the
28 French city of Bordeaux, a team of psychologists and counselors tries
29 to get through to young people seduced by ISIS propaganda. The staff
30 Imam, Fouad Saanadi, says half of the thirty-three people they’re
31 counseling are women, many radicalized after a personal trauma.

Immediately after Laura narrated how she joined IS, Eleanor conveys to the audience that efforts are being made to prevent people like Laura from being recruited into IS. With these lines,
Eleanor announces to the audience that professionals are working to counsel young people who have been “seduced” by IS and women radicalized after a personal trauma. Uniquely, the interventions being used are being employed quite late in the game, as those undergoing counseling have already been “seduced” by IS propaganda (line 29) and have already been “radicalized” (line 31). The leaves the audience to wonder: if efforts to counsel those radicalized after a personal trauma - half of whom are women (lines 30-31) - are already underway, why is Europe only “now waking up to the prospect of female terrorists” (lines 6-7)?

Let us take a moment to step back and consider this. At this point, Laura’s mediated narrative account seems to be persuading its audience that women join terrorist groups because they are brainwashed, taken advantage of, and exploited at times in their lives when they are vulnerable, say, because they experienced personal trauma. Is this the message we are being encouraged to embrace since, as a justification, this might make it possible for us to finally admit that women do, in fact, commit violent acts and can, in fact, be terrorists, and that it is not, perhaps, as “prospective” as online news reports like this one might claim it is? Might constructions of women-as-terrorists-because-they-were-preyed-upon-when-they-were-vulnerable be merely one way for online news reports to depict women terrorists as no more than “interlopers in an utterly male domain” (Nacos, 2006)? By presenting the case that Laura joined IS because she was vulnerable, because she was depressed because her husband met another women, and left her and their child (lines 21-23), does this account merely recast women as slaves to our emotions, as blinded by our feelings, and therefore as perfect targets for the big, bad, violent men who are the “real” terrorists and who join groups like IS for “real” reasons?

If these are the questions we, as audience members, are left to ask - especially this early on in a mediated narrative account - the point is quite clear. Women are not taken seriously as
terrorists. Why does this matter? By continuing to not take women seriously, those “frontline activists, propagandists, and recruiters” (Blooms, 2017) in organizations like IS will remain under noticed and under studied, and as a result, their actions will remain under checked, and their violent acts of terrorism under countered.

In her account, Eleanor presents being seduced by IS propaganda and/or by having experienced personal trauma as viable ways two populations may become members of the so-called Islamic State: young people (line 29) and women (line 31). As emotionally vulnerable, a potential recruit who is a young person or a woman, or perhaps even both is cast as innocent, and not to blame for their recruitment. For example, recruiters “played on” their “vulnerability” (line 23) and made them “believe” certain things, such as dreams in Laura’s case, to get them to join (line 25). This excerpt constructs women and young people who joined IS as having been victimized, manipulated because they were in an emotionally fragile state, and as a result not to be held accountable for their actions.

The text proceeds with staff Imam, Fouad Saanadi, describing those being counseled at the facility (another man’s voice offers an English to French translation):

33 F: They’ve been a victim of violence, or have been raped, or have been marginalized in some way. And this makes them more vulnerable to ISIS’s message of a better world and revenge against society.

This account presents the individuals being counseled at the facility as having been victims of violence, including sexual violence, and/or as having been marginalized in some way, and names those experiences as what made those individuals “more vulnerable” to IS’s message (line 34-35). This explanation of recruitment simplifies the phenomenon. While marginalization might
contribute to an individual’s vulnerability in certain ways, other aspects of an individual’s joining require examination.

**The New Man in Her Life**

Returning to Laura’s case, Eleanor asserts that an unnamed IS agent successfully recruited Laura through social media:

36  E: The ISIS agent recruited Passoni online through a Facebook profile that
37   she created. At the same time, she met the new man in her life, also
38   online. The couple went to Syria along with her four year old son.
39   Passoni says, while her partner was fighting, she was housed with
40   dozens of other women from the West.

Glossing over these events, offering little detail, Eleanor reports that Laura was recruited on Facebook, met the new man in her life online, and “went to Syria” (lines 36-38) with him and her son. Syntactically, lines 36 through 38 present Laura as non-agentic: in line 36, “the ISIS agent” is the actor or agent (subject) in the sentence; he carries out the action of having “recruited” (verb); and the individual who was recruited was Laura (object). In line 38, “the couple” is the actor or agent (subject), and as a couple, Laura and the new man in her life carry out the action of “going” (verb) to Syria. In neither case is Laura syntactically constructed as the sole actor who is carrying out the action that is underway. Yet, again, she is at least partially absolved of “untoward behavior” that accounts are used to explain (Scott & Lyman, 1968, p. 46).

In conjunction with the syntactic organization of lines 36 through 38, reported speech in lines 39 and 40 distances Laura from the action being reported. Eleanor reports Laura’s speech (line 39), and describes Laura, in passive voice, as having been physically “housed” with scores of other women. The individuals who arranged the housing - those who would be the subject of
the sentence, if it were in active voice - are not explicitly mentioned. Collectively, the syntax, reported speech, and passive voice of lines 36 through 40 present Laura’s recruitment and experience as a woman in IS as:

1) a phenomenon for which Laura is not to blame, and as

2) experiences that are quite common, i.e. not unique to Laura and Laura alone as recruit.

Laura’s account is presented as one of many cases of women, young people, and members of other marginalized groups who are recruited into IS. She is constructed as a mere thread in an entire tapestry of those affected. This contributes to building the phenomenon of vulnerable individuals who are recruited into IS as an epidemic, as an illness that must be eradicated, and as a public enemy needing to be eliminated.

Furthermore, since this phenomenon is presented as one that victimizes those most vulnerable in societies, mediated narrative accounts like Laura’s rhetorically function as calls to action. This is so because they serve as invitations for potential heroes to step in, take the lead, and punish the IS recruiters for taking advantage of those marginalized, vulnerable, and helpless. In this vein, online new report such as this one featuring Laura serve, rhetorically, as invitations, as calls to arms, and as a signaling of troops to report to rescue those built up as being unable to rescue themselves. In this way, accounts of women of IS, such as Laura’s, can be considered damsel in distress narratives.

As Sarkeesian explains, “in the game of patriarchy, women are not the enemy -- they are the ball” (2015). Think of women characters as the figurative, objectified ball that is passed back and forth between (for the most part) a man protagonist and a man antagonist. In this dynamic, women often symbolically provide the game with “motivation” (Sarkeesian), a reason to continue, because their role as prize to be won, or treasure to obtain fuels the story. This damsel
in distress narrative reinforces archaic, and yet surprisingly still prevalent gender notions that support a culture that excludes (or in many ways still finds quite hard to swallow) women’s participation. Accounts of women of IS constructed as damsel in distress narratives, like Laura’s, do the rhetorical work of keeping terrorism in men’s, and only men’s domain (Nacos, 2006). This matter because, though women have been in the terrorism game across the world for centuries, this rhetorical work shows how those women continue to fly below the radar.

**Some to Help, Some for Love, & Plenty Full of Hatred**

After Eleanor informs the audience that when Laura was in IS controlled territory she lived with dozens of other women from “the West” (line 40), Laura describes the women by grouping them:

42 L: Some were there to try to help. Some were there for love- they had
43 followed a fighter. But there were plenty of women who were full of
44 hatred, and ALL they wanted to do was get a Kalashnikov\(^1\) and launch
45 attacks, and they didn’t try to shield their kids from horrible things
46 like the crucifixions every Friday in the town square. Some even let
47 them touch the dead bodies.

In her account, Laura establishes three categories of women of IS: one group of women are helpers; the second group are there “for love” because they followed fighters to the territory; and the third group are full of hatred. Laura refers to all three types of women of IS as “they.” By using this pronoun, Laura separates herself from the other women. Sacks (1992) and Schegloff (2007) note that person references are often used to convey evaluative stances. Related to this is the notion that a category, its member terms, and rules of application can be used to explain what

---

\(^1\) A Kalashnikov is a type of automatic rifle or machine gun made in Russia and based on the original design of Mikhail Kalashnikov (\textit{RT}, 2013).
happens in certain interaction. People make countless evaluations that go well beyond what speakers explicitly say. According to Sacks, membership terms - in this case, how Laura uses “they” to refer to the women with whom she lived, yet to exclude herself from that group - are inference-rich because they imply whether a member’s actions are appropriate or not (Tracy, 2016, pp. 45-46). By referring to the other women of IS with whom she lived as “they,” Laura takes a stance, “an attitudinal dimension that includes features which refer to the ways” speakers convey their judgments, opinions, and commitments (Hyland, 2005, p. 176). By using “they” instead of “we” to describe the women and exclude herself, Laura disguises her own involvement, stamps her personal authority onto the argument she is making for her audience and interviewer, and engages in moral work by justifying her own (all the while making unreasonable the other women’s) doing of certain activities. In the words of Hester and Eglin (1997), “the category-related features of motives become available for interactants for the moral work of justifying and excusing actions - all this being done through the use of categories for describing persons” (p. 8). This excerpt illustrates how, by using certain pronouns to describe people, Laura engages in moral work: she excuses her own actions, while she condemns those of the other women with whom she lived when she was an IS member.

Whereas Laura spends only a few words on each of the first two groups of women, she uses five lines to describe the third group of women. This signals that Laura treats the third group as the most reportable of the three.
Table 8: Laura’s Categories of Women There to Love, Help, & Hate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women There to “Help”</th>
<th>Women There to “Love”</th>
<th>Women There to “Hate”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“some were there”</td>
<td>“some were there”</td>
<td>“but there were plenty of women who were”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to try to help”</td>
<td>“for love”</td>
<td>“full of hatred”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-they had followed a fighter”</td>
<td></td>
<td>“and ALL they wanted to do was get a Kalashnikov and launch attacks and they didn’t try to shield their kids from horrible things like the crucifixions every Friday in the town square some even let them touch the bodies”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third group of women is the group that engages in actions that are least like those of a categorically stereotypical woman: an individual who is not physically violent, who has children, and who is protective of their children. According to Laura, the third group of women was there neither to help, nor to follow their partners out of love or romance. Instead, as Laura explains, this third group of women was full of hatred, “wanted” to engage in violence, and did not shield their children from the brutality that was so prevalent in IS territory. Further distancing herself from the three types of women she describes, Laura reports that the women who were full of hatred and who were mothers “didn’t try to shield their kids from horrible things like the crucifixions every Friday in the town square some even let them touch the bodies” (lines 45-47). Using “even,” Laura conveys her stance by signaling her disapproval of how this group of women engaged in the brutality and encouraged their children to witness the violence that IS members carry out. In context, “even” serves to underscore how inappropriate and unacceptable Laura finds these women’s actions to be. Additionally, Laura’s use of “even” in the account to
the audience contributes to the interactional business she is carrying out, i.e. the argument she continues to build: she is condemning these women for their actions, and she is absolving herself of her own, even when she, too, was a woman of IS. Laura’s description of the third group of women of IS shows that she finds it aberrant that those women wanted to participate in and expose their children to the violence IS members carried out. The disapproval Laura conveys in her account indicates that the actions of this group of women - effectively stepping out of the woman gender role by behaving quite un-womanly, according to conventional, traditional established gender expectations - is the most reportable, and therefore deserving of more conversational space than the actions of the first two groups of women.

Following Laura’s description of other women of IS, Eleanor reports:

49 E: It wasn’t long before she’d seen enough. And after nine months
50 Passoni and her partner escaped and returned to Belgium.

Eleanor narrates Laura’s leaving IS as her coming to realize that she had witnessed plenty, and that she wanted to go back to her home country.

Offering Context & Making Distinctions

Eleanor proceeds by offering the audience context for Laura’s account. She accomplishes this by juxtaposing Laura’s narrative with recent French national news about IS members who are women. Indirectly, the audience is led to consider how Laura’s recruitment into, and experiences as a member of IS relate to the text’s title. Eleanor reports:

52 E: Last month, Paris prosecutor, François Molins, said it was clear ISIS intends to turn women into attackers. Speaking after the arrest of the women linked to the attempted car bombing, Molins said the group had received guidance directly from Syria. Police had bugged one of the
women’s cell phones and heard them planning other attacks at Paris train stations. Before they were caught, two of the women stabbed police officers as they were being arrested. French journalist, Matthieu Suc, who’s written a book about female jihadists, says, “ISIS has changed the nature of terrorism. A terrorist group turning women into attackers is a reportable piece of news. The term “terrorist” is not commonly used to refer to women; what illustrates this is how online news reports label terrorists who are women as “female combatants,” or “woman terrorists.” In the construction, “female terrorists,” the second noun, “terrorists,” is the one that is being qualified, or modified. As I mention earlier, including the gender of these individuals at all speaks volumes about how unpalatable it continues to be for women to engage in political violence (McFeeters, 2017).

In addition to reporting that women terrorists commit acts of violence (line 54) and plan future acts of violence (lines 56-57), Eleanor announces that two women terrorists recently stabbed police officers during an arrest (line 58). From line 52 through 60, Eleanor’s turn exemplifies for the audience how, presumably because of IS, women are now being considered terrorists. This is the case even though women have been among the leaders and members of terrorist organizations for centuries (Nacos, 2006). Evidencing this point, this mediated account typifies online news reporters and producers’ common treatment of women terrorists as interlopers in the domain of terrorism, a domain that continues to be treated as exclusively men’s. This happens through the sensemaking that is done in the production of texts like this one featuring Laura, as well as through audience consumption of those publicized interactions.
In the midst of the story of Laura’s IS recruitment, terrorism scholar, Matthieu Suc, whose voice is dubbed by another man’s, offering French to English translation, is then quoted providing evidence of how ISIS “has changed the nature of terrorism” (lines 59-60):

M: Under al-Qaida, men left their families and went to Afghanistan alone.

But in Syria it’s become a sort of family jihad. Couples go together sharing a common project. It’s almost like buying a house together.

And the role women play is as strong as that of men.

Suc’s explanation of how IS has changed the nature of terrorism recasts joining and serving IS as an opportunity for men and women to work in tandem (line 63), in a partnership in which they share a goal (line 64), and as a family and potentially even financial investment (lines 63-64). IS is presented as a new kind of terrorist group because joining the group and traveling to its territory have come to be treated 1) as a collective, bonding act that a couple, or even entire family can carry out together, and 2) as normalized activities (“like buying a house together” in line 64).

Illustrating this point, Suc mentions how joining IS is like going through the process of “buying a house together” (line 64). Purchasing a home can be a rite of passage for a couple or family, and at times it can be an action that might signify that the couple or family is “moving up” financially, relationally, or otherwise. Thus, buying a house is a meaningful act since it can represent a collaborative decision, a commitment to something greater than what may have come before. These lines inform the audience that IS is “changing the nature of terrorism” (lines 59-60) because of what joining IS has come to signify for those who are doing it: joining is being constructed as much more than unknowing, vulnerable, helpless victims succumbing to predatory IS recruiters who “play on” their vulnerability (line 23). Joining IS is a collective act.
It is an act in which women and men are complicit. It is a rite of passage. And it is a way to start fresh, move up in the world, and even make a difference. As Suc concludes, IS is also changing the face of terrorism because, IS, unlike other terrorist groups, has women playing roles that are as “strong” as the roles it is having men play (line 65). Working in conjunction with lines 52 through 60, lines 62 through 65 offer the audience a particular context for Laura’s joining: IS is a terrorist group that is unique in that it has been bringing women effectively into the (formerly) exclusively-men’s world of terrorism: as attackers (line 53), bombers (line 54), planners (line 56), and members of families and couples sharing a common project as IS members (lines 63-64).

**Hoping to Stop Others from Making the Same Mistake**

Eleanor brings Laura’s mediated narrative account to a close by informing the audience about what Laura has been up to since she returned from IS:

67   E: Now back in Belgium, Laura Passoni has written a book about her experience, hoping to stop others from making the same mistake she did. She was given a suspended sentence. Her partner is still in jail. Still Passoni says she’s lucky. Her son is back in school and doesn’t appear to remember much about what happened in Syria.


Eleanor positions Laura as agent, subject of the sentence (lines 67-69), and actor who is actively engaging in her community now that she has returned to Belgium from IS-controlled land.

Eleanor also categorizes what Laura did as a mistake (line 68), casting Laura’s story about joining and serving IS as a member of the group as a cautionary tale, as a warning to others who are vulnerable, like Laura was. By having written a book (line 67), Laura is described as having
reassured others that there are other, safer, and wiser ways of responding to one’s life circumstances in order to transform them.

Among the key rhetorical moves made in this mediated narrative account was naming Laura’s experience joining and living as a member of IS as a “mistake” (line 68). This exemplifies Laura’s as an account that is built for consumption. Characterizing her joining IS as a mistake signals to the audience that Laura thinks of her actions as inappropriate. Concurrently, this characterization makes evident another interactional tension in this text: Laura is being held accountable to her audience, including herself, and rhetorical work is being carried out to persuade the audience to understand Laura’s joining in certain ways.

One way the audience is persuaded to understand Laura’s joining in certain ways is through Laura’s agreeing to give this interview. By having agreed to participate in this interview, Laura put herself in the hot seat. Publically, she allowed herself to be held accountable for her actions.

Another way the audience is persuaded to understand Laura’s joining in a particular way is through Laura’s writing and publishing a book after she returned home from IS-controlled land. According to what she said in her interview, Laura did this to save others from doing what she did, from making the same “mistake” she made (lines 68-69).

As rhetorical acts, Laura’s participating in the interview, and her offering her book serve as Laura’s efforts to publically absolve herself of her untoward action: joining and serving IS. Both public gestures accomplish the interactional goal of Laura attempting to redeem herself in the eyes of her audience.

The mediated narrative account of Laura’s joining IS leaves many questions unanswered. Our societies are filled with people facing tragic circumstances. So, how might being a victim of
violence make us more vulnerable to ISIS’s message? How might being marginalized make us more likely to align with ISIS’s causes?

Perhaps the so-called Islamic State’s recruitment tactics work because they paint a picture of a better world, a fresh start, and a new life that is less painful and more empowering, and that picture greatly appeals to those of us who are most vulnerable and in need of a complete life overhaul. Thus far, the mediated narrative accounts have shown that recruiters offer the vision of a new life to potential new recruits, and in that new life, those who are formerly distraught, violated, and powerless become the very opposite. Potential recruits are told that they will become people who matter to, and in their new community. As revenge for these individuals continues to be presented as sweet, IS continues to successfully recruit. At the same time, the mediated narrative accounts of women’s recruitment into IS that are built, consumed, and circulated leave much to be desired: as these texts continue to show, women of IS are well more than damsels in distress who helplessly await knights in shining armor sporting AKs.

Whereas, in the text featuring Laura, I focus on the construction of accounts of women of IS as stories of vulnerable, helpless women who were taken advantage of by recruiters, in the following chapter I illustrate how texts like Tareena’s are comprised of phases, as a temporal, Labovian narratives (Labov, 1972, 1997). I analyze the structure of the story that unfolds as well as Tareena’s positioning and stancetaking at key points in her telling. I argue that Tareena’s storytelling has important effects on participation structures. Namely, as I show, Tareena uses narrative performance to recruit other persons’ involvement (Goodwin, 1984, 1986; Goodwin, 1990), and to encourage her audience to use their evaluations of story elements to align themselves differentially to parties and positions constituted in her storytelling.
Chapter Five, Tareena:

Narrating Terrorism

In the previous chapters, I examined how terrorism is mobilized through interaction, how terrorism works through mediated narrative accounts of women being recruited that function as cautionary tales that present joining a terrorist group as a futile effort to improve one’s life circumstances, and how the production and consumption of online news reports about women joining IS that work as rhetoric of terrorism since such reports naturalize certain ideologies of terrorism. Since my overall aim is to show how terrorism is produced and consumed in communication, in this chapter I analyze the text featuring Tareena, a woman news reporters describe as a health worker who brought her child with her to join IS. In my analysis, I extend the notion that terrorism should be studied as interaction (that I argue in my analysis of the text featuring Alex). In this chapter featuring Tareena, I build the case that terrorism is mobilized through narrative storytelling, especially in the building of accounts.

My argument in this chapter is threefold. First, I argue that interactional goals can be accomplished paralinguistically (Bombelli, Soler, & Waassaf, 2013). Paralinguistic features can turn the meaning of an account completely on its head such that, even if the words of an account might tell one story, the collective force of an account’s paralinguistic features can tell quite a different one. Second, I show how narrative storytelling is a site of the construction of terrorism. I argue that attending to how the dynamics of narrative allow the teller to engage with the account of terrorism in interesting ways, namely how the context, the scene, or setting of an
account makes possible only certain tellings. Finally, I show the ways in which Tareena builds her account by offering her audience an explanation for her accountable actions (traveling to join IS), and in so doing throwing “bridges between the promised and the performed,” and repairs “the broken and restore the estranged” (Scott & Lyman, 1968, p. 46).

In this chapter, I analyze the mediated narrative account of IS recruitment featuring Tareena Shakil (her real name) who was video recorded by the West Midlands Police, the territorial police force that is responsible for policing the metropolitan county of West Midlands in England. Unlike the other three mediated narrative accounts that I analyze, Tareena’s is presumed to have taken place at a law enforcement facility. Also unlike the other three texts, Tareena’s is a police interview. Law enforcement is presumed to have interviewed her, though officers are neither shown nor heard in the interview featuring Tareena. Akin to the other three mediated narrative accounts presented as interviews, Tareena’s is featured on news websites.

**Entrée: Interviewing Tareena**

New reporters describe Tareena as a mother who took her toddler son to Syria and was later jailed for six years for having joined the so-called Islamic State (*BBC*, 2016); as a British citizen who was arrested when she returned to the UK, and was convicted for being a member of the group and encouraging acts of terror on social media (*The Guardian*, 2016); and as a Sparkbrook mum who took her toddler son abroad to join Islamic State, returned from Syria, and lied her way through her police interview (Larner, 2016a).

The mediated narrative account of twenty-six-year-old Tareena is five-minutes nineteen-second long. A version of the interview is embedded in Tony Larner’s *Birmingham Mail* news report that was published on February 1, 2016, “Tareena Shakil jailed for six years for travelling to Syria to join Islamic State.” During the interview, Tareena describes her experiences having
traveled with her child to Syria to join the so-called Islamic State (Larner, 2016b). She is the only individual featured in the video recorded interview. Those serving as her interviewers are neither seen, nor heard. The audience is never told to whom Tareena is speaking.

The text’s caption, “Tareena Shakil Police Interview: Entering Syria,” introduces the topic of the text as Tareena’s account of her experience entering Syria. In the recording, the date is cut off, displaying only “/02/2015.” The blurring on the left and right sides of screen creates a tunnel-vision effect. Positioned in the middle of the screen, Tareena is made the main focus.

Figure 20: Screenshot of Tareena’s Interview Frame (Larner, 2016)

Blowing her nose at various points, Tareena narrates a chain of events that led up to her being at a detention center for six weeks, before being permitted to return to England.

Because one of my aims is to show how non-verbal and paralinguistic features contribute to the affective meaning of the oral discourse that constitutes Tareena’s mediated narrative account, I use a greater level of detail in my transcript of Tareena’s interview than I do in the
transcripts of the other three mediated narrative accounts. Before I present Tareena’s account in full, I include a list of transcription symbols that I use, as well as the meanings of those symbols.

**Table 9: Transcription System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notation Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning of Notation Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>Falling (final) intonation (not necessarily the end of a sentence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>Stretch of the preceding sound or syllable; the length of the row of colons indicates the length of the prolongation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>Talk between carrots is delivered more slowly than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; &lt;</td>
<td>Talk between carrots is delivered more quickly than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>An abruptly ended (cut off) utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!</td>
<td>Strong emphasis, with falling intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓ or ↑</td>
<td>Sharp rises or falls in intonation or pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° °</td>
<td>Talk between degree signs is quieter than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA</td>
<td>Talk in capital letters is louder than the surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>One-tenth of a second pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>Intervals or pauses between utterances (timed in tenths of a second)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>One second pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What’s up</td>
<td>Stress in pitch or amplitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sylvia</td>
<td>Talk in lower-cased letters is at a normal conversational volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Overlapping talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.h</td>
<td>Audible inhalation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Audible exhalation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Latched, or nearly overlapping turns at talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(( ))</td>
<td>Transcriber’s description of actions noted in the transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((inaudible))</td>
<td>Talk that the transcriber finds inaudible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(radio)</td>
<td>Transcriber’s candidate hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tareena’s Account**

1. Um (0.5) it was never my intention to enter into Syria↓ .h (0.5)

2. h ihm whilst >bein on holiday< (. ) ihm (0.2) I happened to meet um a

3. young Turkish man ((sniffs)) on the beach >he claimed he was workin<

4. on the beeach (0.2) an ihm (. ) ° I li↑ked him↑° (0.2) .h and (0.2) <we

5. developed ihm a> somewhat of a relationship.
((Recording shifts to next clip))

So I found this ihm slight relation with this Turkish man and he’d said that ihm (0.2) because there in October ihm >holiday season in Antalya is comin< to an end ((sniffs)) he’s not from Antalya ((wipes nose)) he’s (.) originally from Gaziantep ((sniffs)) and he’d said that (.) it would be nice if I wanted to (.) to ihm ((tilts head)) (.) fly to Antalya, meet with his family (.) ((wipes nose)) get to know him a bit betta.
((Recording shifts to next clip))

so °I stayed the night in a hotel° (.) and then in the morning (.) the hotel arranged a taxi for me (0.5) <to (.) go (.) to> (.) ihm (.) °Gaziantep° airport and take my luggage .h ((adjusts head scarf)) I did that (.) luggage was there (.) <onnn the wayyy↑> (0.3) ihm > back ((nods head)) to the hotel I m- made contact with this man .h and ihm he said, “yes↑ you know I- uh- I’m ready whenever you are- if you need to get some things at the hotel anything you know, we can meet up↑” ((sniff)) I said (.) “↑yes I ah I’m ready now it’s not- no problem. .h so:o he said ihm <to pass the pho:one> to the taxi driver because obviously he- he’s a Turkish man- he speaks Turkish- >I don’t< speak Turkish and he said that I’ll tell the man where to drop you off and I’ll meet you there (.2) so that’s <what °happened↓>°
((Recording shifts to next clip))

>I said, “I WAnt to LEAVE this place I want to leave this place- why have you brought me here- I don’t want to be in this place (0.2) I want to go back
to Antalya↑ an he said (0.2) ((shakes head)) "no" ((shakes head)) no (.)
this is impossible for me to let you leave because ((sniffs)) maybe you will
al et the police of this place maybe you will (0.2) eh- uh bring problems for
this place↑ .h it’s impossible I’ll let you leave” (. ) >and I said< “but y- you
brought me here and I don’t want to be hFire (. ) and then they just drove
ihm (0.5) across this farmland and then (0.2)°ihm w- (. ) we’d entered Syr↓ia°
.h and ihm (.3) there was two men with us but the- they
>never came from the same house that I came from they were uh< (. ) at
the border already waiting .h and we (. ) came to a- a big gate- a
big gate and ihm the MEN were instructed to get off and there was many,
many ((gesturing with hand)) ISIS soldiers there with guns
((Recording shifts to next clip))
everybody handed over these devices (. ) and ihm (. ) immediately I
>already didn’t want to be in Syria< but immediately >as we were there<
>the other women< they were like (0.2) °this place is ((shakes head)) (. )
this place is He↓ll this place is Hell .h (0.5) hh that place is >not
a good place< it was a horrible, ↑horrible place
((Recording shifts to next clip))
So I went to this place and ihm (0.2) the man he spoke a ↑li:imited Arabic
(I speak) limited Arabic ((sniffs)) .h and I said to HIM IHM I’m going to
Jarabulus (0.2) and he KNEW (. ) >people who come there they’re called
Muhajir ((sniffs)) .h >I’m not Syrian I’m Muhajir and he said< “are you
Muhajir?↑ You come with me.”° .h I THOught it was OVer then I
thought oh God they’ve got me but there was cuz there’s a big ihm ihm the
flag that ISIS used to represent themselves ((sniffs)) and ihm these
people from ISIS< and they want to know >wa- why are you traveling?↑
wa- where you want< to go↑ (.2) and I thought oh God they rumbled me
I’m done (. ) but ihm (. ) I just (. ) >went with the flow and acted stupid<
((Recording shifts to next clip))
I have no idea how I’m gonna make my escape I don’t what ((inaudible))
or nothin I just know to take me to this place (. ) . h this
man he DID not want to take me he was like (. ) a ihm (. ) “big problem
((headshake)) big problem (. ) many Muhajir many (. ) ma- ((inaudible)) Islam
many Muhajir” ((sniffs)) I said, “↑ No↑ no problem you take- my husband
is there↑ you take me there (. ) I need to find my husband he’s training I’ve
not seen any- he he >did not want to take me<
((Recording shifts to next clip))
I heard him say ihm (. ) “Turkey” ((sniff)) to his wi:ife >who’s speakin in
Arabic< with his wife and then I heard him say (. ) “one kilometa” ((sniffs))
and I said to him in Arabic I said, “Brotha- Brotha what’s that about
Tur↓key?↑” . h And he >said to me< “Tur↓key?↑” “Turkey yeah↑” in
Arabic (. ) “one kilometer heading (. ) this way” (. ) I said WHAT? an an he
said (. ) “Turkey one kilometer this way”. h I said “↓Stop the car” (. )
((sniffs)) “stop the car” I threw nine thousand (. ) Syrian dollars at him which
is fifty dollars (. ) grabbed (word removed) (. ) grabbed my pampers everythin-
ih this bag (. )
grabbed the blanket and I just ran >because one kilometer is nothing< (. ) and I just ran, ran, ran (0. 3) an ihm (. )
> I can SEE these ihm ISIS fighters th- the- > I don’t think they’d seen me< because nobody tried to come for me or shoot at me (. ) and as I came up to the border ihm (0. 2) <there’s a car of Turkish soldiers> (. ) patrolling the border (. ) and they took me >and I said to them< you need to help me (. ) well obviously they understand limited English but they knew ( I were in) problem (. ) and then I ihm° (. ) ended up° in a detention center for six weeks and then came back here° ((sniffs)) ° to this place ° (0. 3) oh to England >° after being six weeks in that place° < . 

While the spoken words of Tareena’s account tell one story, the collective force of her paralinguistic features tell a quite different one. Though traditionally considered additional, or marginal features of speech (Tench, 1990, p. 477), paralinguistic and non-verbal features, such as intonation, play a significant role in the realization of affective meaning. Linguists who have analysed and classified paralinguistic features have done so from a variety of perspectives (Brown, 1990; Couper-Kuhlen, 1986; Crystal, 1969; Tench, 1990). For example, Brown approaches paralinguistic features as aspects of speech that “contribute to the expression of attitude by a speaker, and that do not form an intrinsic part of the phonological contrasts which make up the verbal message” (1990, p. 112). According to Brown (1990) and Bombelli, Soler, and Waasaf (2013), paralinguistic features are features that listeners perceive as departures from a speaker’s individual norm. When present in a message, paralinguistic features function as indicators of feelings, emotions, and values. Paralinguistic features often co-occur, and each contributes in its own way to the expression of attitude in a communication moment. In oral
discourse, the paralinguistic domain matters a great deal because paralinguistic features constitute a non-verbal framework of optional ways in which speakers express evaluative meanings of various kinds (Bombelli et al., 2013).

**Chance Happenings**

With just the first two lines, Tareena narrates the events that led up to her being in Syria as nothing but coincidental. Even this early on in the mediated narrative account, Tareena relays to the audience that her account of joining IS is a story of chance happenings, as opposed to a story about events Tareena planned, and for which she is to be blamed and charged.

Tareena opens her account with a statement about what she refers to as her intent:

1. Um (0.5) it was never my intention to enter into Syria↓ .h (0.5)
2. h ihm whilst >bein on holiday< (. ) ihm (0.2) I happened to meet um a
3. young Turkish man ((sniffs)) on the beach >he claimed he was workin<
4. on the beeeach (0.2) an ihm (. ) °I li↑ked him↑° (0.2) .h and (0.2) <we
5. developed ihm a> somewhat of a relationship.

At the beginning of her statement, Tareena uses “um.” This element is a signal a speaker uses when the speaker is “momentarily unable or unwilling to produce the required word or phrase, gives audible evidence that [they are] engaged in speech-productive labor” (Goffman, 1981, p. 293). On a lexico-grammatical level, this opening utterance illustrates that Tareena is aware that she is in the hot seat since she is being held accountable for having entered into Syria. Evidence of this is her plainly telling the audience, from the very first line, that she did not intend to enter Syria. With this statement, Tareena characterizes her entering Syria as an unpremeditated act.

In relation to the rest of the transcript, the first five lines are uniquely saturated with paralinguistic features, variations from the norm (Brown, 1990). The frequency of co-occurring
paralinguistic features in this short extract is notable because they cumulatively add affective meaning to the verbal content of Tareena’s utterances, signaling her attitude about the events she describes. Let us take a closer look.

Toward the end of the first line, Tareena’s pitch falls (“Syria↓”), she inhales (“.h”), and she pauses for half of a second (“(0.5)”), which is a substantial pause, since the typical within-turn pause is one-tenth of a second.

At the beginning of line 2, Tareena exhales (“h”) and then verbally hesitates (saying, “ihm”) before she describes how she met a young Turkish man when she was on vacation:

2 h ihm whilst >bein on holiday< (. ) ihm (0.2) I happened to meet um a

After exhaling, Tareena speeds up her tempo when she says, “bein on holiday” (indicated by the carrot symbols), executing this phrase notably more quickly than she executes the surrounding talk. Also in line 2, Tareena bookends “whilst >bein on holiday<” with the sound “ihm,” a version of “um.” Including “ihm” multiple times (twice in line 2) - in conjunction with “um” (end of line 2), “ihm” (line 4), and another “ihm” (line 5) - decreases the articulatory precision Tareena displays during most of the rest of the interview.

Pauses punctuate Tareena’s speech in the opening excerpt, showing up at key moments during her story about meeting a young Turkish man on the beach when she was on holiday. The first pause occurs when Tareena states that she met a young Turkish man (line 2). On this line, the phrase “happened to” functions as a hedge, characterizing their meeting on the beach as coincidental. A hedge is a mitigating word, sound, or construction that serves to lessen the impact of an utterance by constraining the interaction between speaker and addressee, and can be used to attend to politeness, to soften a blow, or to avoid appearing as a braggart (Levinson, 1983). With “happened to,” Tareena softens the action of her having met this man’s by casting
this meeting - the initial contact made between potential recruit and presumed recruiter - as one that was not planned in advance. What is the point? This matters because a meeting between two people that is storied as having occurred coincidentally is significantly less suspicious than a meeting that is storied as having been prearranged. This is so because intent, or premeditation is the determining factor in this circumstance. Therefore, in addition to informing the audience that “it was never [her] intention to enter into Syria” (line 1), Tareena informs the audience that her having met the young Turkish man was mere happenstance (line 2). The point Tareena makes is their meeting was just as unintended as her traveling to Syria.

The second and third pauses in the opening excerpt occur when Tareena tells her audience that she liked this young Turkish man that she met. In addition to pausing, Tareena softens her tone (indicated by °°) and heightens her pitch (indicated by ↑):

4 on the beeach (0.2) an ihm (.) °I li↑ked him↑° (0.2) .h and (0.2) <we

Taken together, the pauses, tone softening, and pitch heightening signify some sort of trouble in Tareena’s account.

**Context Matters**

Since this is a police interview, the interview’s established context makes the telling of Tareena’s account possible. Yet, because this interview took place in a law enforcement atmosphere, Tareena’s audience, including the immediate audience of police officers and/or government agents, presumably, expects an account in the form of a confession of Tareena’s experiences having joined IS because joining a terrorist group is an action for which anyone would be held accountable. In this sense, the context of Tareena’s mediated narrative account functions metacommunicatively. Tareena is being held particularly accountable since she has been accused of having brought her toddler along with her when she traveled to Syria to join IS.
As the very first lines of Tareena’s interview illustrate, Tareena’s action of going into Syria is being “subjected to valuative inquiry” (Scott & Lyman, 1968, p. 46). This sets the scene for this mediated narrative account by revealing it to be an interactional circumstance in which Tareena is being held accountable for her former actions. The context of the interview also effectively introduces the audience to an unasked, though implied question. Why would a mother, along with her toddler in tow, travel to Syria to join the so-called Islamic State? Considered in this way, the accounts Tareena offers in her interview work as accomplishments in the maintenance and mending of social organization and order: they functions as opportunities for audiences to hear how Tareena explains her actions. This mediated narrative account, therefore, serves as a chance for Tareena to “verbally bridg[e] the gap between action and expectation” (Scott & Lyman, p. 46). Since Tareena is a woman, and especially since she is a mother, audiences would likely not anticipate that such an individual would carry out the action of attempting to join IS. As a social actor, Tareena builds her account to “repair the broken and restore the estranged” (Scott & Lyman, p. 46), and works to do that by reframing her actions as one her audience would interpret as understandable. Though the context, scene, or setting of an account can possible only certain tellings, this does not leave the narrator helpless, as Tareena’s cases illustrates.

To continue contextualizing Tareena’s account, let us use the frame of someone extending an invitation. When an invitation is offered, the preferred response is acceptance of the invitation. However, a response that is not preferred, in that situation, would be a refusal, a rejection, or a turning town of the invitation. This type of response, a type that is generally to be avoided, is likely to be marked by features such as delays, prefaces, and accounts (Levinson, 1983, p. 333). Examples of these might be declining in response to a request or offer, disagreeing
in response to an assessment, offering an unexpected answer in response to a question, or admitting in response to being blamed (Levinson, pp. 333-336).

Because Tareena’s account is produced in a law enforcement institution (a police station, center, or other facility), i.e. a place where crimes are typically investigated, Tareena is in a position in which she is expected to tell, confess, and/or explain her actions to her audience. The context of Tareena’s mediated narrative account, in this sense, makes possible only tellings that take the form of confessions/admissions of guilt, denials of guilt/pleas of innocence, or, less commonly, claims of ignorance, an inability to remember, and/or mental or other kind of illness.

However, Tareena’s account muddles this picture. As she stories her experiences, Tareena resists offering one of these kinds of possible tellings. Even though the telling possibilities are restricted by context, Tareena employs paralinguistic features as resources that allow her account to break out of the established confines. By exploiting paralinguistic resources, Tareena accomplishes communicative work that makes her not-so-black-or-white story tell-able in this restrictive context. Tareena accomplishes this by working to make her account as acceptable as possible to her audience. Tareena is not telling the audience a story about how she fell head over heels in love with an IS affiliate, and then did whatever he instructed her to do. Nor is Tareena building an account about herself as a duped, naïve woman who did not know any better. Tareena builds her account as a story about how she had a chance meeting with a stranger, and how that chance meeting led to their having a “slight relation” (line 7).

In the opening extract, Tareena reports to the audience that the Turkish man “claimed he was workin< on the beeach (0.2) an ihm (.) °I li↑ked him↑ (0.2) .h and” they “developed ihm a> somewhat of a relation ship” (lines 3-5). She executes “I liked him” with a great deal of hesitation: she pauses before saying it, she says it softly, as she says it she increases her pitch
halfway through and at the end, and she pauses once more after she says it. In conjunction with this hesitant execution, Tareena downgrades “somewhat of a relationship” to a “slight relation” (line 7). By conveying such lack of significance to her connection to the Turkish man (if she had said that she loved him, for instance, she would have signaled more of a bond with this person), Tareena communicates to her audience that she and he do not have close personal ties. With these strategies, Tareena distances herself from the man, presenting herself to her audience as potentially less culpable than she might be if she had constructed her relationship to the Turkish man as closer, romantically, sexually, or otherwise, and if she had told the audience about their relationship in a more confident, unreserved, and unpunctuated manner.

**Reference**

Related to this is how, throughout the mediated narrative account, unlike Alex - who consistently referred to Faisal by name, or as her “friend” during her interview - Tareena refers to the man presumed to be an IS affiliate as “this Turkish man” (line 3). By referring to the man this way, Tareena widens the gap between them as characters, effectively conveying to the audience that she and this man were not closely co-conspiring. This reinforces the argument that she is building: that she is not as culpable as the audience might initially presume her to be.

As Enfield (2013) describes, reference is a way of relating to another person, “literally pointing to something in order for two people to share attention on that thing, for some interactional purpose.” Enfield goes on to explain, “for instance, a child points to a toy in order to get someone to pass it; or I direct your attention to a museum exhibit so that we may appreciate it together” (cf. Enfield, 2009; Goodwin 2003a; Kidwell & Zimmerman, 2007; Kita, 2003; Moore, 2008; Sidnell, 2005; Tomasello, 2008). In social interaction, language users use rich, elaborate resources. For example, in order to make reference to a person, a speaker must
select from a variety of lexical and gestural possibilities. Because of this, reference is a matter of selection, whether lexical or otherwise (Frege, 1960/1892; cf. Brown 1958; Chafe 1980).

Throughout her mediated narrative account, Tareena consistently chooses to refer to the IS affiliate as “this Turkish man.” As Enfield (2013) reminds us, “we are never free from the consequences of our choices in interaction both in terms of how they increment or alter common ground (knowledge, beliefs, focus of attention), and how they increment or alter social relationships (affiliation, distance, etc.)” (p. 454). Tareena’s use of “this Turkish man” as a reference to the IS affiliate focuses the audience’s attention on her lack of familiarity with him.

Concurrently, interactionally, interpersonally, and intersubjectively, Tareena engineers her relationship with her audience: as she consistently distances herself from the IS affiliate (leaving the audience assuming that, since she refers to him as “this Turkish man,” she is quite unfamiliar with him), Tareena effectively aligns herself, more and more, with those listening and/or watching her interview. This illustrates how reference is central to constructing social action with talk, and how “affiliational functions of talk generally require reference to have been successfully made in order for them to work at all” (Enfield, p. 454). When Tareena selects and regularly uses, “this Turkish man,” as a form of reference, she creates and strengthens a coalitional bond between herself and her audience. This ensures that her audience knows about whom she is referring, and consistently reminds her audience that Tareena considers her relationship with him to be one that is neither familiar, nor close.

In the following segment, Tareena uses indirect, i.e. reported speech. In lines 7 and 10, especially, she uses this kind of speech to inform the audience that the young Turkish man invited her to visit his family.

7 So I found this ihm slight relation with this Turkish man and he’d said that
ihm (0.2) because there in October him >holiday season in Antalya is comin< to an end ((sniffs)) he’s not from Antalya ((wipes nose)) he’s (. ) originally from Gaziantep ((sniffs)) and he’d said that (. ) it would be nice if I wanted to (. ) to ihm ((tilts head)) (. ) fly to Antalya, meet with his family (. ) ((wipes nose)) get to know him a bit better.

Tareena’s use of indirect speech serves to minimize the distance between her, as speaker and her audience, and maximize the distance between Tareena and the man about whom she is speaking. Through accounts, speakers scenically stage the events about which they discuss. Instead of merely reporting information, speakers present “a sort of drama to the audience” (Goffman, 1974, p. 508). This narrative detailing works as a rhetorical device since speakers use it to claim authenticity. Furthermore, by scenically reconstructing the past situation, the speaker stages the scene of the story. This effectively involves the audience in the narrated events as it minimizes the distance between the audience and the event. As Kotthoff and Wodak (1997) explain, a common device speakers use to carry out scenic staging is reconstructing past dialogues through reported speech and the animation of characters. When Tareena does this from line 7 through line 12, she claims authenticity, but she also offers her audience the chance to “experience” the past interactions she narrates since, by being “confronted with” segments of dialogue of characters, the audience is placed in “the role of an eye witness” (Kotthoff & Wodak, 1997, p. 211). By reporting speech in an account, a speaker imbues her that account with affect:

Even though parts of the reported dialogues are staged in direct speech, the narrator - by using prosodic means of stylization - melts the reported utterances with her own evaluation of it and thus metapragmatically comments on the quotation (‘layering of voices’). (Kotthoff & Wodak, p. 211)
From line 7 through 12, instead of directly stating, “the man invited me to visit him and his family in Antalya,” Tareena offers her audience a lengthy, elaborate account of the invitation that the Turkish man extended to her. Furthermore, she interjects side comments along the way.

**Knowing Your Audience**

Preparing to report the speech of the man (at the end of line 7), Tareena provides her audience with background information. First, she informs her audience that in Antalya, in October, holiday season is coming to an end. Second, she notes that the young Turkish man is not from Antalya. Third, she tells the audience that he is originally from Gaziantep. By providing her audience with these additional details - information offers as necessary to share with the audience so that her audience members are effectively brought into her narrative fold - Tareena works to provide her audience with an insider’s view. Her role she plays is that of audience’s narrative guide. She tells them how to interpret the words of the characters in her story, and in so doing presents herself as reliable narrator. Tareena’s narrative detailing increases the involvement of the audience in the narrated events, therefore decreasing the distance between speaker, events being reported, and audience (Kotthoff & Wodak, 1997). This is important because Tareena’s is an account about a woman’s joining IS and traveling with her young child to IS-controlled lands. In this case, when an audience becoming increasingly more aligned with the speaker, the audience may find themselves more easily able put themselves in her shoes. In Tareena’s case, the text’s context is one that prefers confession/admission of guilt. Yet, the story Tareena constructs is an increasingly relatable one.

When Tareena relays to her audience that the Turkish man invited her, she describes his invitation as indirect. As Tareena explains, the man told her that: “it would be nice if I wanted to (. ) to ihm ((tilts head)) (. ) fly to Antalya, meet with his family (. ) ((wipes nose)) get to know him
a bit betta” (lines 10-12). Tareena casts the man’s invitation as a roundabout, hesitant one. Instead of saying point blank “come to Antalya with me,” the man is constructed as having hinted that he would find it “nice” if she would choose to make a trip to spend time with him and his family. Tareena’s account of the man’s invitation is linguistically marked because it is clunky and muddled: she begins by extending “nice,” slowing down her execution of the phrase, she then pauses, she tilts her head, she then pauses again, she pauses yet another time a few words later, and she wipes her nose before she finishes the utterance. This excerpt is saturated with hesitation markers and delays.

As Church (2004) explains, when a speaker offers a response that is prefaced with delay and/or hesitation markers, that response is typically characterised as dispreferred; in contrast, when a speaker offers a response that is direct and is produced without delay, that response is typically a preferred one (p. 124). The excerpt above falls in the former category, what in conversation analysis (CA) would be called a dispreferred response. In contrast, if Tareena were offering her audience a confession or plea of innocence, either of which would be considered a preferred response in this context, Tareena’s account would be expected to take the form of a direct account produced without delay.

In line 14, Tareena lowers her voice to report to the audience that she stayed in a hotel one night:

14 so °I stayed the night in a hotel° (.) and then in the morning (.) the hotel

15 arranged a taxi for me (0.5) <to (.) go (.) to> (.) ihm (.) °Gaziantep° airport

Tareena lowers her volume again in line 15 when she mentions the city’s name where the airport was located. Lowering the volume of her voice when she admits that she slept in a hotel, and that she was at the Gaziantep airport, indicates Tareena’s hesitance and reluctance to tell the audience
about those experiences. This contributes to stance by casting the account as one imbued with regret, shame, and/or embarrassment.

Tareena proceeds with her account by explaining that on her way back to the hotel she “made contact with this man” (line 18) and he requested that she pass the phone to the taxi driver to give him directions to where he should drop her off. At this point, instead of relying on a direct, concise statement (like, “the man gave the taxi driver directions to our meeting place”), Tareena offers the audience another lengthy, elaborate, includes several asides:

21 I’m ready now it’s not- no problem. h so:o he said ihm <to pass the
22 phone> to the taxi driver because obviously he- he’s a Turkish man- he
23 speaks Turkish- >I don’t< speak Turkish and he said that I’ll tell the man
24 where to drop you off and I’ll meet you there (.2) so that’s
25 <what happened↓>°

When Tareena adds details to her account, she clarifies for her audience why the young Turkish man used the taxi driver as an intermediary and brings the audience more deeply into the narrative fold, increasing the audience’s involvement in the recounted events. By including that the taxi driver is “a Turkish man,” that “he speaks Turkish,” and that she does not,” Tareena helps her audience experience the interactions she narrates, keeping us in “the role of an eye witness” (Kotthoff & Wodak, 1997, p. 211). When Tareena refers to the taxi driver as “obviously” a Turkish man who speaks Turkish, she states, “>I don’t< speak Turkish” (line 23). With this statement, Tareena accomplishes two things. First, she provides the audience with a justification for why she was not the direct recipient of the young Turkish man’s driving directions. Second, she publicizes the fact that she did not know exactly what the men discussed. Because she does not speak Turkish like the two men who were navigating for her, she was not
in on that planning. By interjecting these details, Tareena presents herself as having been out of
the information fold of the men’s interaction (just as the audience is), aligning her even further
with her audience.

When Tareena is recounting particularly tense and significant interactional moments,
hesitations and filled pauses become more frequent. Tareena begins her mediated narrative account
by producing an opening statement about her intentions (or lack thereof) in a tentative, decelerated,
and punctuated way. She then narrates her coming to know the Turkish man in a hesitant, subdued,
and reserved manner. Both of these interactional moments are tense because they are high-stakes for
Tareena since at these points in her account Tareena is most acutely at the mercy of her audience. In
the beginning of the mediated narrative account, relationally and contextually, Tareena is in a
position that requires her to provide an account of her actions. Likewise, when she tells the audience
about the Turkish man - presumably an IS affiliate and her recruiter - Tareena is uniquely vulnerable.

**Reenactment & Embodiment**

Tareena’s storytelling influences participation structures because, by using particular
strategies in her storytelling, Tareena shapes her audience’s interpretations of her and the account
that she builds of her joining the so-called Islamic State.

In line 27, Tareena’s narrative takes a turn as she describes having been in the taxi. Tareena’s
subdued accounting shifts to expressions of resistance to the circumstances in which she found
herself. With markedly loud, quick speech, Tareena recounts that she told the taxi driver:

27  T:   >I said, “I Want to LEAVE this place I want to leave this place- why have
28       you brought me here- I don’t want to be in this place (0.2) I want to go back
29       to Antalya↑ an he said (0.2) ((shakes head)) “no° ((shakes head)) no (.)
In these lines, Tareena’s increased volume, increased tempo, stressing certain words and parts of words, repetition, and cascading of phrases without pauses between them are notable. Collectively, these paralinguistic elements contribute to Tareena’s stancetaking because they convey panic, helplessness, and desperation in relation to the events that unfolded when she was in the taxi. To recount the event to her audience, Tareena reenacts them by displaying the sensations she had when she was in the taxi. According to what she relays in her accounting, Tareena was experiencing feelings of panic, fear/anxiety, and regret. Tareena indicates her feelings of panic with “I WAnt to LEAVE this place I want to leave this place” (line 27), feelings of fear/anxiety with “why have you brought me here I don’t want to be in this place” (lines 27-28), and feelings of regret with “I want to go back” (line 28).

In contrast to how Tareena recounts her actions and the feelings she was having in the taxi, she describes the taxi driver as unsympathetic when he responded to her pleading with him. In a soft tone of voice, Tareena reports the driver’s speech when he said, “no,” informing her:

30 this is impossible for me to let you leave because ((sniffs)) maybe you will
31 alet the police of this place maybe you will (0.2) eh- uh bring problems for
32 this place↑ .h it’s impossible I’ll let you leave” (.) >and I said< “but y- you
33 brought me here and I don’t want to be hEre (.) and then they just drove

Several paralinguistic features increase the dramatic effect of how Tareena’s relays this moment to her audience. She brings the story she is telling to life by using gestures. For instance, she shakes her head just as the taxi driver did (line 29). Concurrently, she softens her voice when she says “°no°” (line 29), changing the pace, adding texture to her performance of what happened. Additionally, Tareena pauses mid-sentence (line 30), and embodies the driver by using first-person pronouns to directly report his speech (lines 30 - 32). Together, these elements work to
place the audience within the scene, and experience the events from Tareena’s point of view, as though we, too, are in the backseat of the driver’s taxi.

Subsequently, narrating her second attempt to get the driver to turn around, Tareena tells the audience that she said to the driver, “but you brought me here and I don’t want to be here” (line 33), and yet the car kept going. Tareena relays how, at that point, she was emotionally unwilling to go along with the events, and she felt physically trapped:

34 ihm (0.5) across this farmland and then (0.2)iém w- (. we’d entered Syria°
35 .h and ihm (.3) there was two men with us but the- they

In addition to the rising pitch, Tareena’s tone softens and she pauses twice in line 34 and once in line 35. Collectively, these paralinguistic features contribute to the building of Tareena’s account as a story about a woman who was not playing an active role in the series of events that led to her and her child being in Syria. Instead, Tareena is constructed as a prisoner of circumstance.

Next in her account, Tareena explains what it was like when her taxi approached the Turkey-Syria border:

36 >never came from the same house that I came from they they were uh< (. at
37 the border already waiting .h and we (. came to a- a big gate- a
38 big g:gate and ihm the MEN were instructed to get off and there was many,
39 many ((gesturing with hand)) ISIS soldiers there with guns

From line 38 to line 39, Tareena’s speech features repetition (“many, many” and “a- a big gate- a big gate”) and gesture (stressing the number of men present). By repeating “gate” and “many,” Tareena contributes to her accounting because such repetition helps disparate sequences of utterances hold together as a coherent narrative (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Tareena’s repetition binds together seemingly disjointed elements, building momentum to create one,
cohesive story. Repetition is also serving an emphasis function, stressing “big” (line 37-38) and “many” (lines 38-39), for example.

Furthermore, repetition of this sort helps audience members keep track of what is being said in spoken language interaction (Ong, 1982). This repetition, therefore, works in multiple ways: 1) underscoring the point Tareena is making, i.e. that at the border the gate was very large and there were many IS soldiers with guns; 2) tying together disparate sequences of utterances so that they function as a coherent narrative; and 3) providing the audience with an check-in, reminding us of the topics and direction of the account. As members of the audience, we are reminded that Tareena faced three obstacles that prevented her from achieving her aim (i.e., turning around and going back):

1. First, the taxi driver refused to take her instruction.
2. Second, they faced a big gate at the Turkey-Syrian border.
3. Third, many IS soldiers with guns were at the border when they arrived there in the taxi.

Reminding us of these obstructions, Tareena contributes to her construction of herself as having been trapped, a victim of circumstance, emotionally as well as physically.

Tareena proceeds by offering a description of the women who were in IS-controlled land. With fast-paced talk riddled with repetition, pauses, inhalations, and exhalations, she recalls:

41 T: everybody handed over these devices (.) and ihm (.) immediately I
42 >already didn’t want to be in Syria< but immediately >as we were there<
43 >the other women< they were like (0.2) “this place is ((shakes head)) (.)
44 this place is Hell this place is Hell .h (0.5) hh that place is >not
45 a good place< it was a horrible, ↑horrible place
Tareena paints a picture of the scene at the border, describing IS-controlled territory as “hell” (twice in line 44), “not a good place” (once, from line 44 to 45), and a “horrible” place (twice in line 45), again repetition serves by emphasizing. Through this negative characterization of IS-controlled territory, Tareena distances herself from IS. Just as she was in the beginning of her mediated narrative account, Tareena continues to be accountable to her audience for her circumstances, i.e., as someone who ended up being a detainee at a detention center because of her actions, including traveling with her small child to IS-controlled territory. However, by building characterizations such as the one from line 41 through line 45, Tareena continues her narrative project of building herself up as inculpable, or at least as not agentic in the events that led up to her being in IS lands. With this construction, Tareena further aligns herself with the audience while distancing herself from IS.

Asides

Tareena continues her account:

47  T: So I went to this place and ihm (0.2) the man he spoke a limited Arabic (I speak) limited Arabic ((sniffs)) .h and I said to HIM IHM I’m going to Jarabulus (0.2) and he KNEW (.>)people who come there they’re called Muhajir ((sniffs)) .h >I’m not Syrian I’m Muhajir and he said< “are you Muhajir? You come with me.” .h I THOught it was Over then I thought oh God they’ve got me but there was cuz there’s a big ihm ihm the

Once more, Tareena pulls the audience into the scene. She accomplishes this by including a series of audience-designed utterances. In line 48, Tareena mentions “(I speak) limited Arabic” to explain how she and “the man” were able to understand one another. In lines forty-nine through fifty, Tareena explains to the audience that “Muhajir” refers to non-Syrian people who
go to Jarabulus. Finally, in lines 51 through 52, Tareena tells the audience, “I THOught it was OVer then I thought oh God they’ve got me,” announcing what she was feeling at the time.

Still engaging in what seems to be a side conversation with her audience, Tareena proceeds by mentioning that IS uses a flag to represent themselves (in the context of her seeing a big IS flag), and noting that the IS members want to know why and where individuals at the border are traveling:

53 flag that ISIS used to represent themselves ((sniffs)) and ihm >these
54 people from ISIS< and they want to know >wa- why are you traveling?↑
55 wa- where you want< to go↑ (.2) and I thought oh God they rumbled me
56 I’m done (. ) but ihm (. ) I just (. ) >went with the flow and acted stupid<

When Tareena mentions that the IS members wanted to know why she was traveling and where she was going, she could have reported their speech. Instead, Tareena merely states that “these people from ISIS” want to know “why are you traveling” and “where you want to go” (lines 54-55). By mentioning this as a generality - instead of reporting it as IS members’ speech that was directly addressed to her - Tareena brings the audience in, increasing their participation in the goings on of the narrated events. However, this time she accomplishes this by confessing to the audience what thoughts she had had at that moment: Tareena states, “I thought oh God they rumbled me I’m done (. ) but ihm (. ) I just (. ) >went with the flow and acted stupid<” (lines 55-56). In these lines, Tareena offers the audience her assessment of how she managed to get through the dangerous interaction she describes: she tricked the IS soldiers into thinking that she was oblivious and did not know what was going on.

In an effort to convince the taxi driver to bring her to IS-controlled territory, Tareena tells him that she was expected to rendezvous with her husband who is training there (lines 63-64).
Though the driver continued refusing, he mentioned that Turkey was only one kilometer away. Tareena relays the chain of events in a notable way, incorporating the audience into the scene, and involving us as co-participants in the goings on that she narrates:

66    T:    I heard him say ihm (.) “Turkey” ((sniff)) to his wi:ife >who’s speakin in
67 Arabic< with his wife and then I heard him say (.) “one kilometa” ((sniffs))
68 and I said to him in Arabic I said, “Brotha- Brotha what’s that about
69 Tur↓key↑↑ .h And he >said to me< “Turkey↑↑ “Turkey yeah↑↑” in
70 Arabic (.) “one kilometer heading (.) this way” (.) I said WHAT? an an he
71 said (.) “Turkey one kilometer this way” .h I said “↓Stop the car” (.)

Through her use of progressive (ongoing, background) tense, Tareena brings her audience temporally into the taxicab with her: “who’s speakin in Arabic< with his wife” (lines 66-67). She reports the direct speech that unfolded during her conversation with the driver: “I said, ‘Brotha-Brotha what’s that about Turkey?’” and “he >said to me<‘Turkey?’” (lines 67-71). This too functions by bringing her audience, interactionally, into the taxi with Tareena.

Scenic Staging

Throughout her narrative, Tareena carries out what Kotthoff and Wodak (1997) call scenic staging, i.e. reconstructing past dialogue through reported speech and animation of characters. Instead of merely providing information about what she experienced, Tareena uses certain narrative features to paint a picture for the audience of what she experienced. She scenically reconstructs the past situation by presenting the “drama to the audience” (Goffman, 1974, p. 508), and she accomplishes this through her use of pauses (line 70), rising intonation, repetition, and changes in inflection and volume (lines 68-71).
In the final segment of the mediated narrative account, Tareena narrates how she exited the taxi, collected her child, gathered her belongings, and ran toward IS-controlled lands:

72 ((sniffs)) “stop the car” I threw nine thousand (.) Syrian dollars at him which
73 is fifty dollars (.) grabbed (word removed) (.) grabbed my pampers everythin-
74 ih this bag (.)
75 grabbed ((word removed)) grabbed the blanket and I just ran >because
76 one kilometer is nothing< (.) and I just ran, ran, ran (0.3) an ihm (.)
77 >I can SEE these ihm ISIS fighters th- the- >I don’t think they’d seen me<

Tareena’s description of these events include repetition (“grabbed,” twice in line 73, and twice in line 75, and “ran,” four times in lines 75-76), side notes that are addressed to the audience (“which is fifty dollars,” in lines 72 - 73 and “>because one kilometer is just nothing<,” in lines 75 - 76), and pauses (two in line 73, two in line 74, and two in line 76). As is the case at other points in the mediated narrative account, these features contribute to the account by connecting disparate sequences of utterances to form a coherent narrative, by helping the audience keep track of what is being said in the interaction, and by reminding the audience of the direction of the account. This last contribution takes Tareena’s audience down a slightly different path.

In prior extracts, Tareena’s project is one of revealing to her audience that she is regretful about having decided to go to IS-controlled lands. For example, in line 27 she recounts how she desperately attempted to convince the taxi driver to return to the hotel, and in line 45 she negatively characterizes IS-controlled land. In contrast, from lines 72 through line 76, Tareena’s conveys to her audience that she was willing to run one kilometer, with her child and belongings in tow, toward Turkey. Though at times Tareena’s account does not make clear where, exactly,
the taxi may have been going, or where she was heading on foot, however it is evident that Tareena is constructing herself as desperate enough to resort to running.

    Even after she saw the IS fighters, Tareena approached the border, encountered a car of Turkish soldiers, and demanded that they help her:

    78 because nobody tried to come for me or shoot at me (.) and as I came up to the border ihm (0.2) <there’s a car of Turkish soldiers> (.) patrolling the border (.) and they took me >and I said to them< you need to help me (.)
    80    well obviously they understand limited English but they knew (I were in)
    81    problem (.) °and then I ihm° (.) °ended up° in a detention center for six weeks and then came back here° ((sniffs)) °to this place.° (0.3) oh to
    82    England >°after being six weeks in that place°< .h

Without explaining exactly why or how she ended up in the detention center for six weeks and then “here” (England), Tareena brings her account to a close. Using a softened tone, falling intonation, pauses, and inhalations, Tareena concludes by reporting to the audience that she said to the Turkish soldiers that they needed to help her (line 80). By reporting her speech directly, Tareena again brings the audience into the scene with her, decreasing the distance between audience and speaker. By referring to the Turkish soldiers as “you” (line 80), Tareena renders it particularly easy for the audience to envision being in her place when she was pleading for soldiers’ help. This, too, functions by decreasing the distance between audience and speaker.

    In line 81, Tareena offers the audience another aside when she mentions: “well obviously they understand limited English.” “Well” is a word that often signals some problems between interlocutors (Owen, 1981). Frequently, “well” is used in “face-threatening” (Brown & Levinson, 1987) situations, or circumstances in which, no matter what the speaker and the hearer utter, both
conversational participants are threatened. By stating, “well obviously they understand limited
English” (line 81), Tareena uses “well” to mitigate the effect of her account. This works as
Tareena’s self-protection strategy. For Tareena, confrontation could arise if members of her
audience were to reject her account. She is already in a vulnerable position because of the
context of this interview. Like she was at the outset of the interview, Tareena is still vulnerable
and open to judgment at the end of her mediated narrative account. Whereas at the beginning,
Tareena was expected to offer an account of how she ended up in a detention center, at the end of
the interview, as Tareena brings her account to a close, she is admitting that Turkish soldiers
took her at the IS-territory border, and as a result of that taking, she ended up in a detention
center. Tareena is, once more, positioned as a suspicious character in the account: the
presumption is, those who are innocent seldom end up in a foreign country’s detention center.
With “well,” Tareena perhaps erases some of the interactional work she did as she built her
account. The audience is left on edge: Is Tareena a woman who, by chance, met a man on a
beach, arranged to meet up with him in IS-controlled lands, but then desperately tried, and failed
to return to safety because she was ultimately unable to advocate for herself? Was Tareena’s
experience a series of unfortunate events out of her control? Is Tareena’s mediated narrative
account a confession, or a plea of innocence?

As Tareena builds her account, she uses paralinguistic and nonverbal features, and it is
because of those features that her story takes on its own form: neither 100% confession, nor
200% plea of innocent.

**Beyond Words**

In my analysis of the mediated narrative account of Tareena’s joining, I illustrated how
narrative storytelling serves as a site of the construction of terrorism, and how the narrative floor
functions as a way to intervene in the terrorist project because the narrator can control the narrative by making the audience complicit in their interactional aims. Finally, I built a case about how narrators can accomplish interactional goals through their use of non-verbal, or paralinguistic features since such element can be used to contradict or reinforce the verbal content of accounts. Additionally, I argued that, while the setting of an account might seem to allow only certain tellings, speakers are able to creatively exploit communicative resources to fashion stories for a purpose to accomplish certain intersubjective and/or interpersonal goals. Finally, I addressed how narrative performances like Tareena’s can be used persuasively, to shape, or in Burke’s (1966) term, to “bend” interpretations of the actors and actions featured in accounts built in the telling.

As Tareena’s case shows, the stories that most warrant our careful attention may be the ones least often heard. They may also be the ones most easily or often dismissed, or even the ones labeled as mere messes of “lies” (Larner, 2016). Let us remember, the plots for which we search may lie in the pauses. The climaxes may be just out of view, but still there, masked in the subtleties of the repetitions that freckle our transcripts, or in the tones transfiguring the tales the words tell.
Conclusion & Future Directions:

On Terrorism as Intra-action

Terrorism is a word used to describe the actions of people who commit violent, physical acts that fall within certain bounds. However, the term “terrorism” is a morally weighted one. This is because the term, “terrorism,” is already an account. It is a motive that is ascribed. According to Burke (1950), a motive is the name, or naming of an act. It is an act of invention, and an act of interpretation that assigns motive. Terrorism names a situation. As the four analyses I offer in this project illustrate, the situation that is being named by terrorism is: people who are not us carrying out violent acts against us. The analyses I offer in this project illustrate how terrorism discourse, writ large, works as terrorism because that discourse is terrifying: it terrifies. In other words, terrorism produces and disseminates terror.

Whereas the four accounts of women being recruited into IS that I analyze are discrete texts, accomplish unique persuasive goals, and are designed with different audiences in mind, they share a common rhetorical purpose. An overall moral account is being produced across the texts: their shared rhetorical purpose is to terrify. In this sense, the texts work as terrorism for public consumption. This common aim influences the kinds of moral accounting that is done in these narratives. Akin to how Cold War propaganda depended on the “evil empire” of the Soviets, the notion of the “evil-doer” terrorists fuels current propaganda. When “terrorism” is defined, narrated, and accounted for in texts like the ones featured in this project, those definitions, narrations, and accounts work because of the rhetoric of terror.
My analyses also point to the fact that terrorism is pervasive and that we are all complicit in the production and the consumption of terrorism. This project shows that the tentacles of terrorism stretch well beyond the carnage from explosions in cars and businesses that shock us as we stare helplessly at our laptop, cell phone, and television screens. With this in mind, terrorism should no longer be exclusively defined by the gruesome aftermath of weapons deployed, perhaps thousands of miles away. Terrorism works as and through communication, and communication must be oriented to as physical as well as material.

Studying terrorism effectively requires that we move to a more complex understanding of materiality in communication. Pursuing this should involve revising the work of scholars like Barad (1998, 2003), who argues in her theory of agential realism that the universe is comprised of phenomena, which are the ontological inseparability of intra-acting agencies. As Barad explains, objects or phenomena – such as terrorism, for instance – do not precede their interaction. Instead, they emerge through particular intra-actions. In this sense, they are material-discursive. As objects and phenomena – such as these four very differently presented types of accounts – produce determinate meanings and material beings, they simultaneously exclude the production of others. Concurrently, those beings, in turn, produce objects and phenomena. Theories like Barad’s help us realize that, to matter is, therefore, always material-discursive, and for this reason it is crucial to attend to how we co-create phenomena in the inter-actions in which we all engage.

As I have argued in this project, producers of mediated narrative accounts of terrorist recruitment – such as producers, reporters, and writers of news stories that take the form of written reports, videos, and audio interviews of women joining the so-called Islamic State, for example – are complicit in the constitution and production of terrorism for consumption. To
illustrate this, let us consider the different layers of mediation involved in the construction of the four texts I analyzed in this project.

While the four texts I analyze in this project are presented as interviews, I refer to each as a mediated narrative account of IS recruitment. I do this to acknowledge that each is its own type of speech activity. Though each text accomplishes a different interactional goal and is designed for its own audience, all four texts do the work of terrorism by being designed to instill fear in their audience. Though all four texts are presented as interviews, different layers of mediation are involved in the construction of each text. This is important to acknowledge because doing discourse analysis requires analysts to attend to how various production circumstances shape the resulting texts.

In the mediated narrative account of Alex’s near recruitment, the use of multiple modes of communication evidences how heavily produced the text is. For example, written text is used in what are constructed as the producers’ turns, screenshots of the social media messages Faisal has sent to Alex are embedded, recorded segments of face-to-face conversations between Alex and her grandmother are featured, and even background visuals depicting Alex at home on her phone, on her computer, and in her bedroom and kitchen in Washington state are included in the text.

Additionally, different layers of mediation are involved in the construction of the text that features Khadija. One way this is the case is how the words of Khadija and others quoted in what is presented as her interview have been interpreted into another language. Another way is how, at various points in mediated account, the person presented as Khadija’s interviewer, Arwa Damon, paraphrases what Khadija says for the audience. For instance, Arwa informs the audience that Khadija “speaks longingly about the start of the Syrian Revolution” (line 14). At another point,
Arwa recounts for the audience that Khadija and her IS recruiter “met online when curiosity drew [Khadija] to ISIS social media pages” (line 23-24).

Akin to Khadija’s narrative account of recruitment, the text featuring Laura is highly mediated. First, Laura’s speech, originally in French, is translated into English (line 13). Second, the account of Laura’s recruitment that is offered is highly edited in the sense that, between segments of Laura and her interviewers’ speech, other information is provided. For example, details about interventions being used in Europe to address terrorist recruitment (lines 27-31; lines 33-35) are embedded within the text. Finally, the text featuring Laura includes paraphrased and translated (since it was also offered in French, originally) reporting of Paris prosecutor, François Molins, about ISIS (line 52-53), and even a translated quote by French journalist, Matthieu Suc, who wrote a book about “female jihadists” (line 58-60).

Finally, different layers of mediation are involved in the construction of the text presented as an interview of Tareena. In addition to the recording shifts (points at which different clips are spliced together), the absence of an interviewer evidences the highly edited nature of the text featuring Tareena. Furthermore, the text’s recontextualizations illustrate how mediated it is: Heart News WestMids published the text on YouTube on January 21, 2016, but the West Midlands police department originally created the interview text, as it is presented as a police interrogation of Tareena, despite the fact that no interrogator is featured in the public YouTube version of the video interview that I analyze. Finally, the text featuring Tareena is embedded in a Birmingham Mail news report called, “WATCH: Tareena Shakil lies her way through police interview after return from Syria” (Larner, 2016a). The context of the mediated narrative account of Tareena’s IS recruitment must be acknowledged as it instructs the audience to “WATCH,” and announces that, in the text about to unfold, Tareena “lies her way through” her police
interview. From the start, this text is presented to the audience in a way that implies that Tareena is a narrator who not only lies, but also does so throughout the interview that is about to unfold on screen. The various production circumstances of the four texts, addressed above, shape the resulting texts.

In addition to the producers of accounts of terrorist recruitment being complicit in the constitution and production of terrorism for consumption, the world consumes, co-generates, re-contextualizes, and disseminates (through “sharing” on social media, for example) terrorism. This happens through interaction, and it is through communication that we form our opinions, assumptions, ideas, and fears, and in so doing co-build the materiality of our world. The accounts of Alex, Khadija, Laura, and Tareena exemplify how discourse constitutes terrorism because discourses of terrorism can produce the same results physical terrorist action can produce: fear, anxiety, anger, vulnerability, and other serious, lasting emotional effects. Discourse matters because we use communication “to form attitudes or induce actions in other human agents” (Burke, 1969, p. 41), as well as because discourse is matter in the sense that it literally constitutes our world. Terrorism does its fear-inducing work through how language users go about wielding symbols together. The phenomena we orient to as terrorism are built through communication. Discourse, therefore, constitutes the ways in which any being happens to exist because we do world making together, because reality is jointly accomplished.

In the words of Cooren (2015), even though materiality is so often discussed in absolute terms (something is either material/existent or immaterial/inexistent), by employing a relational view, we allow ourselves to study how materiality and existence can be considered in terms of degree or gradation. Reorienting to reality in this way necessitates the use of a specifically communication lens, because:
A world where things more or less exist or are more or less material is a world where communication always matters. Communication is indeed the way by which things, animals, and people come to express themselves in a variety of embodiments, materialisations, and incarnations. Communication is therefore constitutive of the way any being happens to exist more or less since it, she, or he always exists through other beings. (p. 307)

A lonely, young woman, Alex, lives in a rural place with her family. Regularly, she goes online to build community, to try to be less lonely. She ends up nearly becoming a member of IS. Even after her presumed recruiter is confronted, he and she stay in touch.

Audiences are informed that terrorist recruitment can happen anywhere online. Terrorism can happen at any time, with anyone, and under any conditions. How can we be safe?

A schoolteacher, Khadija, finds empowerment, authority, and happiness as she becomes a leader of the all-women’s brigade of IS. Once home, she feels just as, if not more unfulfilled and unhappy than she was before she joined the group, sported a gun, whip, and dagger, and disciplined other women on the streets in IS-controlled land. Discomfort and apprehension grow.

Encountering this mediated narrative account, audiences are presented with the message that joining IS is women’s “way out” of their life circumstances. But, joining the group does not always lead the women who join to better, more livable life circumstances. How desperate were they before joining, how desperate are they now, and what other “ways out” might they try on for size?

After her husband leaves her and her child, a mother from Belgium, Laura, finds love, a chance to change her career, better serve others, and come to be appreciated for the work she does. She travels to a new land for a fresh start. Witnessing brutal violence, murder, and
atrocities, she returns home. She writes a book and gives an interview to help other vulnerable people avoid making the same mistake she made. Audiences are led to wonder.

How many other “vulnerable” potential recruits are out there, where are they, and how can they be identified? If they are so “vulnerable,” how can their joining even be prevented?

A health worker, Tareena, goes on vacation and meets a man on the beach. She brings her young child, diapers in tow, in a taxi with her to join the new man in her life. They cross borders, but she ends up detained for her efforts to join IS. Upon her return, police interview her and her that mediated narrative account goes viral. Stories swirl. She is called a horrible mother and liar, and she should be ashamed and punished to the fullest extend of the law. Left concerned and suspicious, audiences of mediated narrative accounts like these are left asking ourselves questions about the where, how, and whys of such terrorist action.

How do we know which terrorism tales should be trusted? Who are reliable narrators in the dark world of terrorist (inter)action? How can we ever even know?

Considering terrorism through a communication lens can lead its witnesses to ask important questions about the phenomenon, some of which should necessarily function as fodder for future scholarship.

**Reviewing the Interview Analyses**

As I conducted my analyses, I used a combination of research tools from multimodal discourse analysis, conversation analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, and pragmatics. This project illustrates how such tools can be uniquely versatile in studies of communication of terrorism, as they allow opportunities to (re)consider terrorism as a communicatively enacted, material, and incarnate phenomenon.
My first analysis focused on Alex’s joining as a way of creating and maintaining community and relationship with others, including Faisal, God, and IS affiliates. I discussed Alex’s case as a warning story. I showed how it serves as a narrative they conveys to audiences that IS recruitment happens to young women online with men who come to serve them in various capacities: as friends, confidants, spiritual or religious guides, mentors, providers, and matchmakers. Alex’s was far from a coherent, one-sided account. The dynamic of the mediated narrative account of IS recruitment featuring Alex exemplifies how online news reports about women joining groups like IS warrant close analysis as interaction, and specifically as conversation in which tensions build and sometimes never dissipate. Since Alex and the producers of her account co-constructed the story of Alex as a woman of IS, I identified the interactional strategies used, and showed how the communicative structure of the mediated narrative account, as a whole, shapes each utterance and turn as each sequence is linked to prior ones, and establishes the foundation for ones that follow. In my analysis, I attended to what Alex said during her turns (transcription data to present her turns), what the producers said (screenshots to present their turns), and the visual semiotic resources used (screenshots to present how Alex is physically positioned in the video frame at certain points, for example). By analyzing the accounts built in what is presented as an interview of Alex, I argued that terrorism is mobilized through interaction.

In my second analysis, I argued that former schoolteacher, Khadija, presented her joining and serving in IS’s all-women’s Al-Khansa’a Brigade as a way to become a new kind of woman: an empowered one. I showed how Khadija’s joining is initially built up as her way of attempting to find empowerment and happiness by gaining and exercising authority, carrying a weapon, and intimidating and disciplining others, yet how, by the end of her mediated narrative account, the
empowerment and happiness Khadija initially experienced as a member is described as having not lasted for a number of reasons. Among those is how, as a woman in IS controlled territory, Khadija was in line to be married off, and she chose to leave IS because she was afraid that her new husband would abuse her. In my analysis of the mediated narrative account of Khadija’s joining, I address how the concept of the double bind (Bateson, Jackson, Haley, & Weakland, 1956) is a dynamic uniquely applicable to women. Drawing on the double bind notion, I discuss how becoming a member of a terrorist group can be examined as an act of gender resistance. Analyzing how Khadija described for the audience what it is to be an ordinary woman versus what it is to be someone who carries a gun and has the authority to discipline, intimidate, and punish, I argue that a double bind dynamic can be helpful by effectively characterizing the circumstances of women who join groups like IS. This is the case because, by joining and serving groups like IS, women might find purpose, connection, and/or sense of belonging. However, once they have joined, those women might come to find their new circumstances as IS members just as, if not more unlivable (Butler, 2004) than the circumstances they left behind to join the organization. In my analysis of the text featuring Khadija, I proposed that the notion of the double bind can be used to characterize the life circumstances of women who join groups like IS, as well as to study how joining a terrorist group can function as an act of gender resistance.

In my analysis of the mediated narrative account of IS recruitment featuring Laura, I examined how Laura’s joining was constructed as a way for her to be rescued from her dire situation (her husband left her for another woman, she was caring for their young child alone, and she was experiencing depression). I discussed how, once she returned from IS, Laura employed her joining and serving IS as a means of persuasion wielded to rescue others by helping them avoid making the same mistakes she made. I attended to how Laura built her
account as a damsel in distress: a woman who was vulnerable, manipulated, and lured into IS. I pointed out the resources Laura used to story herself as a woman who was abandoned and desperate, and who joined IS to create a new life for herself and her child and contribute by serving as a nurse. Arguing that Laura’s account is a story of redemption, I articulate how, like Khadija, Laura storied herself as having made a mistake by having joined IS, and once she left IS, she wrote a book for those she refers to as vulnerable to terrorist recruitment. I argued that Laura’s account serves as a cautionary tale and rhetorical tool used to prevent other “vulnerable” people (in the words of the mediated narrative account) from taking the same path that Laura took.

In my analysis of the mediated narrative account of Tareena’s IS recruitment, I claimed that, through narrative storytelling, Tareena offered her audience alternative ways to interpret her story about her experiences, motivations, actions, and characters featured in her account. I pointed out how through stance-taking and emotion expression, Tareena tells her audience a story that is quite different from the one she tells verbally, and from those the context of her mediated narrative account would typically permit: since it takes place in a law enforcement setting, tellings that are made possible are typically either a confession/admission of guilt or a plea of innocence. I point out how, by positioning herself in certain ways in her story, Tareena brings her audience into closer alignment with her at key points. Through my analysis of the mediated narrative account featuring Tareena, I argued that terrorism can be mobilized through narrative storytelling.

Revisiting the Premises

Four premises guided this project. My first premise was that terrorism works as rhetoric. To show how terrorism functions as rhetorical communication, I studied how, in and across the
four text I analyzed, accounts were built up about actions, events, and people, and by interviewees, interviewers, reporters, and producers. In my analyses, I point out how terrorism, as action, social and otherwise, is designed to have a persuasive or impressive effect on its audience. While a story can do a great deal of rhetorical work on its own, stories work even more effectively to “bend” (Burke, 1950) or reshape people’s views when there are many of them, and when common threads run through the lot.

In this project I showed how mediated narrative accounts of women being recruited into the so-called Islamic State work as rhetorical communication because they instill fear in audiences. They leave us on edge, nervous, and perhaps wondering, if these women ended up joining such a group, who is to say others are not doing that right now, that one of them is not your neighbor in the house right next to yours, or that your neighbor or peer does not have access to a deadly weapon? Exemplified by the four mediated narrative accounts of women being recruited into IS, the stories of terrorism that are created and circulated spread terror.

My second premise was that terrorism is comprised of, relies on, and accomplishes accounts. Related, my third premise was that terrorism mobilizes various sorts of accounting, and vice versa. In all four analyses, I illustrated how the phenomenon becoming a woman of IS is constituted through accounting. I identified the features of those accounts. Finally, I discussed what the accounts accomplish in the interactional goal of defining what it means to become a woman of IS.

My fourth and final premise was that terrorism works intertextually. In my study, I argued that terrorism works as indexes because it mobilizes various sorts of accounting. By carefully examining each of the four mediated narrative accounts of women being recruited into IS, I showed how terrorism is an indexical term because it points to: 1) those engaged in actions
that become characterized as terrorism, as well as 2) the explanations, justifications, and excuses for certain actions that work as various parties’ accounts (Scott & Lyman, 1968; Burke, 1972).

To show how terrorism is an indexical term, I analyzed how it works through the diverse accounts of actions, events, and people featured in the texts I analyzed. In order to attend to intertextuality, I illustrated how the same kind of text - i.e., mediated narrative accounts presented as interviews of women who joined, or almost joined and served IS - is produced in each account of women being recruited into IS, but for different purposes. Furthermore, I analyzed how the communication constituting those texts recycles and links to former utterances as well as how, as such recontextualization happens, that communication takes on new meanings in new contexts (Briggs & Bauman, 1992; Bartesaghi, 2015; Bartesaghi & Noy, 2015).

In my analyses, I illustrated how terrorism is productive and (re)generative because terrorism works intertextually. Additionally, I show how discourse is active because it organizes relations among people (Tracy, 2002), and consequential, because it concerns the actualities of people’s lives (Smith, 2005, p. 25). In order to concentrate on the functions and accomplishments of discourse, I oriented to discourse as social action in the sense that it brings about the very things it is presumed to describe (Baker, 1997). Through discourse, seemingly natural conditions – in this case, what being a woman of IS means, and what terrorism is – are brought into being.

To this aim, I attended to how each of the four women is constituted as a woman of IS in the context of her mediated narrative account. As social action, terrorism is mobilized as interaction because it works communicatively: through talk, conversations, visuals, paralinguistic features, dynamics, utterances, tone, intertextuality, and recontextualization, for instance.

Terrorism is not only discourse in the linguistic sense, but also social action in the sense that it brings about the very things it is presumed to describe. As I argued in Alex’s case,
terrorism as recruitment talk mobilizes individuals to create relationships with one another online, and lead individuals to join groups like IS to find meaning, community, and connection. In Khadija’s case, I argue that terrorism works through accounts of joining and serving organizations like IS as ways for women to find empowerment and authority, to break out of restrictive life circumstances they leave behind. As I argued in Laura’s case, terrorism works as persuasive communication because the telling and sharing of stories about vulnerable potential recruits invites audiences into the world of terrorism, constructing countering terrorism as a shared problem needing to be solved. Finally, in Tareena’s case, I argued that terrorism works through dynamics, storytelling, and even nonverbal communication because, through narration and wielding the narrative floor, stories, positions, and stances can be recalibrated so as to paint certain pictures while concurrently disallowing other pictures of terrorist action.

The four analyses in this dissertation propose that terrorism can be understood differently. They point to the fact that terrorism is not merely a word used to refer to the collective violent physical acts carried out by certain people labeled “terrorists.” Rather, as I argued, terrorism should be understood as consequential and material communication. This is so because, with this lens, terrorist action can be recognized in dynamics of interaction and conversation, and across the nuances of rhetoric and tools of persuasion, and the ways in which speakers like Alex and Khadija design and fill categories (such as, “friend,” and “ordinary woman,” respectively) in their talk about terrorism.

Reorienting to terrorism in this way is a project worth pursuing because the currently employed Revised Academic Consensus Definition of Terrorism (Schmid, 2011/2012) exclusively describes terrorism as a doctrine, a physical tactic, and the use of physical violence or threat thereof (see Table 1). Expanding the definition of terrorism allows us to recognize
terrorism territory as encompassing not only the violent, physical acts or threat, intent, or motives thereof, but also the rhetorical acts: the conversations of recruitment, what are presented as interviews about joining and serving groups like IS, accounts about phenomena like women joining organizations, visual representations, and the communication elements and resources thereof.

Studying talk “as an object in its own right, and not merely as a screen on which are projected other processes” (Schegloff in Sacks, 1992, p. 1) allows us to see how such limits work, and the anatomies and physiologies involved in the goings on of our talk. I chose to analyze the processes of production involved in the accounting about women joining IS because, through accounting, explaining actions, and telling stories to make sense of our experiences, we build and maintain our social world (Garfinkel, 1967). I analyzed the four accounts to show how in and through productions of accounts of becoming a woman of IS, conceptualizations about the phenomenon - becoming a woman of IS - are constructed by various, and often multiple social actors with different, and possibly competing agendas. Furthermore, I analyzed these accounts to argue that terrorism relies on interaction - in contexts of face-to-face conversations, as well as highly edited and dramatized online news reports presented as interviews, for example - and is fueled by, in, and as communication.

**Extending the Scope**

In this study, I attended to how the accounts of the four women who joined, or almost joined IS were built up in each context, the linguistic and paralinguistic resources that the women, producers, and interviewers used, and the actions and goals the accounts accomplished in situ. I suggest that future scholarship further explore the complexities of accounts that are built up about people’s joining terrorist groups. For instance, analyses of accounts about people’s joining
terrorist groups should focus on cases of individuals recruited into certain terrorist organizations categorized as most dangerous in the world: Boko Haram, al-Qaeda, the Taliban, Al-Shabaab, as well as IS (Martin, SBS, 2017). Whereas examinations of mediated narrative accounts of IS recruitment are necessary, other scholars might arrange one-on-one meetings with individuals who have joined such groups, conduct interviews with individuals, and analyze the interviews through a communication lens.

In conjunction with analyses of mediated narrative accounts of recruitment featuring women joining the certain terrorist groups, analyses of mediated narrative accounts of recruitment featuring men joining the same terrorist groups are necessary. This is because such examinations have the potential to lead scholars to identify important patterns in the communicative construction of individuals’ joining terrorist groups. By undertaking such research projects, scholars might discover differences and similarities between the accounts built up about women and men’s joining terrorist groups, which might lead to new, uniquely effective intervention strategies designed to counter, resist, and perhaps even prevent violent terrorist action.

Furthermore, I recommend that scholars search existing archives and study the histories and herstories of terrorism to analyze the diverse accounts that exist of women who have joined groups that have been labeled terrorist organizations. By pursuing this, scholars will be able to effective examine how mass media’s treatment of women who are terrorists – for example, how online news report and newspaper story writers, producers, editors, and reporters construct them – has changed over time, especially as modes of communication have evolved from one generation to the next.
Since, as I have shown, individuals do not become terrorists in a vacuum - but, instead, join and serve such organizations through interaction - it is vital that scholars interested in studying communication, terrorism, and gender explore discourses on a more macro level. Rather than fostering a sense of belonging and community, certain discourses - such as discourses of nationalism (see Weigel’s 2018 article on the speech of France’s far-right politician, Marion Maréchal-Le Pen, at the Conservative Political Action Conference in Oxon Hill in Maryland, U.S., in February of 2018), for example - can function by creating contexts in which individuals are alienated, marginalized, and ultimately othered in the countries in which they live. Through the use of such discourses, certain individuals can be rendered “vulnerable” to organizations like IS in their efforts to seek belonging, build community, and secure for themselves the sense that they are “part of something great” (to use language from the mediated narrative account of Khadija’s joining), for instance. Because such discourses play important, lasting parts in the “becoming” of terrorists - internationally and nationally - they warrant close examination through a communication lens. Armed with a frame that is specifically attuned to communication, scholars of terrorism will be uniquely prepared to examine the interaction that constitutes the becoming of terrorists as a joint accomplishment, and therefore, as well as necessarily, a shared problem to be addressed by all. Studying terrorism through a communication lens will lead scholars to collectively create and maintain a new, reflexive orientation to terrorism: one that defines, examines, and intervenes in terrorism as (inter)action.

The scope of this project can be enhanced by quantitative analyses of the same data I presented here, as well as additional data on Alex, Khadija, Laura, and Tareena. By using tools from Corpus-Assisted Discourse Studies, such as concordance (in corpus linguistics, a concordance is a list of examples of how a word occurs in a corpus, which allows a researcher to
read how the word is used in the contexts in which it occurs in the text), I will supplement my qualitative analyses of the four texts I examine in this project. To compare features of particular discourse types, I will generate word frequency, word cluster, and comparative key word lists. By determining the specific terms and phrases used most frequently to describe each woman in reports about them, I will investigate questions of the data I have, thus far, left unaddressed.

By drawing on corpus analysis concordancing and text analysis, I will be able to provide statistical overviews of large amounts of discourse data so as to discuss trends that are different from those I identify by using qualitative techniques of discourse analysis. For example, in a particular corpus - say, the extensive comments that readers contribute at the end of a news report about a terrorist recruit - I will be able to search for, find, and display in useful ways the trends in the linguistic data. I aim to use simple concordance, for instance, to offer lists of examples of certain words as they occur in a given corpus. With such lists, I will study how certain terms are used, and how they show up in the context in which they occur in the text.

Since Tareena’s police video interview has been shared countless times online, a vast number of comments have been posted in response to her interview. Using concordance, I will conduct tests on those new report comments data to make generalizations about the audience’s responses to the mediated narrative account of Tareena’s joining.

**Resisting Complicity**

To reorient to terrorism as interaction, I encourage scholars to re-view and reassess the stories told about those who join and serve terrorist groups like IS, and those who engage in violent acts. Reorienting to terrorism as interaction will lead to unexpected discoveries about what makes recruitment successful, for instance. In predictably recursive form, those discoveries
will, in turn, reshape, in important, lasting ways how the world counters, resists, and prevents the violence that we have come to understand as terrorism.

News reports like the following story about what happened in February 2018 at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, work by tapping into what we all have in common, anxiety, fear, and worry that the children of our communities are unsafe in their school environments:

A football coach. An athletic director. And young, eager and forward-looking students.

They were among the 17 people killed by a gunman Wednesday at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida. (Levenson & Sterling, 2018)

As Barad (1998) reminds us, it is necessary that we take account of the ways in which matter comes to matter, including the active role of material constraints and conditions within a theoretical framework. Missing from interpretations like Eric Levenson and Joe Sterling’s CNN piece, “These are the victims of the Florida school shooting” (2018), quoted above, is the orientation to violence as communication. Scholars must ask communication-oriented questions about stories like this because a great deal is at stake if we do not.

In addition to listing and describing the victims of this shooting at a Florida school, how might this event be understood as one in which communication played, and continues to play a major role? What differentiates a “gunman” from a “terrorist,” if both share the aim of instilling fear in others by carrying out acts of violence? What are the implications of calling an event like this the “St. Valentine’s Day Massacre”?

The F.B.I. “received information last year about a comment made on a YouTube channel which has been attributed to the gunman, but was unable to identify the person” (Turkewitz,
Mazzei, & Burch, 2018). What communication issues prevented an earlier response, as
intervention, by authorities that could have potentially prevented an event like this?

In Turkewitz et al. (2018), the shooter’s public defender, Melisa McNeill, is quoted,
stating, “He’s sad. He’s mournful,” and, “He is fully aware of what is going on, and he’s just a
broken human being.” Why might the use of constructions like “broken human being” matter? In
what ways might such constructions exemplify the common tendency to orient to individuals like
the 19-year-old shooter as not fully intact humans and in the social fold?

The report goes on, “Mr. Weekes, the chief assistant public defender, said the lawyers
were still trying to piece together the details of Mr. Cruz’s life,” and, “Mr. Cruz has a
‘significant’ history of mental illness, according to Mr. Weekes, and is possibly autistic or has a
learning disability” (Turkewitz et al., 2018). Exemplified by the text featuring Alex, the
discursive intersections of mental illness, violence, emotional and intellectual capacities,
decision-making abilities, and agency in circumstances like terrorism, and violence more
generally, warrant close examination.

As 1922 physics Nobel Prize winner Danish physicist, Niels Henrik David Bohr,
explained, observers of what goes on in the world are not merely passive instruments. We
participate in the formulation of how we go about observing. In this way, we participate in the
construction of what, as well as how we go about observing. By referring to objects of
observation and agencies of observation, Bohr challenged the separateness of observer and the
observed. This signals how implicated we all are because, as Bohr taught nearly a century ago,
interaction between object and apparatus forms an inseparable part of the phenomenon, and that
part must never be overlooked.
This project is but one contribution to the great and vast research that is underway on terrorism, communication, and gender. As Burke (1941) wisely reminds us, scholarship is an ongoing, joint endeavor, and each of us participates in the intellectual conversations that began before we arrived, and that will of course continue once we are long gone:

You listen for a while, until you decide that you have caught the tenor of the argument; then you put in your oar. Someone answers; you answer him; another comes to your defense; another aligns herself against you, to either the embarrassment or gratification of your opponent, depending on the quality of your ally’s assistance. However the discussion is interminable. The hour grows late, you must depart. And you do depart, with the discussion still vigorously in progress. (p. 111)

With these analyses, I offer a lens through which to re-view and reconsider the stories being told in mediated narrative accounts of women joining the so-called Islamic State. The analyses illustrated that specific bits of prior text are shaped and reshaped in new, future contexts. Through that process, those specific bits of prior text create play, build rapport, construct alignments, and put forth particular identities at particular interactional moments, and thus serve as “resources for creating multiple alignments and identities in discourse” (Gordon, 2006, p. 545). In their communication, each of the four women, producers, interviewers, and reporters featured in the text, shaped and reshaped how audiences interpreted the actors, events, and actions storied in the accounts.

Reality “is not composed of things-in-themselves or things-behind-phenomena, but things-in-phenomena” (Barad, 1998, p. 104). This means that phenomena represent the inseparability of an object and observations of it. We are all part of the world. We are all audience members. At the same time, we are all creators of the world. We are all performers. So,
too, are we the millers of our lenses. Enmeshment, messiness, and interdependence are inescapable. Because we all use language, we are all entangled in the words, accounts, and phenomena that we create together through how we use symbols, words, frames, discourses, and other communication magic to jointly build our realities. Since we all participate in the becoming of each other, let communication guide us as we necessarily turn back upon ourselves and seriously examine the micro- and macro-practices that led us to this point. By lifting our communication frame to resist complicity (Chappell, 2017), with our ear to the door, our loving eye (Frye, 1983) toward each other, and our fingertip on the pulse of the world, let us examine how we arrived here, where we are, and where we are going. The stakes could not be higher.
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Appendices
Appendix One: Alex’s Interview

“Flirting With the Islamic State” (Ten & Laffin, 2015) is featured in the New York Times article, “ISIS and the Lonely Young American” (Callimachi, 2015).

Interview title: Flirting With the Islamic State

Interviewee: Alex (a pseudonym)

Interviewer/reporter: Rukmini Callimachi

Producers: Poh Si Teng & Ben Laffin, New York Times

Interview date: June 27, 2015

Interview length: 8 minutes 7 seconds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bold:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[text]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transcript of the interview with Alex:

Interview caption: The conversations between a young woman in rural Washington State and a British man with ties to radical Islam may provide clues about how ISIS recruits new members around the world.

1 A: The first thing they told me was I was not allowed to listen to music.
2 Um the sec-in thing they told me is like how to pray ((nods))
3 They did tell me that it is a sin t- to live- to stay in non-Muslim lands if you have a chance, to make- to go to Muslim lands (0.3)
4 because, why would we stay in a land of disbelievers and doubters?

“Alex,” 23, started chatting online with sympathizers of the Islamic State in August.

“Alex,” 23, started chatting online with sympathizers of the Islamic State in August.

Figure 4: Screenshot (00:34)

7 A: I live in, like, a modular home
8 with my grandparents
9 and it’s in the middle of nowhere.
If we lived in the city we could walk wherever we wanted and here- it was a lot better in a lot of ways because it was safer but it was also- because it was also safer it was a lot more boring (3.0)

I’ve metten my friends on the Internet. I have more community with them than I have with people in my own community

After James Foley, an American journalist, was beheaded by the Islamic State, she posted questions about the group on Twitter.

A: I was lookin for people who agreed with what they were doing so I could understand why they were doing it and it was actually really easy to find them

In October, Alex and a man named Faisal Mostafa started exchanging messages.
Figure 6: Screenshot (1:27)

19 A: Fa:eeza:hl
20 (5.0)
21 He is my friend.

Faisal lives in England.

He is 51 and is married.
A: He uh always answered my questions. He always like brought up things against Christianity but, in a kind way.

F: “Your a nice person with a beautiful character in many ways ur much better than many so called born muslims”

07:13 PM - 19 Feb 15

F: “see knowledge always. Never be a be a blind sheep like the masses”

08:31 PM – 31 Jan 15
F: “yes the statement from the kahiffa is valid i’ll explain later tonight fully inshallah”

04:51 AM – 31 Jan 15

F: “if you need money i can get some dont be shy just keep it quiet let me know please wasalaam”

04:31 PM – 10 Feb 15
Faisal was twice acquitted of bomb plots in Britain.

Investigators found a document titled ‘Mujahedin Explosives Handbook’ on his computer.

But his lawyer said the explosives in his home were for research purposes.

Faisal was also arrested and detained in Bangladesh, where he was accused of running a bomb-making factory.
Figure 10: Screenshots (2:07 & 2:19)

F: “salaams pls could you send me a delivery address
Inshallah will send items on monday”

05:25 PM – 2 Jan 15

A: They were all innocent gifts.
Um headscarfs. Prayer mats.

Chocolate.

A lot of candy.

Learning books.

I like this one because it kinda elevated the woman?

I don’t like this one because that was-

This is thicker than this one and it’s all about how you’re supposed to dress.

This might be it.

Yeah I think this is the one he sent me.

[Alex displays a YouTube video of a woman tying her headscarf, “Basic Triangle Scarf.”]

A: You’re not supposed to show your hair cuh if you show your hair then that’s like the equivalent of bein naked.

I don’t get that.

24   A: It’s very normal like friendship. Like in real life if you were to go to a coffee shop.

25

26   He was like, my mentor. ((looks down))

F: “we need 2 practice those Arabic prayers etc on skype sometime ok”

07:52 PM – 19 Feb 15

In December, Alex converted to Islam, taking a vow on Twitter.
A: It was nice to consciously be able to meet (. . .) God not (. . .) just um in Christianity you can talk to him whenever (. . .) .hh but because of that you usually don’t.

F: “To find a husband you ask within the Muslim community, even twitter, mosques, friends etc…”

I know someone who will marry you”

05:35 PM – 07 Feb 15

A: Faisal found a guy that would marry me (0.2) an (. . .) if I was more serious about it he would send me his picture and every more information .hh but the information he game me was ((smiles)) heez forty-five and and bald ((smiles)) hhh. (. . .) but heez a very good Muslim.

Faisal’s communications mirrored recruitment instructions found in an ISIS manual.
I don’t think that thuh Islamic State is as bad as everyone says- I think that their atrocities are exaggerated .hh I think that um ((sniffs)) I think that they brought stablility- stability to the land, umm I think that, it might be one of the safest places to live in the Middle East. I don’t know if I know the truth about thuh Islamic State.

You know- I became aware of it when she started receiving gifts and I just knew from a married man this wasn’t appropriate- I don’t care where in the- on Earth he lived.

Initially she wasn’t very upset- she just said don’t do it again .hh an:d, nn, so I, did it again. But to-ow ata different a:ddress so I wouldn’t get caught.

An I tried tellin her this man was grooming her.
A: Yeah- he’s still my friend (even if) I can’t talk to him. ((rocks back and forth))

A: My therapist said that I’m emotionally immature. I make decisions without thinking. It affects me like similar the way A.D.H.D. affects people. An I don’t react the way I want to or should.

*In February, Alex’s grandmother told her to stop talking to Faisal.*

---

A: Family’s very important, an, um, I dunno know ihd be very difficult ta hem- go over there and never be able ta come back.

*The night after this interview, she contacted Faisal again.*
Figure 15: Screenshot (6:01)

F: “really miss you loads [crying emoji] i’ll wait whatever it takes…

‘I love you God, i miss you and i forgive you’ lol [smiling emoji]

02:59AM – 10 Mar 15”

Figure 16: Screenshot (6:11)

55 A: I’m not talking to him anymore- I waz jus saying goodb[ye]
you’re not- you jus scared me this morning when you told me that you

[No]
talked to im again. I wouldn’t mind. I’ve given it a lot of thought

of talking to im.

(Skype call ringing sound. Faisal answers Skype call.)

F: Hey.

A: Hello?

F: Hello? ((inaudible)) Can you hear me? Can you hear me?

G: ((whispering to Alex)) °Talk to him.°

A: Yes now I can hear you

F: Good hhh

A: Um I want you to know that I’m recording us↑

(Skype call hang-up sound. Faisal hangs up Skype call.)

[On Skype Alex’s grandmother types to Faisal in a typed instant message:]

G: I am ___’s grandmother,

A: What did he say?

G: He’s writing a long one. He writes, kay you have not address my word but also

the word of all her friends and in no way will we ever try to harm her or make her

harm others or do anything that is illegal. Please understand we are happy to see

you all as one cohesive family. Okay, that’s what I wrote. I beg to differ with you.

I believe that you had alternative reasons for contacting her. I don’t like it. What

would you think if your daughter got this offer? Asshole.

[On Skype Alex’s grandmother types to Faisal in a typed instant message:]
G: Respect my wishes, leave her alone and all will be fine.

5:35 PM

((blocks tin.man39 on Skype))

A: I’m happy, that I won’t be, um lying to my parents- my grandparents anymore. I’m h sad because I lost a friend. (bows her head)

Alex and Faisal resumed communication following this interview.

Figure 17: Screenshot (8:00)
Appendix Two: Khadija’s Interview

The interview of Khadija is featured in the News.com.au article, “ISIS: Khansa’a Brigade former fighter reveals what life is like inside the group” (Craw, 2014).

Interview title: Untitled

Interviewee: Khadija (a pseudonym)


Interview date: October 7, 2014

Interview length: 3 minutes 51 seconds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transcript of the interview with Khadija:

1  A: Beneath the veil is a young heart-shaped face,
2      eyes filled with guilt and turmoil under perfectly sculpted brows.
3  K: At the start I was happy.
4      I was carrying a gun. It was something new. I had authority.
5      I didn’t think I was frightening people. But then I started asking
6      myself, “Where am I? Where am I going?” I could feel the tides
7      dragging me some place ugly.
8  A: Twenty-five year old Khadija not her real name is a former
9      elementary school teacher turned member of the feared
10     female ISIS Al-Khansa’a Brigade in Raqqa.
11  K: We’d patrol the streets. If we saw a woman who was not wearing
12      the proper Sharia clothing, we’d grab her. Sometimes they’d
13      be lashed.
14  A: She speaks longingly about the start of the Syrian Revolution, the
15      elation of being a part of something great. But then came
16      the violence, displacing her family multiple times.
17  K: Everything around us was chaos: Free Syrian Army regime
18      barrel bomb strikes wounded clinics blood. You wanna tear
19      yourself away to find something to run to. My problem was I ran
20      away to something uglier.
21  K: I ran away to people - this Tunisian - who lured me into the
22      Islamic State.
23  A: They met online when curiosity drew her to ISIS social media
pages. He told her that he was coming to Raqqa that they
could even get married. So she convinced her family to move
there. Her cousin Umm Abdullah was already married to an
ISIS fighter and a member of the Al-Khansa’a Brigade.

K: Umm Abdullah took me to the brigade’s headquarters in the Siahi
Hotel in Raqqa. She introduced me to the commander, Umm
Rayan. She had a very strong personality. Her features were very
sharp. She gave you the sense that she was a leader, not an
ordinary woman. Umm Rayan is Tunisian. But, it’s Umm Hamsa, a
Syrian, who was in charge of carrying out the lashings.

K: She’s female, but she’s not a normal female. She’s HUGE. She has
an AK, a pistol, a whip, a dagger, and she wears the niqab.

K: The foreigners are very brutal with women, even the ones they
marry. There were cases where the wife had to be taken to the
emergency ward because of the violence- the sexual violence.

A: Burned into her mind, this horrific image she saw online of a
crucified teenager accused of rape. It’s not the only sight plaguing
her dreams.

K: The worst thing I saw was a man getting his head hacked off right
in front of me.

A: Then her commander Umm Rayan said she’d found her a Saudi
husband.

K: I said, “ENOUGH.” After EVERYTHING I had already seen, and
all the times I had stayed silent, telling myself, “We’re at war. And then, when it’s over, it will all be rectified.” But after THIS, I decided, “No. I have to leave.”

A: This is the first time she tells anyone her story. She escaped just before the U.S. led coalition airstrikes began. Her family also fled Raqqa, but are still in Syria. She desperately wants to be her old self.

K: A girl who’s happy, who loves life and laughter. I want to be like that again.
Appendix Three: Laura’s Interview

The interview of Laura is featured in the *NPR* report, “Europe Wakes Up To Prospect Of Female Terrorists,” hosted by David Greene (October 17, 2016).

Interview title: Untitled

Interviewee: Laura Passoni

Interviewer/reporter: Eleanor Beardsley

Host: David Greene, *NPR*

Interview date: October 17, 2016

Interview length: 4 minutes 40 seconds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E: Eleanor (interviewer) is speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: David (host) is speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L: Laura (interviewee) is speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: Matthieu Sue is speaking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transcript of the interview with Laura:

Interview caption: Laura Passoni, a Belgian woman who was recruited by ISIS, traveled to Syria and eventually escaped, has written a book to discourage young people who may be tempted to follow the same path.

D: Now let’s turn to another topic that has come up in this campaign, and that’s terrorism. The terrorist attacks in Paris and Brussels over the past two years were carried out by men who were citizens of France and Belgium and who had been radicalized by ISIS. In the most recent attempted attacks, several women including a teenager tried to blow up a car filled with gas canisters in central Paris. Europe is now waking up to the prospect of female terrorists. NPR’s Eleanor Beardsley met a woman who ISIS radicalized. She has now returned to Belgium—and we should warn you, there are parts of this story that could be disturbing to some listeners.

((Recording shifts to next clip))

E: Bonjour.

L: (Tout d’un coup)

E: I met thirty-four year old Laura Passoni in a Brussels hotel. She grew up in a Catholic family in the Belgian town of Charleroi. She converted to Islam at the age of sixteen because she liked the religion and her best friend was Muslim. Later, Passoni married a Muslim man and everything was fine, until her marriage collapsed.
L: My husband met another woman and left me, and abandoned his little boy. I went into a deep depression, and that’s when I met the recruiter. I was vulnerable and he played on that. He told me I could be a nurse and help the Syrian people. He told me I could start my life all over again. He made me believe in dreams.

E: Behind these heavy locked doors, at an unpublished address, in the French city of Bordeaux, a team of psychologists and counselors tries to get through to young people seduced by ISIS propaganda. The staff Imam, Fouad Saanadi, says half of the thirty-three people they’re counseling are women, many radicalized after a personal trauma.

F: They’ve been a victim of violence, or have been raped, or have been marginalized in some way. And this makes them more vulnerable to ISIS’s message of a better world and revenge against society.

E: The ISIS agent recruited Passoni online through a Facebook profile that she created. At the same time, she met the new man in her life, also online. The couple went to Syria along with her four year old son. Passoni says, while her partner was fighting, she was housed with dozens of other women from the West.

L: Some were there to try to help. Some were there for love- they had
followed a fighter. But there were plenty of women who were full of hatred, and ALL they wanted to do was get a Kalashnikov and launch attacks, and they didn’t try to shield their kids from horrible things like the crucifixions every Friday in the town square. Some even let them touch the dead bodies.

((Recording shifts to next clip))

E: It wasn’t long before she’d seen enough. And after nine months Passoni and her partner escaped and returned to Belgium.

((Recording shifts to next clip))

E: Last month, Paris prosecutor, François Molins, said it was clear ISIS intends to turn women into attackers. Speaking after the arrest of the women linked to the attempted car bombing, Molins said the group had received guidance directly from Syria. Police had bugged one of the women’s cell phones and heard them planning other attacks at Paris train stations. Before they were caught, two of the women stabbed police officers as they were being arrested. French journalist, Matthieu Suc, who’s written a book about female jihadists, says, “ISIS has changed the nature of terrorism.”

((Recording shifts to next clip))

M: Under al-Qaida, men left their families and went to Afghanistan alone. But in Syria it’s become a sort of family jihad. Couples go together sharing a common project. It’s almost like buying a house together. And the role women play is as strong as that of men.
Now back in Belgium, Laura Passoni has written a book about her experience, hoping to stop others from making the same mistake she did. She was given a suspended sentence. Her partner is still in jail. Still Passoni says she's lucky. Her son is back in school and doesn’t appear to remember much about what happened in Syria. Eleanor Beardsley. NPR news. Paris.
Appendix Four: Tareena’s Interview

“Tareena Shakil police interview” (wmpolice, 2015) was published on YouTube by Heart News WestMids on January 21, 2016, and was featured in the Birmingham Mail article, “WATCH: Tareena Shakil lies her way through police interview after return from Syria” (Larner, 2016a).

Interview title: Tareena Shakil police interview

Interviewee: Tareena Shakil

Producers: West Midlands Police; Birmingham Mail

Reporter: Tony Larner, Birmingham Mail

Interview date: February of 2015

Interview title: “Tareena Shakil police interview”

Interview length: 5 minutes 19 seconds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tareena is speaking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transcript of the interview with Tareena:

Interview caption: “Tareena Shakil Police Interview: Entering Syria”

1. T: Um (0.5) it was never my intention to enter into Syria↓.h (0.5)

2. h ihm whilst >bein on holiday< (.i hm (0.2) I happened to meet um a

3. young Turkish man ((sniffs)) on the beach >he claimed he was workin<

4. on the beeeach (0.2) an ihm (.).°I like him° (0.2) .h and (0.2) <we

5. developed ihm a> somewhat of a relationship.

((Recording shifts to next clip))

7. So I found this ihm slight relation with this Turkish man and he’d said that

8. ihm (0.2) because there in October ihm >holiday season in Antalya is comin<

9. to an end ((sniffs)) he’s not from Antalya ((wipes nose)) he’s (.). originally

10. from Gaziantep ((sniffs)) and he’d said that (.). it would be ni:ce if I wanted

11. to (.). to ihm ((tilts head)) (.). fly to Antalya, meet with his family (.)

12. ((wipes nose)) get to know him a bit betta.

((Recording shifts to next clip))

14. so °I stayed the night in a hotel° (.). and then in the morning (.). the hotel

15. arranged a taxi for me (0.5) <to (.). go (.). to> (.). ihm (.). °Gaziantep° airport

16. and take my luggage .h ((adjusts head scarf)) I did that (.). luggage

17. was there (.). <onnn the wayyy↑> (0.3) ihm > back ((nods head)) to the hotel I

18. m- made contact with this man .h and ihm he said, “yes↑ you know

19. I- uh- I’m ready whenever you are- if you need to get some things at the

20. hotel anything you know, we can meet up↑” ((sniff)) I said (.). “↑yes I ah

21. I’m ready now it’s not- no problem. .h so:o he said ihm <to pass the

22. phone> to the taxi driver because obviously he- he’s a Turkish man- he
speaks Turkish- >I don’t< speak Turkish and he said that I’ll tell the man where to drop you off and I’ll meet you there (.2) so that’s <what happened> ((Recording shifts to next clip))

> I said, “I WANT to LEAVE this place I want to leave this place- why have you brought me here- I don’t want to be in this place (0.2) I want to go back to Antalya↑ an he said (0.2) ((shakes head)) “no” ((shakes head)) no (.)

this is impossible for me to let you leave because ((sniffs)) maybe you will alet the police of this place maybe you will (0.2) eh- uh bring problems for this place↑ .h it’s impossible I’ll let you leave” (.)> and I said< “but y- you brought me here and I don’t want to be here (. and then they just drove

ihm (0.5) across this farmland and then (0.2)ihm w- (. we’d entered Syria↑.h and ihm (.3) there was two men with us but the- they

>never came from the same house that I came from they they were uh< (. at the border already waiting .h and we (. came to a- a big gate- a

big g:ate and ihm the MEN were instructed to get off and there was many, many ((gesturing with hand)) ISIS soldiers there with guns

((Recording shifts to next clip))
everybody handed over these devices (. and ihm (. immediately I

>already didn’t want to be in Syria< but immediately >as we were there<

>the other women< they were like (0.2)  °this place is ((shakes head)) (. this place is He↑ll this place is Hell .h (0.5) hh that place is >not

a good place< it was a horrible, ↑horrible place
((Recording shifts to next clip))

So I **went** to this **place** and ihm (0.2) the man he spoke a ↑li:imited Arabic (I speak) limited Arabic ((sniffs)) .h and I said to HIM IHM I’m going to Jarabulus (0.2) and he **KNEW** (.) >people who **come** there they’re called Muhajir ((sniffs)) .h >I’m not Syrian I’m Muhajir and he said< “are you Muhajir?↑ You come with me.” .h I THOught it was OVer then I thought oh God they’ve got me but there was cuz there’s a big ihm ihm the flag that ISIS used to represent themselves ((sniffs)) and ihm >these people from ISIS< and they want to know >wa- why are you traveling?↑ wa- where you want< to go↑ (.2) and I thought oh God they rumbled me I’m done (.2) but ihm (.2) I just (.2) >went with the flow and acted stupid< ((Recording shifts to next clip))

I have **no idea** how I’m gonna make my escape I don’t what ((inaudible)) or nothin I just **know** to take me to this place (.2) .h this man he DID not want to take me he was like (.2) a ihm (.2) “big problem ((headshake)) big problem (.2) many Muhajir many (.2) ma- ((inaudible)) Islam many Muhajir” ((sniffs)) I said, “↑No↑ no problem you take- my husband is there↑ you take me there (.2) I need to find my husband he’s training I’ve not seen any- he he >did not want to take me< ((Recording shifts to next clip))

I **heard** him say ihm (.2) “Turkey” ((sniff)) to his wi:fe >who’s speakin in Arabic< with his wife and then I heard him say (.2) “one kilometa” ((sniffs)) and I **said** to him in Arabic I said, “Brotha- Brotha what’s that about
Turkey? in Arabic (.) "one kilometer heading this way" (.) I said WHAT? and he said (.) "Turkey one kilometer this way" (.) I said "Stop the car" (.) ((sniffs)) "stop the car" I threw nine thousand Syrian dollars at him which is fifty dollars (.) grabbed (word removed) grabbed my pampers everythin- ih this bag (.) grabbed ((word removed)) grabbed the blanket and I just ran >because one kilometer is nothing< (.) and I just ran, ran, ran (0.3) an ihm (.) >I can SEE these ihm ISIS fighters th- the- >I don’t think they’d seen me< because nobody tried to come for me or shoot at me (.) and as I came up to the border ihm (0.2) <there’s a car of Turkish soldiers> (.) patrolling the border (.) and they took me >and I said to them< you need to help me (.) well obviously they understand limited English but they knew (I were in) problem (. ) °and then ihm ° ended up ° in a detention center for six weeks and then came back here ° ((sniffs)) ° to this place. ° (0.3) oh to England ° after being six weeks in that place °.
Appendix Five: University of South Florida Tampa Library Fair Use Documentation

USF Fair Use Worksheet

The fair use exception was added to the Copyright Act of 1976 as section 107 and was based on a history of judicial decisions that recognized that unauthorized use of copyrighted materials were "fair uses." The distinction between fair use and infringement may be unclear and not easily defined. There is no specific number of words, lines, or notes that may safely be taken without permission. This worksheet is offered as a tool to help you determine if your use of copyrighted content is likely to be considered to be a "fair use."

Before you begin your fair use determination, ask yourself the following questions:

1. Is the work no longer protected by copyright?
   a. Is it in the public domain?
   b. Did I retain my copyright ownership over a work I created when signing my publication contract?

2. Is there a specific exception in copyright law that covers my use?
   a. Does my use fit within Section 108 of copyright law: "Reproduction by libraries and archives?"
   b. Does my use fit within Section 110 (1) of copyright law: ‘performance or display of works in face to face classrooms?’
   c. Does my use fit within Section 110 (2) of copyright law: ‘performance or display of works in online classrooms (also known as the TEACH Act)?’ see TEACH Act checklist

3. Is there a license that covers my use?
   a. Is the work issued under a Creative Commons license and can I comply with the license terms?
   b. Do I have access to the material through library licensed content? Ask your librarian

If your answer to the above questions was no, then you should proceed with your fair use evaluation. Section 107 also sets out four factors to be considered in determining whether or not a particular use is fair:

1. The purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes
2. The nature of the copyrighted work
3. The amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole
4. The effect of the use upon the potential market for, or value of, the copyrighted work

None of these factors are independently determinative of whether or not a use is likely to be considered fair use. In evaluating your use, you should evaluate the totality of the circumstances and consider all of the factors together. The Fair Use Worksheet will help you balance these factors to determine if your use of copyrighted material weighs in favor of 'fair use.' While valuable for your own documentation the Worksheet is not intended as legal advice, which can be provided only by USF General Counsel.

LeEtta Schmidt, lmschmidt@usf.edu and Drew Smith dsmith@usf.edu
Reviewed by USF General Counsel 08/11/2015
INSTRUCTIONS

Check all boxes that apply, and keep a copy of this form for your records. If you have questions, please contact the USF General Counsel or your USF Tampa Library Copyright Librarian.

Name: Zoe DuPree Fine Date: April 21, 2018
Class or Project: Becoming a Woman of ISIS
Title of Copyrighted Work: "Firing With the Islamic State" (Tan & Laffin, 2015 in The New York Times article) or "ISIS and the Lonely American" (Callmann, 2015)

PURPOSE AND CHARACTER OF THE USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Educational</td>
<td>☐ Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use)</td>
<td>☐ Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Research or Scholarship</td>
<td>☐ Bad-faith behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Criticism, Parody, News Reporting or Comment</td>
<td>☐ Denying credit to original author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Transformative Use (your new work relies on and adds new expression, meaning, or message to the original work)</td>
<td>☐ Non-transformative or exact copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Restricted Access (to students or other appropriate group)</td>
<td>☐ Made accessible on Web or to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Nonprofit</td>
<td>☐ Profit-generating use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the purpose and character of your use supports fair use or does not support fair use.

NATURE OF THE COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Factual or nonfiction</td>
<td>☐ Creative or fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Important to favored educational objectives</td>
<td>☐ Consumable (workbooks, tests)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Published work</td>
<td>☐ Unpublished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the nature of the copyrighted material supports fair use or does not support fair use.

AMOUNT AND SUBSTANTIALITY OF MATERIAL USED IN RELATION TO WHOLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Small amount (using only the amount necessary to accomplish the purpose)</td>
<td>☐ Large portion or whole work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Amount is important to favored socially beneficial objective (i.e. educational objectives)</td>
<td>☐ Portion used is qualitatively substantial (i.e. it is the ‘heart of the work’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Lower quality from original (ex. Lower resolution or bitrate photos, video, and audio)</td>
<td>☐ Similar or exact quality of original work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Overall, the amount and substantiality of material used in relation to the whole 

☐ supports fair use or
☐ does not support fair use.

**EFFECT ON THE MARKET FOR ORIGINAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ No significant effect on the market or potential market for the original</td>
<td>☐ Replaces sale of copyrighted work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No similar product marketed by the copyright holder</td>
<td>☐ Significantly impairs market or potential market for the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ You own a lawfully acquired copy of the material</td>
<td>☐ Numerous copies or repeated, long-term use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ The copyright holder is identifiable</td>
<td>☐ Made accessible on Web or to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Lack of licensing mechanism for the material</td>
<td>☐ Affordable and reasonably available permissions or licensing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the effect on the market for the original 

☐ supports fair use or ☐ does not support fair use.

**CONCLUSION**

The combined purpose and character of the use, nature of the copyrighted material, amount and substantiality of material used in relation to the whole and the effect on the market for the original 

☐ likely supports fair use or ☐ likely does not support fair use.

*Note: Should your use of copyrighted material not support fair use, you may still be able to locate and request permissions from the copyright holder. For help on this, please feel free to [contact your Copyright Librarian.](mailto:copyright.lib@usf.edu)*

This worksheet has been adapted from:

- Cornell University's Checklist for Conducting A Fair use Analysis Before Using Copyrighted Materials: [https://copyright.cornell.edu/policies/docs/Fair_Use_Checklist.pdf](https://copyright.cornell.edu/policies/docs/Fair_Use_Checklist.pdf)
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USF Fair Use Worksheet

The fair use exception was added to the Copyright Act of 1976 as section 107 and was based on a history of judicial decisions that recognized that unauthorized use of copyrighted materials were "fair uses." The distinction between fair use and infringement may be unclear and not easily defined. There is no specific number of words, lines, or notes that may safely be taken without permission. This worksheet is offered as a tool to help you determine if your use of copyrighted content is likely to be considered to be a "fair use."

Before you begin your fair use determination, ask yourself the following questions:

1. Is the work no longer protected by copyright?
   a. Is it in the public domain?
   b. Did I retain my copyright ownership over a work I created when signing my publication contract?

2. Is there a specific exception in copyright law that covers my use?
   a. Does my use fit within Section 108 of copyright law: "Reproduction by libraries and archives?"
   b. Does my use fit within Section 110 (1) of copyright law: ‘performance or display of works in face to face classrooms?’
   c. Does my use fit within Section 110 (2) of copyright law: ‘performance or display of works in online classrooms (also known as the TEACH Act)?’ see TEACH Act checklist

3. Is there a license that covers my use?
   a. Is the work issued under a Creative Commons license and can I comply with the license terms?
   b. Do I have access to the material through library licensed content? Ask your librarian

If your answer to the above questions was no, then you should proceed with your fair use evaluation. Section 107 also sets out four factors to be considered in determining whether or not a particular use is fair:

1. The purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes
2. The nature of the copyrighted work
3. The amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole
4. The effect of the use upon the potential market for, or value of, the copyrighted work

None of these factors are independently determinative of whether or not a use is likely to be considered fair use. In evaluating your use, you should evaluate the totality of the circumstances and consider all of the factors together. The Fair Use Worksheet will help you balance these factors to determine if your use of copyrighted material weighs in favor of ‘fair use.’ While valuable for your own documentation the Worksheet is not intended as legal advice, which can be provided only by USF General Counsel.
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INSTRUCTIONS

Check all boxes that apply, and keep a copy of this form for your records. If you have questions, please contact the USF General Counsel or your USF Tampa Library Copyright Librarian.

Name: Zoe DuPree Fine
Date: April 21, 2018

Class or Project: Becoming a Woman of ISIS

Title of Copyrighted Work:

Purpose and Character of the Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use)</td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research or Scholarship</td>
<td>Bad-faith behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism, Parody, News Reporting or Comment</td>
<td>Denying credit to original author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformative Use (your new work relies on and adds new expression, meaning, or message to the original work)</td>
<td>Non-transformative or exact copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Access (to students or other appropriate group)</td>
<td>Made accessible on Web or to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>Profit-generating use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the purpose and character of your use ☐ supports fair use or ☐ does not support fair use.

Nature of the Copyrighted Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factual or nonfiction</td>
<td>Creative or fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to favored educational objectives</td>
<td>Consumable (workbooks, tests)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published work</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the nature of the copyrighted material ☐ supports fair use or ☐ does not support fair use.

Amount and Substantiality of Material Used in Relation to Whole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small amount (using only the amount necessary to accomplish the purpose)</td>
<td>Large portion or whole work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount is important to favored socially beneficial objective (i.e. educational objectives)</td>
<td>Portion used is qualitatively substantial (i.e. it is the ‘heart of the work’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower quality from original (ex. Lower resolution or bitrate photos, video, and audio)</td>
<td>Similar or exact quality of original work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Overall, the amount and substantiality of material used in relation to the whole □ supports fair use or □ does not support fair use.

EFFECT ON THE MARKET FOR ORIGINAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ No significant effect on the market or potential market for the original</td>
<td>□ Replaces sale of copyrighted work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No similar product marketed by the copyright holder</td>
<td>□ Significantly impairs market or potential market for the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ You own a lawfully acquired copy of the material</td>
<td>□ Numerous copies or repeated, long-term use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ The copyright holder is unidentified</td>
<td>□ Made accessible on Web or to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Lack of licensing mechanism for the material</td>
<td>□ Affordable and reasonably available permissions or licensing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the effect on the market for the original □ supports fair use or □ does not support fair use.

CONCLUSION

The combined purpose and character of the use, nature of the copyrighted material, amount and substantiality of material used in relation to the whole and the effect on the market for the original □ likely supports fair use or □ likely does not support fair use.

Note: Should your use of copyrighted material not support fair use, you may still be able to locate and request permissions from the copyright holder. For help on this, please feel free to contact your Copyright Librarian.

This worksheet has been adapted from:

Cornell University’s Checklist for Conducting A Fair use Analysis Before Using Copyrighted Materials:  
https://copyright.cornell.edu/policies/docs/Fair_Use_Checklist.pdf


Smith, Kevin; Macklin, Lisa A.; Gilliland, Anne. A Framework for Analyzing any Copyright Problem. Retrieved from:  
https://63966ussex4doc.cloudfront.net/cfel/Reading%20Docs/Ann%20Framework%20for%20Analyzing%20a ny%20Copyright%20Problem.pdf
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USF Fair Use Worksheet

The fair use exception was added to the Copyright Act of 1976 as section 107 and was based on a history of judicial decisions that recognized that unauthorized use of copyrighted materials were "fair uses." The distinction between fair use and infringement may be unclear and not easily defined. There is no specific number of words, lines, or notes that may safely be taken without permission. This worksheet is offered as a tool to help you determine if your use of copyrighted content is likely to be considered to be a “fair use.”

Before you begin your fair use determination, ask yourself the following questions:

1. Is the work no longer protected by copyright?
   a. Is it in the public domain?
   b. Did I retain my copyright ownership over a work I created when signing my publication contract?

2. Is there a specific exception in copyright law that covers my use?
   a. Does my use fit within Section 108 of copyright law: ‘Reproduction by libraries and archives?’
   b. Does my use fit within Section 110 (1) of copyright law: ‘performance or display of works in face to face classrooms?’
   c. Does my use fit within Section 110 (2) of copyright law: ‘performance or display of works in online classrooms (also known as the TEACH Act)?’ see TEACH Act checklist

3. Is there a license that covers my use?
   a. Is the work issued under a Creative Commons license and can I comply with the license terms?
   b. Do I have access to the material through library licensed content? Ask your librarian

If your answer to the above questions was no, then you should proceed with your fair use evaluation. Section 107 also sets out four factors to be considered in determining whether or not a particular use is fair:

1. The purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes
2. The nature of the copyrighted work
3. The amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole
4. The effect of the use upon the potential market for, or value of, the copyrighted work

None of these factors are independently determinative of whether or not a use is likely to be considered fair use. In evaluating your use, you should evaluate the totality of the circumstances and consider all of the factors together. The Fair Use Worksheet will help you balance these factors to determine if your use of copyrighted material weighs in favor of ‘fair use.’ While valuable for your own documentation the Worksheet is not intended as legal advice, which can be provided only by USF General Counsel.

LeEtta Schmidt, lmschmidt@usf.edu and Drew Smith dsmith@usf.edu
Reviewed by USF General Counsel 08/11/2015
INSTRUCTIONS

Check all boxes that apply, and keep a copy of this form for your records. If you have questions, please contact the USF General Counsel or your USF Tampa Library Copyright Librarian.

Zoe DuPree Fine

April 21, 2018

Becoming a Woman of ISIS

Untitled interview in NPR report/article, “Europe Wakes Up To Prospect Of Female Terrorists” (2016)

Title of Copyrighted Work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use)</td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research or Scholarship</td>
<td>Bad-faith behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism, Parody, News Reporting or Comment</td>
<td>Denying credit to original author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformative Use (your new work relies on and adds new expression, meaning, or message to the original work)</td>
<td>Non-transformative or exact copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Access (to students or other appropriate group)</td>
<td>Made accessible on Web or to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>Profit-generating use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the purpose and character of your use supports fair use or does not support fair use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factual or nonfiction</td>
<td>Creative or fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to favored educational objectives</td>
<td>Consumable (workbooks, tests)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published work</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the nature of the copyrighted material supports fair use or does not support fair use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small amount (using only the amount necessary to accomplish the purpose)</td>
<td>Large portion or whole work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount is important to favored socially beneficial objective (i.e. educational objectives)</td>
<td>Portion used is qualitatively substantial (i.e. it is the ‘heart of the work’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower quality from original (ex. Lower resolution or bit rate photos, video, and audio)</td>
<td>Similar or exact quality of original work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Overall, the amount and substantiality of material used in relation to the whole supports fair use or does not support fair use.

**EFFECT ON THE MARKET FOR ORIGINAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ No significant effect on the market or potential market for the original</td>
<td>☐ Replaces sale of copyrighted work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No similar product marketed by the copyright holder</td>
<td>☐ Significantly impairs market or potential market for the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ You own a lawfully acquired copy of the material</td>
<td>☐ Numerous copies or repeated, long-term use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ The copyright holder is unidentified</td>
<td>☐ Made accessible on Web or to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Lack of licensing mechanism for the material</td>
<td>☐ Affordable and reasonably available permissions or licensing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the effect on the market for the original supports fair use or does not support fair use.

**CONCLUSION**

The combined purpose and character of the use, nature of the copyrighted material, amount and substantiality of material used in relation to the whole and the effect on the market for the original likely supports fair use or likely does not support fair use.

*Note: Should your use of copyrighted material not support fair use, you may still be able to locate and request permissions from the copyright holder. For help on this, please feel free to contact your Copyright Librarian.*

This worksheet has been adapted from:

Cornell University’s Checklist for Conducting A Fair use Analysis Before Using Copyrighted Materials: [https://copyright.cornell.edu/policies/docs/Fair_Use_Checklist.pdf](https://copyright.cornell.edu/policies/docs/Fair_Use_Checklist.pdf)


LeEtta Schmidt, [lmschmidt@usf.edu](mailto:lmschmidt@usf.edu) and Drew Smith [dsmith@usf.edu](mailto:dsmith@usf.edu)
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USF Fair Use Worksheet

The fair use exception was added to the Copyright Act of 1976 as section 107 and was based on a history of judicial decisions that recognized that unauthorized use of copyrighted materials were "fair uses." The distinction between fair use and infringement may be unclear and not easily defined. There is no specific number of words, lines, or notes that may safely be taken without permission. This worksheet is offered as a tool to help you determine if your use of copyrighted content is likely to be considered to be a “fair use.”

Before you begin your fair use determination, ask yourself the following questions:

1. Is the work no longer protected by copyright?
   a. Is it in the public domain?
   b. Did I retain my copyright ownership over a work I created when signing my publication contract?
2. Is there a specific exception in copyright law that covers my use?
   a. Does my use fit within Section 108 of copyright law: ‘Reproduction by libraries and archives?’
   b. Does my use fit within Section 110 (1) of copyright law: ‘performance or display of works in face to face classrooms?’
   c. Does my use fit within Section 110 (2) of copyright law: ‘performance or display of works in online classrooms (also known as the TEACH Act)?’ see TEACH Act checklist
3. Is there a license that covers my use?
   a. Is the work issued under a Creative Commons license and can I comply with the license terms?
   b. Do I have access to the material through library licensed content? Ask your librarian

If your answer to the above questions was no, then you should proceed with your fair use evaluation. Section 107 also sets out four factors to be considered in determining whether or not a particular use is fair:

1. The purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes
2. The nature of the copyrighted work
3. The amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole
4. The effect of the use upon the potential market for, or value of, the copyrighted work

None of these factors are independently determinative of whether or not a use is likely to be considered fair use. In evaluating your use, you should evaluate the totality of the circumstances and consider all of the factors together. The Fair Use Worksheet will help you balance these factors to determine if your use of copyrighted material weighs in favor of ‘fair use.’ While valuable for your own documentation the Worksheet is not intended as legal advice, which can be provided only by USF General Counsel.

LeEtta Schmidt, jmschmidt@usf.edu and Drew Smith dsmith@usf.edu
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INSTRUCTIONS

Check all boxes that apply, and keep a copy of this form for your records. If you have questions, please contact the USF General Counsel or your USF Tampa Library Copyright Librarian.

Name: Zoe DuPree Fine          Date: April 21, 2018

Class or Project: Becoming a Woman of ISIS

Title of Copyrighted Work: [Interview, "Tareena Shakil police interview" published on YouTube by Heart News WestMids (West Midlands Police, 2015/2016) and in Birmingham Mail report/article, “WATCH: Tareena Shakil lies her way through police interview after return from Syria” (Lanner, 2016)]

PURPOSE AND CHARACTER OF THE USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Educational</td>
<td>□ Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use)</td>
<td>□ Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Research or Scholarship</td>
<td>□ Bad-faith behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Criticism, Parody, News Reporting or Comment</td>
<td>□ Denying credit to original author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Transformative Use (your new work relies on and adds new expression, meaning, or message to the original work)</td>
<td>□ Non-transformative or exact copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Restricted Access (to students or other appropriate group)</td>
<td>□ Made accessible on Web or to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Nonprofit</td>
<td>□ Profit-generating use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the purpose and character of your use supports fair use or does not support fair use.

NATURE OF THE COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Factual or nonfiction</td>
<td>□ Creative or fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Important to favored educational objectives</td>
<td>□ Consumable (workbooks, tests)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Published work</td>
<td>□ Unpublished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the nature of the copyrighted material supports fair use or does not support fair use.

AMOUNT AND SUBSTANTIALITY OF MATERIAL USED IN RELATION TO WHOLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Small amount (using only the amount necessary to accomplish the purpose)</td>
<td>□ Large portion or whole work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Amount is important to favored socially beneficial objective (i.e. educational objectives)</td>
<td>□ Portion used is qualitatively substantial (i.e. it is the ‘heart of the work’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Lower quality from original (ex. Lower resolution or bitrate photos, video, and audio)</td>
<td>□ Similar or exact quality of original work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Overall, the amount and substantiality of material used in relation to the whole □ supports fair use or □ does not support fair use.

**EFFECT ON THE MARKET FOR ORIGINAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ No significant effect on the market or potential market for the original</td>
<td>☐ Replaces sale of copyrighted work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No similar product marketed by the copyright holder</td>
<td>☐ Significantly impairs market or potential market for the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ You own a lawfully acquired copy of the material</td>
<td>☐ Numerous copies or repeated, long-term use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ The copyright holder is unidentified</td>
<td>☐ Made accessible on Web or to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Lack of licensing mechanism for the material</td>
<td>☐ Affordable and reasonably available permissions or licensing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the effect on the market for the original ☐ supports fair use or □ does not support fair use.

**CONCLUSION**

The combined purpose and character of the use, nature of the copyrighted material, amount and substantiality of material used in relation to the whole and the effect on the market for the original ☐ likely supports fair use or □ likely does not support fair use.

*Note: Should your use of copyrighted material not support fair use, you may still be able to locate and request permissions from the copyright holder. For help on this, please feel free to contact your Copyright Librarian.*

This worksheet has been adapted from:

Cornell University's Checklist for Conducting A Fair use Analysis Before Using Copyrighted Materials:  
[https://copyright.cornell.edu/policies/docs/Fair_Use_Checklist.pdf](https://copyright.cornell.edu/policies/docs/Fair_Use_Checklist.pdf)  
Smith, Kevin; Macklin, Lisa A.; Gilliland, Anne. A Framework for Analyzing any Copyright Problem. Retrieved from:  
[https://63966susea4dorc.cloudfront.net/cfel/Reading%20Docs/R%20Framework%20for%20Analyzing%20a ny%20Copyright%20Problem.pdf](https://63966susea4dorc.cloudfront.net/cfel/Reading%20Docs/R%20Framework%20for%20Analyzing%20any%20Copyright%20Problem.pdf)
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