The turn-taking system of broadcast political interviews

Dr. Jassim N. Al-Azzawi
Ph.D.General Linguistics

Introduction

Nowadays the broadcast political interview plays such an important role in both the media and the political process that it has become the focus of present day research,(Cohen,1987:23).The most extensive work has been within the general framework of Conversation Analysis, and there is no doubt that this work has been fruitful (See Heritage,1985;
Jucker, 1986; Greatbatch, 1986a).The main focus has been on the interview turn-taking system.

The interview turn taking system is a product both of the general tasks of broadcasting and of the place of broadcasting within the political and economic systems of the western democracies. The generic product of this system is that the participants treat their talk as geared to an overhearing audience. The participants have to cooperate in building the "interview talk", and their roles as interviewer and interviewee. The interview turn taking system is basically made of questions and answers. The activities of asking and answering are pre-allocated to the roles of interviewer and interviewee (Clayman and Heritage, 2002a:119).

Section One: Questions

In interviews, speakers convey information and express opinions. These activities are very largely done as responses to questioning. Questioning handles the main interactional and institutional tasks charged to interviews. First, interviewers are obliged to elicit interviewees' information and opinions for the benefit of overhearers,(Heritage and Greatbatch,1991:121).Second, interviewers must maintain a "neutralistic" position. They are not authorized to argue with, or criticize the interviewee's point of view nor, conversely, to agree with, support, or defend it. This stance can be achieved only through questioning (Heritage and Roth, 1995:1).

The question and answer format is the defining feature of interviews. This claim means that the interviewer turn is asking the interviewee questions and that the interviewee naturally answers the questions. The interviewer turn has to arrive at a sentence or other turn constructional unit that does questioning, and the interviewee has to wait until such a unit is achieved before beginning a response. In extract (1) Vice President George Bush tries several times to

answer the interviewer's initial statement, but the interviewer refuses depending on the claim that his turn has not yet reached a question (Ibid.:3).

(1) (Bush-Rather:3)
```
 1  IR: You said that if you had known this was an arms for
 2       Hostages swap, that you would've opposed it.
 3  IE: Yes
 4  IR: You also said that you did not know that
 5  IE: Exactly, may I answer that?
 6  IE: Right.
 7  IR: That wasn't a question. It was a statement.
 8  IE: Yes it was a
 9  IE: statement and I'll answer it.
10 IR:  Let me ask the question if I may first ……
11 IE:  created this program has testified or stated
12       publicaly, he did not think it was arms for hostages.
```

1.1 Grammar as a Resource for Coding Questioning

In investigating the interviewer's production of question actions, we can depend on grammatical form, specifically, the interrogative sentence type, for determining whether an utterance accomplishes questioning, (Schegloff,1984:34). Most of the major classes of questions identified by Quirk et al. (1985) are used in interviews.

(1) Yes/No questions

They are usually formed by placing the operator before the subject and giving the sentence a rising intonation. They expect affirmation or negation (Quirk et al., 1985:807-10).

(2) (Nightline 7/22/85:5) ((IE = Reverend Alan Boesak))
```
 1   IE:   … I do not think that anyone in South Africa can
 2         say that he or she is safe from any
 3         action from side of the government
 4   IR:   Are you willing personally to renounce
 5         the violence in that country?
 6   IE:   Yes I will. I mean I have said so …
```

(2) Tag questions

Tag questions are appended to statements, consisting of an operator and subject (Quirk et al., 1985:810-14).

(3) UK BBCTV *Newsnight*: June 1989: European Elections
IR: Peter Snow   IE: Bryan Gould
```
 1   IE:   .hhh because although Missus Thatcher constantly
 2         says how tough she's going to be: (.) .h and indeed
 3         she does: use the language which antagonizes
 4         everybody in Europe.
 5   IR:    She's been no pushover has she.
```

(3) Declarative questions

This type of questions is identical in form to declarative, except for the final rising question intonation (Quirk et al., 1985:814).

(4) (MacNeil/Lehrer 2/3/92:6) (("OAS" = Organization of American States)

```
1    IE:     … We've talked about it and it's been
2            discussed  not  because
3  –  IR:    You have. You have discussed it
4  –         within the OAS?
5    IE:     It's been discussed as a theoretical
6            possibility …
```

(4) WH-questions

They expect a reply from an open range of replies. They are formed with the aid of one of the wh-words. They generally have falling intonation (Quirk, et al., 1985:817-23).

(5) US PBS *Newshour*: 4 Dec 1989: US-Soviet Summit

IR: Jim Lehrer   IE: Senator George Mitchell

```
1    IR:→ . Senator Mitchell, what's your overview
2            of the summit from President Bush's point of
3            view.
4    IE:→ It was positive …
```

(5) Alternative questions

Alternative questions presuppose the truth of only one of the propositions. There are two types of alternative questions. The first resembles a yes-no question except in intonation. Instead of the final rising tone, it contains a rising tone in each item in the list, except the last, on which there is a fall, indicating that the list is complete. The second type of alternative question is a compound of a wh-question and an elliptical alternative question (Quirk et al., 1985:823-4).

(6) US PBS *Newshour*: 22 July 1985: South Africa

IR1: Rober MacNeil → IR2: Jim Lehrer

IE: Herman Beukus (South African ambassador)

```
1    IR:     Do you believe we're talking a matter of days
2            or weeks or months for the state of
3            emergency?
```

(Heritage and Roth, 1995:8)

1.2 Pragmatic Extensions Beyond the Grammatical Nucleus

In addition to interrogative syntax, interviewers use other sources to build their turns as questions. Prominent among these are:

(a) Directives

Schegloff (1984:38) states that imperative utterances are used to accomplish questioning, as in the following example:

(7) (Nightline 6/3/85:1)
```
 1    IR:    Well. no question that 'e tabled it, 'n in fact when I
 2           hear Richard Viguerie saying that uh one uh thuh
 3           reasons he likes having ya in that job izzat ya know
 4           thuh media's true agenda.
 5    →      .hh Tell us about it.
 6    IE:    tch .hhhh Well uh as director of communication
 7           I suppose I'm not supposed tuh get induh any
 8           combat with 'uh media, but lemme state what my views
 9           are on that uh .hhhh Ted …
```
(Heritage and Roth, 1995:9)

(b) B-Event statements

B-event statements are declarative utterances. They unlike Quirk et al.'s declarative questions, do not necessarily depending on final rising intonation for their questioning force,(Ibid:10). They refer to events about which the recipient of the statement has unique or privileged knowledge. Such utterances make a recipient's confirmation or denial relevant in the next turn. In interviews, the interviewer uses "B-events" to refer to interviewee's subjective state, such as his feelings, attitude or intention, and areas in which the interviewee has particular knowledge,   expertise   or   authority,(Labove   and Fanshel,1977:100;Pomerantz,1980:191).

(8) UK BBCTV *Newsnight*: 29 Sep 1981: Labour Party Split
IR: John Tusa   IE: David Owen
```
 1    IR:→   So in a very brief word David Owen you in no
 2           way regret what you did despite what has
 3           happened in Brighton this week in the Labour Party.
 4    IE:→   In no way do I regret it.
```
"B-event" questions also include hypothetical or future-oriented statements about courses of action with which the interviewee may be associated. In the following example, a Labour politician is questioned about the party's plans for a settlement of problems in Northern Ireland:

(9) UK BBCTV *Newsnight*: 29 Sep 1981: Northern Ireland
IR: John Tusa   IE: Don Concannon
```
 1    IE:    All we've said is that it is our view that a
 2           lasting settlement in Northern Ireland will
 3           come about by reunification.  .hh We know we've
 4           got a hard task. We know we've er a long
 5           plough to furrow er er on this. .h We know we've
 6           got to win a lot of hearts and minds. .h I'm not
 7           saying it's impossible.A lot of people tell me
 8           it's impossible. I don't think it's impossible
 9           or else I wouldn't be a party to it.
```

10	IR:	It's not something you're going to force on the
11		Northern Ireland people.
12	IE:	et You can't force ((continues))

(Ibid.:10-13)

Bull (1994:121) mentions that Jucker (1986: 115) introduces two additional categories: indirect questions and moodless questions. An example of a moodless question can be seen in the following extract:

(10) UK BBC Radio World at One (1992): General Election

IR: Robin Day   IE: Neil Kinnock

1	IR:	Under a Labour Government would the trade
2		unions recover much of their pre-Thatcher power?
3	IE:	We've made the propositions and we will put
4		into effect those propositions that there is
5		universal balloting that there is a system er of
6		industrial tribunals that er the membership
7		shall be in control.
8	IR:	→ Secondary picketing?
9	IE:	of the trade union and there will be no
10		flying pickets what we will have of course.
11	IR:	Secondary picketing?

Although the question is not couched in the interrogative, nor has a verb, the interviewer is clearly asking whether a Labour Government would restore the right to secondary picketing.

Indirect questions which have the force of the question in a subordinate clause are used as a means of questioning politicians. In the following extract, the interviewer (Robin Day) is obviously using 'the reported speech of Powell as a means of questioning Margaret Thatcher.'

(11) IR: What this er remarkable man with the tremendous brain Mr. Powell says

IE: mm

IR: in his latest utterance he says it almost defies belief that grown men and women should seriously propose so crazy a scenario which he says is this Russia invades Germany or northern Norway perhaps the United States declines to commit suicide so he says Britain fires a nuclear salvo at Moscow and Leningrad and he asks the question how balmy do you have to be to believe that or believe that the Kremlin believes that.

IE: Yes but you see so many of Enoch's arguments stem from the starting place he close and the starting place he close isn't the right one.

Clayman and Heritage (2002a:104) state that 70 percent of British and American interview questions are formed using interrogative syntax. The most frequent form of non-interrogative question is the declarative.

In studying the interviewer's turn construction, we have to concentrate on the world of interaction rather than of grammar, where utterances are constructed as turns at talk that are situated in sequences of actions. Utterances are built from lexical items, phrases, clauses, and sentences. These units are called "turn constructional units" (TCUs). They are the building blocks of turns at talk. The organization of the interviewer's TC has certain features. First, it is not necessarily sentential; in certain cases, questioning can be achieved by rising intonation on subsential units (i.e., lexical, phrasal, and clausal TCUs), as in the following example:

(12) (Newsnight/China:2)

```
1   IE:   So if I see him doing
2         several things first of all briefly .hh um:
3         instituting a system where the national people's
4         congress becomes a more realistic parliament perhaps
5         with multiple slate elections to it .hhhh the rule of
6         law.
7   IR: →  Multiple state multiparty?
8   IE:   No: multiple multiple candidates …
```

Second, it comprises more than one TCU. Questioning is the fundamental condition under which interviewer-interviewee turn transfer occurs. It has been noticed that some interviewer's turns consist of two or more TCUs. These complex turns may include both interrogative and non-interrogative TCUs. As in an ordinary conversation, recipients' responses work on the "preference of contiguity". The recipient responds first to the final TCU of the prior turn. This preference's operation can be clearly seen in extract (13). The interviewer's turn at lines 6-10 consists of a statement (arrowed "a") and an interrogative question (arrowed "b"). The interviewee first responds to the last, interrogative TCU (arrowed "c"), then turns to rebut the earlier challenging statement (arrowed "d").

(13) (WAO:13.3.79)

```
1       IR:  .hhh er What's the difference between your Marxism and
2            Mister McGarhey's Communism.
3       IE:  er The difference is that it's the press that constantly
4            call me a Ma:rxist when I do not, (.) and never have
5            given that description of myself.I
6  a–   IR:  But I've
7  a–        heard you- I've heard you'd be very happy to: to: er
8  a–        .hhhh er describe yourself as a Marxist.
9  b–        Could it be that with an election in the offing you're
```

10 b–   anxious to play down that you're a Marxist.
11 c–   IE: Not at
12 c–   all Mister Day.
13 d–   And I:'m (.) sorry to say I must disagree with you,
14 d–   you have never heard me describe myself .hhh er as
15   a Marxist. I have only …

Third, it is subject to intersection by another speaker's talk. Interviewees contribute to the achievement of interviewer's turn in many ways. One of these ways is withholding talk until the interviewer's turn is recognizably complete. There are a few cases in which interviewees begin speaking before interviewers reach such a point, resulting in overlapping talk. There is no easy programmatic answer to this problem. It must be addressed on a case-by-case basis (Heritage and Roth, 1995:13-21).

1.3 Prefaced Questions and Their Interact ional Construction

Some interviewer questions are complex, including more than a single questioning unit. These questions are normally preceded by additional statements that lead up to the question itself. The interviewee withholds any response until a recognizable question has been produced. The initial statement is "prefatory" to a question, and is not to be responded to its own right. While in ordinary conversation, the initial statement is treated as a completed turn in its own right and responded to as such. Extract (14) contains an example of complex, prefaced question. This extract concerns a museum's efforts to buy the letters of a British explorer. This additional statement provides background information for the audience (arrow 1).

(14) UK BBC Radio World at once: 25 Jan. 1979: Letters
        IR: Anna Sebastian   IE: Harry King, Librarian
 1   IR: →The price being asked for these letters
 2   is three thousand pounds.
 3   Are you going to be able to raise it?
 4   IE:→ At the moment it ….. (continues)

(Clayman and Heritage, 2002b:46)

The manifest function of prefatory statements is often to tell the interviewee and the audience the context (background) of the questions that follow, or managing topic shifts of various kinds (Clayman and Heritage, 2002a:193).

(15) US ABC *Nightline*: 22 July 1985: South Africa
        IR: Charles Gibson   IE: Reverend Allan Boesak
 1   IR: S → .Two- two members of your organization(.)
 2   supposedly arrested today:
 3   Q → Do you feel in some danger when you go back.

Interviewers may also use prefatory statements to provide an experiential context for the interviewee's answer. In the following example, the interview deals with proposals to arm the British police. The interviewee is a policeman who was shot by a criminal while unarmed, and his personal experience is invoked to convey to the audience that the question has a special relevance for him. Here, the preface is the presumptive foundation for the interviewee's answer, and the audience's understanding of the issues involved in any decision to arm the police (Ibid.:195).

(16) UK BBCTV *Newsnight*: 21 Oct 1993: Arming the Police
      IR: Jeremy Paxman   IE: David Brady

1	IR:	… You as I say have been shot yourself in
2		the- in the line of duty, ahm let's just
3		look at the question of arming the police
4		first of all. Is it your view that the police
5		should now be armed?
6	IE:	.hhh But definitely. .hhh Ahm we: wuh- (.) we have no
7		rights as a society .hh to expect young men (.) .hh to
8		enter situations …

Prefatory statements may also be used to make the agenda of a question more complex, constraining, or problematic. In the following extract, the preface is used to instruct the audience about two conflicting positions on closer ties with Europe within British Conservative Party. Within this framework, a British Conservative politician, Michael Heseltine, is asked to say where he "lines up" in that conflict (Roth, 1998a:87).

(17) UK BBCTV *Newsnight*: June 1989: European Ties
      IR: Donald MacCormick IE: Michael Heseltine

1	IR:	.hh what Missus Thatcher has been saying: is
2		that there is a danger (.) .h of a socialist
3		superstate being imposed (0.5) from Brussels
4		(0.2) and what Mister Heath and others are
5		saying is (0.2) that is (.) is an illusory
6		fear. – Where do you. line up on that issue.
7	IE:	Well: (eh) technically, because these
8		decisions are yet to be taken, it can go
9		either way, … (continues)

Furthermore, prefatory statements may be used to limit types of answer. The following extract is taken from an interview with Margaret Thatcher, also on closer ties with Europe. The prefatory statement is used to pin down Thatcher to a specification of circumstances in which she would agree to join the exchange rate mechanism.

(18) UK BBCTV *Newsnight*: June 1989: Exchange-Rate Mechanism
      IR: John Cole   IE: Margaret Thatcher

1	IR:	Now turning to the exchange rate mechanism you:
2		have consistently said or the Government has
3		said .hh that you will join when the time is
4		right but people are saying: .hh that that means
5		never. Could you define the kind of
6		conditions when you think we would go in.
7	IE:	Uh no I would not say it means never. For the
8		policy …

Jucker (1986:103) mentions that in political interviews, we can also find the following types of prefaced questions:

(1) Preface relating to the interviewee's opinion

In this type, the prefaced main clause of questions is either in interrogative or in declarative form. The preface is concerned with the interviewee's opinion, what he/she thinks or feels about a particular state of affairs which is the base of the propositional content of the subordinate clause.

(19) IR: **what do you feel** is the Italian view on the future of the community er are they optimistic that some, agreement is going to be reached, in time to save the community from collapse.

(20) IR: so **you think** when you and the other commissioners sit down to discuss this. report from the financial controller. a majority of you or all of you will simply reject it.

(Ibid.:104)

This type of questions explains the importance of the interviewee's opinion for establishing a fact.

(2) Preface relating to what the interviewee has said

This type of prefaced questions refers to what the interviewee has already said. The preface, again, can be in interrogative or in declarative form. In the following example, the preface consists of a subject and a verb:

(21) IR: **you are suggesting** erm er financial: help for thi coal industry or suggesting waiving their their debts er so far as the Government is concerned.

(Ibid.:105)

(3) Preface relating to the speech act required of the interviewee

The preface of this type of prefaced questions refers to the speech act that is required from the interviewee. The interviewer uses the prefaces **can you explain** and **could you just say exactly** in order to get that particular speech act of "explaining", or "saying exactly". This type of questions is marked by its directive nature, and its interrogative form.

(22) IR: well hopefully sitting in our, radio car in Whitehall is the Home Secretary himself, Mr. Brittan, good morning Home Secretary (…) now. first of all **could you just**, **say exactly** what

you had in mind when you talked about (emphatic) desirable adjustments in maximum sentences.

(Ibid.:106)

(4) Preface relating to the speech act performed by the interviewer in asking the question

In this type, the prefaced questions are related to the speech acts performed by the interviewer in asking the question. The prefaces have been termed as **hedged performatives**. In the following, the interviewer uses the performative verb **to ask** together with the modal **can**.

(23) IR: (…) **can I ask you** again with hindsight whether you wish now that you had refused to give up the document.

(Ibid.:106)

(5) Preface relating to the truth conditional status of the proposition

In this type of prefaced questions, the phrases which preface the questions are used to relativise the truth conditional state of the subsequent proposition.

(24) IR: it's well known that the Soviet Union has invested a good deal of time and effort into research into ESP, **wouldn't it be reasonable to assume** that thi the Pentagon. the United States would do the same.

(Ibid.:107).

In this example, the interviewee is confronted with the proposition that the Pentagon puts efforts into the research of extra-sensory phenomena. This proposition is prefaced with a performative verb **assume**. This verb is nonfactive and intensified by a modal in negative interrogative form, **wouldn't it be**.

Now in both USA and UK, interviewers use prefaced questions because they provide room to maneuver, while simple questions restrict them to the context of the interviewee's last response.

By withholding responses to prefatory statements, interviewees emphasise the belief that they do not have rights to a turn until the interviewer has come to a question, and correspondingly that their turn should be an "answer" to a question. This kind of collaboration in the maintenance of the interview framework is clear in forbearance and self-control of hostile question prefaces. In extract (25) the interviewee does not respond to a transparently hostile question preface. The interviewee is British trade union leader. The subject of the interview is the election of National Union of Mineworkers. Day's prefatory statement (arrow 1) directly counters Scargill's previous denial that he is a Marxist.Scargill waits for him to come to a question (arrow 2) before initiating a response (arrow 3),(Clayman and Heritage, 2002a:104-7).

(25) UK BBC Radio *World at One*: 13 Mar 1979: NUM Election

IR: Robin Day   IE: Arthur Scargill

1   IR: .hhh er What's the difference between your_

2			Marxism and Mister McGahey's communisms.
3	IE:		er The difference is that it's the press that
4			constantly call me a Marxist when I do not, (.)
5			and never have (.) er er given that description
6			of myself. I
7	IR:	1 →	But I've heard you-
8		1 →	I've heard you'd be very happy to: to: er .hhhh
9		1 →	er describe yourself as a Marxist.
10		2 →	Could it be that with an election in the offing
11		2 →	you're anxious to play down that you're a
12		2 →	Marxist.
13	IE:	3 →	Not at all Mister Day. And I'm (.)
14			sorry to say I must disagree with you, you have
15			never heard me describe myself .hhh er as a
16			Marxist. I have only ((continues))

In addition to wait for the interviewer to come to a question, the interviewee avoids acknowledgement actions such as "mm hm", "uh huh", "yes", "oh" or "really". Since he has no right to respond to prefatory statements, such actions have no role. While in ordinary conversation, they are frequently used. If they are used in interviews, their production will be considered as "aggressive"; a departure from the interview Q-A turn taking framework. In spite of this constraint, in the following extract, Vice President George Bush crosses swords with CBS anchor Dan Rather (Ibid.:108).

(26) US CBS *Evening News*: 25 Jan 1988: Iran-Contra

      IR: Dan Rather   IE: George Bush

1	IR:	You said that if you had known this was an arms
2		for hostages swap, .hh that you would've
3	IE:	Yes
4	IR:	opposed it. .hhh You also said that
5	IE:	Exactly.
6	IR:	that you did not know that
7	IE:	May I answer that?
8	IE:	Right.
9	IR:	That wasn't a question. It was a …
10	IE:	Yes.
11	IR:	statement
12	IE:	It was a statement and I'll
13	IR:	Let me ask
14	IE:	answer it. The President created this
15	IR:	the question if I may first
16	IE:	program, .h has testified er stated publicly,
17		(.) he did not think it was arms for hostages.

Section Two: Answers

Interviewees normally produce turns at talk as responses to interviewer questions. In order to understand whether an answer is complete, the interviewer must parse the unfolding answer unit by unit. In determining the answer of wh-questions seems unproblematic. The answer is based on their ordinary definition, e.g. "who" asks what or which person(s), "why" asks on what grounds, for what reason, or with what purpose, etc. The interviewee supplies the missing variable.

The answer of yes-no questions is either yes or no. Quirk et al. (1985:808) point out that we can use words or expressions such as "certainly", "of course", "not at all", and "never" to convey affirmation or negation other than "yes" or "no". For example in the following extract from 1992 British General Election, the politician Kinnock answers without using "yes" or "no":

(27) IR: er you have your own views about P.R. at Westminster don't
        you?

IE: ⟶ I do.

There are also questions that are formulated in a yes-no format, but the answer with "yes" or "no" is not sufficient, as in the following extract. This extract is between David Dimbleby and Margaret Thatcher in the 1987 British General Election (Bull, 1994:125).

(28) IR: Were you to be returned tomorrow and come back as Prime Minister is there anything you've learnt during this campaign any lessons you've learnt during this campaign that you would apply in a next period of Thatcher government?

IE: Perhaps, You've taught me one that it's not enough actually to do things that result in caring you also have to talk about is but we have done them and I have done them as you know personally although we don't talk about that either.

Alternative questions introduces two or more alternatives, and the interviewee chooses one of the alternatives. There are cases in which the interviewee presents another alternative, and is considered as a reply. The following extract comes from an interview between Frost and the politician Ashdown in the 1992 British General Election:

(29) IR: Can you get a feeling of whether as some of the people say Labour's support is stronger and firmer than Tory support or do you think they're both equally if there is such a word wavery?

IE: I think the mood of the country is one of some   gloom disappointment.

Since moodless and declarative utterances and indirect questions lack interrogative syntax, it seems there is a problem in the way of analysing replies. Harris (1991:80) suggests that most moodless and declarative utterances are used to gain agreement or disagreement from the interviewee, and hence can be

treated as a form of yes-no question. For example, in the 1987 British General Election, Jonathan Dimbley asks Thatcher, the following question to seek the answer yes or no: "So you expect the proportion in the National Health Service to shift across the private sector in the same way?" (Ibid.:125-6)

Clayman and Heritage (2002a:114) mention that interviewees practice the verbatim repetition of the words in a question to indicate the completion of an answer, as in the following extract:

(30) UK BBC *Newsnight*: 21 Oct 1993: Arming the Police

      IR: Jeremy Paxman   IE: David Brady

1   IR: →... Is: it your: view that the police should now
2   be armed?
3   IE:→ . But definitely. .hhh Ahm we: wuh- (.) we
4   have no rights as a society .hh to expect young
5   men (.) .hh to enter situations where (.) the
6   there is a fair: percentage, (.) of: armed (.)
7   people against them. It's- it's wrong: that they
8   should- we should ask them .hhh to risk their
9   lives, and to risk being shor, .hhh and the
10   chances of th- of them meeting an armed: uh:m
11   assailant is so much in- increase: .hh (.) that
12   police should definitely be armed
13   IR:→ And you don't
14   worry that arming the police might actually …

It is necessary to mention that turn transition from interviewees' answers to interviewer's questions is often messy and conflictual because it is not always easy to determine, especially in political interviews, when an interviewee's answer is complete. In the following extract, the interviewee pauses at line 7, and then he recognizes that his answer is incomplete, and recompletes it with a repeat of the question word "why".

(31) US PBS *Newshour*: 18 Sep 1992: Candidacy

      IR: July Woodruff   IE: Ross Perot

1   IR:→ So why don't you go ahead and (.) say: I'm (.) a
2   candidate for president?
3   IE: →   Because that's not (.) where
4   the organization is now. Our organization (.)
5   is totally focused on trying to get both
6   parties to do the job.
7   (0.7)
8   IE: →That's why.

Interviewers, like interviewees, avoid the vocal acknowledgements in order to establish the audience as an intended recipient of interviewee talk, and to manage a neutralistic stance towards the interviewee's statements, positions and opinions.

3.3.3 The Breaches of Interview Turn-Taking System

In section one we have shown that the question and answer format is the defining feature of interview turn-taking system. In fact this system is not a law of nature, and it can be departed from and returned to. Departures are sensitive and problematic to the persons who perform them, and sanctionable to their recipients. Interviewers may use questions followed by a statement to support the questions they ask. In the following extract, the interviewer thinks that the question may be unclear to the radio audience; she adds the contextual information that the interviewee could be arrested.

(32) UK BBC Radio *World at One*: 21 Aug 1984: Exclusion Order

　　　　IR: Ann Cadwallader　　　IE: Martin Galvin

1	IE:	I went to the north I went through whatever it
2		was I went through (0.2) precisely because: I
3		want to see peace in Ireland. And I recognise
4		that the only way that can come about .h is for
5		the British to withdraw:, to leave Ireland .hh
6		in peace and freedom, for the terrorist to get
7		out of Ireland.
8	IR:→	. hh Will you be coming back next year. The
9		exclusion order still stands against you
10	IE:→	Well it is up to the British, …

Interviewers may also use assertions rather than questions. They use statements to introduce their opinions. When they are accused of violating "neutralism", they defend themselves by pointing out that they were "only asking a question, or attribute the point of view being expressed to some third party. This maneuver is referred to as a shift in the speakers interactional "footing" (Goffman, 1981:60). In the following extract, the interviewer states that nuclear waste can be readily managed, and ascribes this view to another person (Clayman and Heritage, 2002a:152-4).

(33) US ABC *Nightline*: 6 June 1985: Nuclear Waste

　　　　IR: Ted Koppel　　　IE: James Steele

1	IE:	… And if you look et- simply the record in
2		the low level waste field over the last
3		fifteen to twenty years … the record is not
4		very good (0.3) an' it doesn't give one a cause
5		for optimism.
6	IR:→	You heard what Doctor Yalow said earlier in
7	→	this is broadcast she'll have an opportunity to
8	→	express her own opinions again but she seems to
9		feel that it is an eminently soluble problem,
10		and that ultimately that radioactive material
11		can be reduced, to manageable quantities, not put

12		in the bottom of a salt mine.
13	IE:	The point that she was making earlier
14		about (.) reprocessing of: the fuel rods go
15		right to the heart (.) of the way a lot of
16		people look at this particular issue …

The cited third party may also be a group or category of persons such as "Democrats", "Tories", or "critics", as in the following example:

(34) US PBS *NewsHour*: 22 July 1985: South Africa

IR: Jim Lehrer   IE: Herbert Beukes

1	IR:→	Finally Mister Ambassador as you know the
2		critics say that the purpose of the state of
3		emergency the real purpose of the state of
3		'mergeh- uh state of emergency is to suppress
5		political dissent. those who are opposed to the
6		apartheid government of South Africa. Is that so?

A generic and anonymous collectivity such as "people" may be used by interviewers:

(35) UK BBC Radio *Today*: June 1993: Bosnian Camps

IR: John Humphrys   IE: Ian Smedley

1	IR: →	hhh People have used the phrase concentration
2		camps: and the Bosnians themselves have used
3		that phrase. Do you believe there's any
4		justification for that at all?

The interviewers may not name the third party, they use an attributive verb in the passive voice with the agent deleted, e.g. "It is said that …", or "It has been reported that …".

(36) UK BBCTV *Newsnight*: June 1989: Thatcher

IR: John Cole   IE: Margaret Thatcher

1	IR:	.hhh It's been widely reported that these
2		matters are and particularly have put
3		.hhh heavy strains on your relationship with
4		the Foreign Secretary and indeed with the
5		Chancellor. How would you define that
6		relationship

Third party attributed statements are acting as questions, and the interviewees should respond.

Interviewees generally accept the footing shift, speaking on behalf of a third party rather than expressing the interviewer's own views. Three distinct forms of interviewee's response may be distinguished (Clayman and Heritage, 2002a:162-5).

(1) The interviewee cites the same third party as responsible for the previously expressed viewpoint.

(37) US ABC *Nightline*: 22 July 1985: South Africa

IR: Charles Gibson   IE: Reverend Allan Boesak

1	IR:		Reverend Boesak lemme a pick up a point uh
2		1 →	theAmbassador made. What- what assurances can
3			you give us .hh that (.) talks between
4			moderates in that country will take place .h when:
5			it seems that any black leader who is willing
6			to talk to the Government is branded as the
7			Ambassador said a collaborator and is then
8			punished.
9	IE:	2 →	Eh the Ambassador has it wrong.
10			It's not the people who want to talk with
11			the Government that are branded collaborators
12			it is: those people .hh who are given powers
13			by the Government that they use in an oppressive
14			fashion .hh within the township that are branded
15			collaborators …

(2) The interviewee simply refers to the disputed   viewpoint   without attributing it to anyone in particular. In the following extract, the interviewee does not use a possessive noun (e.g., "your premise") that would attach it to the interviewer or to anyone in particular.

(38) US PBS *NewsHour*: 22 July 1985: South Africa

IR: Jim Lehrer   IE: Herbert Beukes

1	IR:	Finally Mister Ambassador as you know the
2		critics say that the purpose of the state of
3		emergency the real purpose of the state of
4		'merjuh- uh state of emergency is to suppress
5		political dissent. those who are opposed to the
6		apartheid government of South Africa. Is that so
7		(.)
8	IE:→	I would have to: uh- take issue with
9		that premise. because …

(3) The interviewee may simply present a contrasting argument without referring to the prior viewpoint in any direct way.

(39) US PBS *NewsHour*: 22 July 1985: South Africa

IR: Jim Lehrer   IE: Herbert Beukes

1	IR:	What do you say to Bishop Tutu and others who
2		have said since the state of emergency was
3		declared that this will cause even more
4		violence rather than to stop the violence
5		that's in effect,
6		(0.4)

7	IE:	Wellit is pretty clear that something
8		has to be done. h.hh in order to stop the
9		violence. .hh Now the state of emergency: un
10		is intended .hh to clamp down on that violence.
11		h.hh Uh to stop it somehow …

Interviewee departures mean initiating some action before a new question has emerged on to the interactional floor. A common form of departure emerges in multi-interviewee interview where unaddressed interviewee seeks to comment on the talk of another interviewee, breaching the turn-taking system that interviewee turns are responses to interviewer questions. This breach initiates a question-answer sequence addressed to a co-interviewee, as in the following example:

(40) UK BBCTV *Panorama*: 28 Sep 1981: Socialist Credentials

   IR: David Dimbleby   IE1: Arthur Scargill   IE2: Roy Hattersley

1	IE1:	… the sooner they join the Social Democrats the
2		better for u s and better for them?
3	IE2:	Well let me a …
4	IE2:	→ David may I ask Mister Scargill a question you
5		asked him and he didn't answer a moment ago.
6		I've been in the Labour Party for thirty two
7		years.I was campaigning for it in South
8		Yorkshire when you were campaigning for a
9		different party. .hhhh I think my socialist
10		credentials stand up against yours in any an-
11		analysis. .hh Do you think people like me ought
12		to leave the Labour Party. (.) Do you want us
13		in.
14	IE1:	That's a decision that you have to make …
15		(continues)

(Clayman and Heritage, 2002a:131-40)

Another form of departure is when a question preface consists of a straightforward assertion of opinion. The interviewee will respond directly without waiting until the interviewer's question is completed. For example, in the following extract, the interviewer makes an assertion concerning the efforts made to rehabilitate criminals, and then he tries to build up a question about how to help the victims of crime. Because the statement is asserted by the interviewer on his own behalf, the interviewee treats it as a position on rehabilitation rather than an introduction to a question on the subject; therefore he treats the statement as a contentious action in its own right.

 (41) UK ATV *Afternoon Plus*: 7 Mar 1979: Victims' Rights

      IR: Unknown   IE: Lord Longford

1	IR:	.hhh Lord Longford erm (0.5) we- we- we do take

2		a lot of trouble (0.8) rehabilitating (0.5)
3		criminals. .hhh er: and long
4	IE:	Well I don't,I
5		don't
6	IR:	long term scheme for the criminals.
7	IE:	No I don't agree with that at all (sir).
8	IR:	But we don't seem to
9	IE:	Sorry I don't agree with
10	IR:	I- I see. Well
11	IE:	that statement not a- no way. We do very
12	IR:	well
13	IE:	little to rehabilitate criminals
14	IR:	Well we seem
15		to spend a lot of money on it even if we do
16		little.
17	IE:	Very little.
18	IR:	(coughs) What are your recommendations
19		to giving the victim a better deal?

Conclusion

The interview turn-taking system is highly distinctive. Interviewers restrict themselves to questioning, and interviewees restrict themselves to answering them. This constrain shapes the form taken by the participants' talk and the order in which they talk to the following pattern:

IR: Question

IE: Answer

IR: Question

IE: Answer

The turn-taking processes are closely associated with the basic task of the political interviews – the elicitation of talk that is expressly produced for an overhearing audience by interviewers who should restrict themselves to questioning, and interviewees restrict themselves to answering questions, or at least responding to them. It is true that some interviewees are evasive in their responses to questions and, in this sense, fail to "answer" them appropriately.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bull, Peter (1994). "On identifying questions, replies and non-replies in political
        interviews. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 13(2):115-31.

Clayman, Stephen (1988).Displaying neutrality in television news
        Interviews. *Social Problems*,35 (4):474-92.

Clayman, Steven and John Heritage (2002a). *The News Interview*: *Journalists
        and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
        Press.

_____(2002b). "Questioning Presidents: journalistic deference and adversarialness in the press conferences of Eisenhour and Reagan." *Journal of Communication*, 52: in Press.

Cohen, Akiba (1987). *The Television Interview*. London : Sage

Goffman, Erving (1981). *Forms of Talk*. London: Basil Blackwell.

Greatbatch, David (1986a). "Aspects of topical organization in news interviews: the use of agenda-shifting procedures by interviewers", *Media, Culture, and Society*, 8(4):441-55.

_____(1988). A turn-taking system for British news interviews.*Language in Society*,17 (3):401-30.

Harris, Sandra (1991). "Evasive Action: How Politicians Respond to Questions in Political Interviews." In P. Seannell (ed.) *Broadcast Talk*, pp.76-99. London: Sage.

Heritage, John (1985) "Analysing News Interviews: Aspects of the Production of Talk for an Overhearing Audience", pp.95-117 in T. Van Dijk(eds.) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Vol. 3:"Discourse and Dialogue". New York: Academic Press.

Heritage , John and David Greatbatch (1991). *On the institutional character of the institutional talk: The case of news interviews.* In D. Boden and D.H. Zimmerman (Eds.*). Talk and social structure* (pp. 93-137). Berkerly: University of California Press.

Heritage, John and Andrew Roth (1995). "Grammar and Institution: Questions and Questioning in the Broadcast News Interview. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*. 28(1):1-60.

Jucker, Andreas (1986). *News Interviews: A Pragmalinguistic Analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Labov , W. , and D. Fanshel (1977). *Therapeutic discourse : psychotherapy as conversation.* New York: Academic.

Pomerantz , A.M. (1980). *Telling me side : " Limited access" as a " Fishing " device*. Sociological Inquiry , 50 : 186-98.

Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvik (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Roth, Andrew (1998a). "Who makes news: descriptions of television news interviewers' public personae." *Media, Culture, and Society*, 20(I):79-107.

Sacks, H. , E. A. Schegloff and G. Jefferson (1974). ″A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation″. *Language* 50 : 696-735.

Schegliff, E. A. (1984). On some questions and ambiguities in conversation. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage Eds.) *Structures of social action* (pp. 28-52). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

نظام أخذ الأدوار في المقابلة السياسية الأذاعية والتلفزيونية

تلعب المقابلـة السياسية دورا كبيـرا فـي الأذاعـة والتلفزيـون والعمليـة الساسـية.وبنـاءا على ذلك حظيت المقابلة بأهتمـام الباحثين وبالتحديد ضمن أطـار تحليل الخطاب. تركزت البحوث على نظام أخذ الأدوار في المقابلـة.أن نظـام أخذ الأدوار في المقابلة السياسية هو نتاج العمل الأذاعـي والتلفزيوني بالأضـافة الـى مكانـة ذلك العمل فـي الأنظمـة الأقتصـادية والسياسية للديمقراطيات الغربية.يدرك المشـاركون فـي المقابلة بأن كلامهم موجه للجمهور، وأدوارهم هي المقابل (interviewer) والمتقابل   (interviewee) .

يتكون نظام أخذ الأدوار في المقابلة بشكل أسـاسـي مـن أسـئلة وأجوبـة، وهذه الأدوار محددة مسبقا فالمقابل يسئل والمتقابل يجيب.يستخدم المقابل جميـع أنواع الأسـئلة المستخدمة في اللغة الأنكليزيـة للحصول على المعلومات المطلوبة،والتي تشمل أسئلة نعم-لا والأسئلة الأسـتفهامية   (Wh-questions) والأسـئلة الخياريـة وغيـر ذلك.تسـتخدم أسـئلة نعـم-لا للحصول على موافقة أو عدم موافقة المتقابل.يجيب المتقابل على الأسئلة الموجهة اليه وفي بعض الأحيان يراوغ في أجابته أو يتجنب أعطاء موقف محدد.