

A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF INTERRUPTION,
MODERATOR ROLE, AND ADDRESS
TERMS IN ARAB AND AMERICAN
PANEL NEWS INTERVIEWS

BY

YOUSEF IBRAHIM AL-ROJAIE

Bachelor of Arts
King Saud University
Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
1995

Master of Arts
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado
2001

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
In partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
December, 2003

THESIS
2003D
AHEAD

A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF INTERRUPTION,
MODERATOR ROLE, AND ADDRESS
TERMS IN ARABIC AND AMERICAN
PANEL NEWS INTERVIEWS

Thesis Approved:

C. L. Madler

Thesis Advisor

Janez Millock

C. L. Madler for R. Shoeney

Hejran Sarlyzi

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The accomplishment of this dissertation could not have been possible without many people's support and help. I would like to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to all the people who have played significant roles during my Ph.D. studies. First, I am deeply grateful to Dr. Carol Lynn Moder, my mentor and major advisor, not only for her guidance and support of this research, but also for introducing me to discourse analysis upon which much this study has been based. Her professional example is a constant source of inspiration. I am also extremely grateful to my wonderful dissertation committee, Dr. Gene Halleck, Dr. Ravi Sheorey, and Dr. Kouider Mokhtari, who all have provided assistance and friendship throughout researching and writing of this work.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my friends for their support, encouragement, and help. Special thanks go to Dr. AbdulAziz al-Ahmad for his enormous efforts with my scholarship. I am also appreciative to other relatives, my father and mother-in law, and my friends, Khalid Abalalkhail and Mansour al-Gefari for their modal support.

Finally, I thank my mother for her support, patience, and prayers. I am indebted to my wife, Maha, for her continuous encouragement, love, devotion, and enthusiastic support. To my daughter, Shaden, I am indebted to her cheerfulness and love. I dedicate this work to my mother, wife, and my beloved friend, Abdullah al-Nusayyan, who passed away just few hours before I defended this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	1
Rationale.....	1
Focus and Scope.....	5
Organization of the Study.....	6
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	10
Introduction.....	10
Related Approaches of Discourse Analysis.....	10
Speech act theory (Pragmatic Approach).....	11
Interactional Sociolinguistics.....	12
The Ethnography of Communication.....	15
Political Interview as a Speech Event.....	16
Previous studies on political interviews.....	21
Previous studies on televised panel news interviews.....	26
Interruption.....	30
Interruption in Political Discourse.....	36
The Moderator's Role.....	41
Address Terms.....	48
Address terms in American English.....	52
Address terms in Arabic.....	55
Address terms use in political interviews and debates.....	59
III. METHODOLOGY.....	64
Introduction.....	64
Data Selection.....	64
Description of the Arabic program (Al-Jazeera ' <i>The Opposing Sides</i> ')....	72
Description of the English program (PBS <i>NewsHour</i>).....	77
Data Analysis.....	78
Transcription.....	78

Chapter	Page
IV. INTERRUPTION	95
Introduction.....	95
Participants' framing of the context.....	96
Arabic participants' framing of panel news interviews	97
English-speakers' framing of panel news interviews	99
Arabic Interviews.....	100
Overview of the results	100
1. 'The Increasing International Alliance Against America'	102
2. 'The Iraqi Opposition'	107
3. 'Kurds and the Expected Changes in Iraq'	114
4. 'Arab Peoples and the Resistance of American Plans'	122
5. 'Arab Countries and the Expected American Attack on Iraq'	128
Summary and Discussion.....	133
English Interviews	134
Overview of the results	134
1. War or Diplomacy.....	136
2. After the War: The U.N.'s Role.....	141
3. Shields & Brooks # 1	144
4. Shields & Brooks # 2	147
5. Talk of War.....	150
Summary and Discussion.....	153
Comparison between Arabic and English Speakers' Usage of Interruption.....	155
V. THE MODERATOR'S ROLE.....	162
Introduction.....	162
First Task: Encouraging Disagreement between Interviewees	163
Arabic Interviews.....	163
English Interviews	169
Second Task: Challenging the Interviewees	173
Arabic Interviews.....	174
English Interviews	181
Third Task: Managing an Escalating Disagreement.....	184
Conclusions.....	191
VI. ADDRESS TERMS.....	193
Introduction	193
Arabic interviews.....	194
Overview of the findings	194
1. 'The Increasing International Alliance against America'	202
2. 'The Iraqi Opposition'	213
3. 'Kurds and the Expected Changes in Iraq'	218

Chapter	Page
4. ‘Arab Peoples and their Resistance to the American Plans’	224
5. ‘Arab Countries and the Expected American Attack on Iraq’	233
Summary and Conclusions	240
English interviews.....	242
Overview of the results	242
1. War or Diplomacy	245
2. After the War: the U.N.’s Role	249
3. Shields and Brooks # 1	252
4. Shields and Brooks # 2	255
5. Talk of War.....	258
Summary and Conclusions	261
Comparison between Arabic and English Speakers’ Usage of Address Terms ..	262
 VII. CONCLUSIONS	 271
Summary of findings.....	271
Interruption	271
The Moderator’s Role.....	272
Address Terms	274
Limitations	277
Implications and Applications	279
Implications for future research.....	285
 REFERENCES	 287

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
 Chapter III	
Table : 1 Times of the editions of the English program.....	78
Table: (2) Transcript Symbols adapted from Clayman & Heritage	80
 Chapter IV	
Table 1: The average relative frequency of using interruptions in all Arabic Interviews.....	100
Table 2: The average use of each function of interruptions in all Arabic Interviews.....	101
Table 3: The frequency distribution of interruptions in ‘the increasing alliance’.....	103
Table 4: The functions of using interruptions in ‘the increasing alliance’	104
Table 5: The relative frequency of using interruptions in ‘The Iraqi opposition’	108
Table 6: The function of using interruptions in ‘The Iraqi Opposition’	109
Table 7: The frequency of using address terms in ‘Kurds’	115
Table 8: The function of using interruptions in ‘Kurds’	116
Table 9: The frequency of using interruptions in ‘Arab Peoples’	123
Table 10: The function of using interruptions in ‘Arab Peoples’	124
Table 11: The frequency of using interruptions in ‘Arab countries’	130
Table 12: The function of using interruptions in ‘Arab Countries’	132
Table 13: The average relative frequency of using interruptions in all English interviews	134
Table :14 The average use of each function of interruption in all English Interviews.....	136
Table 15: The frequency of using interruptions in War or Diplomacy.....	138
Table 16: The function of using interruptions in War or Diplomacy	138
Table 17: The relative frequency of using interruption in After the War: The U.N.’s.....	143
Table 18: The functions of using interruptions in After the War: The U.N.’s Role.....	144
Table 19: The relative frequency of using interruption in Shields and Brooks 1	145
Table 20: The function of using interruptions in Shields & Brooks # 1	146

Table	Page
Table 21: The frequency of using interruption in Shields and Brooks 2	148
Table 22: The function of using interruptions in Shields and Brooks # 2	149
Table 23: The relative frequency of using interruption in Talk of War.....	151
Table 24: The function of using interruptions in Talk of War.....	151
Table 25 The average relative frequency of using interruption by Arabic and English participants.....	156
Table 26: The average use of each function of interruption by Arabic (A.) and English (E.) speakers	158

Chapter V.

Table 1: Number of attempts by the Arabic moderator to encourage disagreement between the interviewees.....	164
Table 2: Number of attempts by the American moderator to encourage disagreement between the interviewees.....	170
Table 3: Number of attempts by the Arabic moderator to challenge the IEs	174
Table 4: Number of attempts by the American moderator to challenge the IEs	181

Chapter VI.

Table 1: The total average of frequency and percentage of using address terms in all the five Arabic interviews.....	194
Table 2: The average frequency and percentage of each types of address terms used in all the five Arabic interviews.....	195
Table 3: The average and percentage of the functions of using address terms by all participants in the entire five Arabic interviews	197
Table 4: The frequency of using address terms in ‘The increasing international alliance against America’	202
Table 5: The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used.....	205
Table 6: The function of using address terms by each speaker	206
Table 7: The frequency of using address terms in ‘The Iraqi opposition’	213
Table 8: The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used	214
Table 9: The functions of using address terms by each speaker	216
Table 10: The frequency of using address terms in ‘Kurds’	220
Table 11: The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used in ‘Kurds’	221
Table 12: The functions of using address terms by each speaker	221
Table 13: The frequency of using address terms in ‘Arab resistance’	225
Table 14: The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used in ‘Arab resistance’	226
Table 15: The functions of using address terms by each speaker in ‘Arab resistance’	227

Table	Page
Table 16:	The frequency of using address terms in ‘Arab countries’234
Table 17:	The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used in ‘Arab countries’235
Table 18:	The functions of using address terms by each speaker in ‘Arab countries’237
Table 19:	The total average of frequency and percentage of using address terms in all the five English interviews242
Table 20:	The average frequency and percentage of each type of address term used in all the five English interviews.....243
Table 21:	The average and percentage of the functions of using address terms by each speaker in all five English interviews.....244
Table 22:	The frequency of using address terms in War or Diplomacy245
Table 23:	The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used in War or Diplomacy.....247
Table 24:	The functions of using address terms by each speaker in War or Diplomacy.....248
Table 25:	The frequency of using address terms in After the War: The U.N.’s Role249
Table 26:	The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used in After the War: The U.N.’s Role250
Table 27:	The functions of using address terms by each speaker in After the War: The U.N.’s Role250
Table 28:	The frequency of using address terms in Shields and Brooks253
Table 29:	The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used in Shields and Brooks # 1254
Table 29:	The functions of using address terms by each speaker in Shields and Brooks # 1255
Table 30:	The frequency of using address terms in Shields and Brooks # 2 ..256
Table 31:	The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used in Shields and Brooks # 2256
Table 32:	The functions of using address terms by each speaker in Shields and Brooks 2258
Table 33:	The frequency of using address terms in Talk of War.....259
Table 34:	The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used in Talk of War.....260
Table 35:	The functions of using address terms by each speaker in Talk of War.....260
Table 36:	The total average of frequency and percentage of using address terms by both Arabic and English speakers.....263
Table 37:	The total average and percentage of each type of address terms used by Arabic (A) and English (E.) speakers.....267
Table 38:	The average and percentage of the functions of using address terms by Arabic and English participants269

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

As a field of linguistics, discourse analysis has witnessed great importance and attention in the last four decades by researchers from a variety of disciplines, including sociology, anthropology, social psychology, sociolinguistics, philosophy, and mass communication (Dijk, 1985). Rather than looking at small parts of language, such as sounds, words, and sentences, researchers use discourse analysis to examine large chunks of language beyond the sentence level, such as written texts or spoken interactions, in order to examine the language form and function used by members of a speech community. Moreover, discourse analysis identifies linguistic features that characterize different genres, as well as social and cultural factors that help in our interpretation and understanding of different texts and types of speech. Therefore, discourse analysis offers better understanding of the meaning of language use than if the analysis is only concerned with the study of smaller bits of language.

Rationale

At the same time, there has been a growing interest among researchers to employ discourse analysis to identify and explore the influence of cultural variability on using

language in various contexts and encounters. Researchers have also become more interested in confirming the universality and applicability of the theories and frameworks based mostly on Anglo-American societies that have been developed in recent years to describe and explain language use. On the basis of the assumption that speakers of different languages and cultural backgrounds are expected to have different norms, rules, and expectations in language interaction, researchers have also been motivated to examine the link between culture and language use and conversational style since differences in culture would result in some cases in miscommunication or stereotyping in cross or intercultural communication. Accordingly, it would be interesting to employ discourse analysis to explore the influence of cultural variation between members of two societies on their linguistic spoken communication. Moreover, it would be of great interest and importance to investigate such variability in the use of certain linguistic features by speakers from two different languages and cultures during a formal encounter of interaction. Such types of studies provide more insights into the cultural norms and social rules that would contribute to shaping the speakers' linguistic behavior and use, specifically in spoken interaction. As a type of spoken interaction, news interviews serve as an excellent opportunity for researchers to explore such variation. Clayman and Heritage (2002) describe the importance of studying news interviews:

The rise of the news interview has made it a significant component of the contemporary public sphere, and hence worthy of social scientific attention. It is a locus of direct and essentially unscripted encounters between journalists and a wide range of public figures, including government officials at the highest levels. It is an arena in which journalists perform certain core democratic function: soliciting statements of official policy, holding officials accountable for their

actions, and managing the parameters of public debate, all of this under the immediate scrutiny of the citizenry (p.2).

For these reasons as well as the assumption that language use in news interviews is highly expected to be influenced by numerous variables, such as social order, conversational style, cultural expectations and norms, etc, a growing body of studies have been conducted recently by researchers from a variety of disciplines. These researchers have used discourse analysis to describe the language use in news interviews, focusing on an array of issues, such as their structure and organization (e.g., Heritage, Clayman, and Zimmerman), turn-taking system (e.g., Heritage & Clayman, 1991), neutrality (e.g., Clayman, 2001, 2002; Bull, 1994), and institutional conditions (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991). Furthermore, there have been other studies conducted to examine the influence of sociocultural factors on the participants' use of language (e.g., Al-Aridi, 1987). Nevertheless, studies conducted to examine news interviews are still very few, particularly those focusing on Arabic speakers. They also did not cover most linguistic features associated with participation in such a context, such as interruption, address terms, disagreement, etc.

As the director of the news interview, the moderator plays a vital role in shaping the discussion flow during the interview through the fulfillment of various tasks, such as asking questions, selecting topics for discussion, monitoring the time of the interview, etc. In addition, there are other tasks, such as encouraging disagreement, challenging the interviewees, managing disagreement between them, etc, which the moderator also is in charge of to make the interview more entertaining and interesting to the audience. As the result of the difference in norms and expectations across cultures, I predict that the

fulfillment of such tasks by the moderator would vary. Yet, no single study has been conducted to investigate such a variation.

Among the other linguistic features that need further exploration are the use of address terms in news interviews, and how the cultural and linguistic variability of speakers could influence their use. The importance of address terms lies in their ability to index a variety of aspects associated with the relationship between the interlocutors, such as social order and status, intimacy and familiarity, etc. Furthermore, although previous research (e.g., Slobin, Miller, and Porter, 1968; McIntire, 1972; Al-Aridi, 1987) indicates that the use of address terms varies across contexts and cultures. Their use has not been fully examined, specifically in the context of news interviews and by speakers from Arab culture.

Likewise, the use of interruption has been found to involve a multifunctional nature, and its use is not necessarily limited to the basic function of preventing the first speaker to finish his/her talk, which is usually interpreted as a violation of normal conversational rules. Researchers (e.g., Zupnik, 2000; Scollon & Scollon, 1981) have found that speakers from different cultures vary in their use and interpretation of conversational interruption due to their different conversational norms and expectations, resulting in some cases in miscommunication and stereotyping, particularly in cross-cultural communication (e.g., Zupnik, 2000; Kochman, 1981; Tannen, 1984). Similarly, other researchers (e.g., Tannen, 1993) assert that context should be taken into consideration in interpreting the use of interruption, including textual, relational, institutional constraints, and conversational styles. Apart from a few studies (e.g., Bull & Mayor, 1988; Yeminci, 2001) researchers have not yet explored the differences in the use

of interruption in a context like news interviews by comparing its use by speakers from different cultures. For example, there is no single study, to my knowledge, that compared the use of interruption by Arabic and English speakers in news interviews.

Focus and Scope

Therefore, the current study seeks to address the various gaps in the literature described above by means of analysis of panel news interviews, one type of news interview in which two interviewees with different ideological views debate about a certain topic under the direction of one moderator. To do so, this study will accomplish a descriptive, comparative, and analytical examination of panel news interviews. In particular, I intend to answer the following questions:

1. What are the similarities and differences between Arabic and English speakers in their use of interruption in panel news interviews?
2. What are the similarities and differences between Arabic and English speakers in their performance of their role as moderators in panel news interviews?
3. What are the similarities and differences between Arabic and English speakers in their language use of address terms in panel news interviews?

For the first research question, I intend to examine the cultural variation between Arabic and English speakers in their performance of their role as moderators, focusing on three tasks: encouraging disagreement, challenging the interviewees, and managing escalating disagreement. My examination of the moderator's role will not be comparative only; rather, it will describe the performance of the moderator's role in the specific tasks through analysis of numerous examples.

For both the second and third research question, I intend to examine the influence of cultural variability on the use of address terms and interruption at the level of frequency and function of use. Similar to the first research question, I will support my qualitative analysis of the use of such linguistic features with a quantitative one to strengthen the validity of the results obtained in the study.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation consists of seven chapters. Chapter II provides a review of the literature on related approaches of discourse analysis and studies relevant to the study of the news interviews as well as the linguistic phenomena of address terms and interruption. The three approaches of discourse analysis related to this study are speech act theory Austin (1962; Searle, 1969), interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 1982), and the ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1972). In addition, I review studies that examined news interviews and panel news interviews in particular. Furthermore, I review the literature on the use of address terms, with special emphasis on address terms usage in both Arabic and American English within the context of news interviews. Similarly, I review the studies on the use of interruption in news interviews, specifically by Arabic and English speakers.

In Chapter III, I outline the research methodology that I used to carry out the current study. In particular, I describe in detail the procedures employed in selecting the database for this study, with special emphasis on controlling the variables that may influence the results of the study. Furthermore, I provide a comprehensive and thorough description of the Arab and the American programs studied in the study, covering their format, content, and hosts. I illustrate in the rest of the chapter the process of data

analysis, including the preparation of data for analysis involving the transcription and coding of the data, and the process used to locate sequences that contain the use of address terms and interruption.

In Chapter IV, I examine the use of interruption by Arabic and English-speaking participants in the database. In particular, I examine the use of interruption in each interview quantitatively in terms of the frequency and function of use. Furthermore, I describe and analyze some examples of the functions of interruption from each interview in order to come up with a thorough and deep examination of functions of interruption, taking into account the possible situational, personal, contextual, and cultural factors that would influence the use of interruption. At the end of the chapter, I compare the findings resulting from the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the database to find the similarities and differences between Arabic and English speakers in their use of interruption, which may be due to the cultural variation.

In Chapter V, I examine the moderator's role in panel news interviews, focusing on three tasks: encouraging disagreement, challenging the interviewees, and managing escalating disagreement. For each one of these tasks, I describe the moderator's fulfillment of it through illustrative examples, followed by a brief analysis with the purpose to examine all the situational, contextual, and cultural reasons in particular that could contribute to influencing the language use of the participants. Furthermore, at the end of the chapter, I compare and contrast the Arab and American moderators' performance of such tasks in order to find the similarities and differences between them that may be due to cultural variation. Moreover, I compare the findings of the current

study with the results of previous studies for the purpose of confirmation or refutation of their prior observations.

In Chapter VI, I examine the address terms usage by Arabic and English-speaking participants in the interviews studied in this dissertation. For each interview, I present a general overview, including the participants, the opposing views discussed, and the level of disagreement and dispute seen in the interview. Next, I provide a general quantitative description of the frequency of use of address terms by the moderator and the interviewees. I then examine the types of address terms used and their frequency and percentage of use. The final level of examining the use of address terms is describing the functions of their use, followed by analytical examination of such functions through some examples to give insights into the contextual and cultural factors that determine the use of address terms for a certain function. After examining all Arab and American interviews, I present a comparison between Arabic and English speakers' use of address terms based on the quantitative analysis of the frequency, types, and functions of use as well as the quantitative examination of some examples. Further, I compare the findings of the current study with the results of previous research to find any discrepancies, if any.

In Chapter VII, I conclude my investigation of the cultural variation between Arabic and English speakers in their language use of address terms and interruption as well as their performance of certain tasks that are part of their role as moderators. In addition, I present a number of limitations that should be considered before generalizing the findings of the results. Furthermore, I outline a list of implications of the findings of the current study for the field, and how these results could contribute in practical applications in our everyday life. Finally, I suggest what further research could be done

to further our understanding of the influence of cultural variability on the use of language in the context of news interviews.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In this chapter, I review the related approaches of discourse analysis and language and culture-specific studies relevant to the study of news interviews, with special focus on the three phenomena investigated in this study: the moderator's role, address terms, and interruption. Since the current study examines the cultural variation in using such linguistic features, this chapter will review literature on the cultural-specific features of Arabic and English speakers in their use of these linguistic features, particularly in the context of news interviews. Accordingly, this chapter is organized as follows: related approaches to discourse analysis; political interview as a speech event; the role of the moderator; address terms, and interruption.

Related Approaches of Discourse Analysis

Like other fields of enquiry, there are a number of approaches to discourse analysis used throughout the fields. Schiffrin (1994) describes and compares six widely used approaches to discourse: speech act theory, interactional sociolinguistics, pragmatics, ethnography of communication, and variation analysis. All of these approaches have originated and developed from different fields and different scholars. For example, interactional sociolinguistics stemmed from the fields of linguistics, anthropology, and sociology. Although there is an overlap between these approaches,

they have different theoretical and methodological ways of examining language, and that influences its assumptions and beliefs about language. Before proceeding to a review of the related literature to the main focus of the study, it would be meaningful to briefly describe the related approaches of discourse analysis to the current study in general.

Speech act theory (Pragmatic Approach)

Speech act theory is an approach to language that was first presented and developed by the philosopher, John Austin (1962). Austin's ideas influenced other researchers of language, particularly John Searle, who expanded Austin's first ideas of the speech act and established speech act theory as a major framework for the study of human communication in subsequent studies (1969, 1979). As an approach to discourse analysis, this view is based on "the basic belief that language is used to perform actions – with the functions of language" (Schiffrin, 1994: 90).

According to this theory, utterances can perform three separate acts: (1) locutionary act, which refers to the actual production of words or utterances, (2) illocutionary act (the speaker's intended meaning), and (3) perlocutionary act (the listener's understanding of the meaning of the message). Austin focused on illocutionary acts, maintaining that they form the basis (illocutionary force) in interpreting and performing an utterance by the listener. For example, to say "I'm sorry" has the illocutionary force of an apology, and it would be interpreted as such if the listener has the same interpretation.

In addition, Austin distinguishes between constative (declarative) acts, which have truth values (being true or false), and performative acts, which do not. According to Austin, both performatives and constatives have to meet textual and conditional

conditions in order to understand and interpret their functions. Instead of conditions, as Austin maintains, Searle argues that people need to have shared rules that are part of their linguistic competence in order to interpret and perform speech acts. Searle's rules are like Austin's conditions in drawing upon text and context (Schiffrin, 1994).

In summary, speech acts can be identified by their illocutionary force as well as their textual and contextual conditions. Once identified, the intended meaning of speech acts can then be analyzed within a situational or cultural context. Therefore, speech act theory leads discourse analysts to discover the multifunctionality of utterances in discourse by examining the linguistic and contextual conditions underlying the realization of a particular act (Schiffrin, 1994). It contributes to the current study by making it possible to identify interruption and address terms as speech acts in which their illocutionary force and function of use can be determined and analyzed within the situational context of panel news interviews and through the cultural backgrounds of the speakers of Arabic and English. The same thing can be said about the moderator's three tasks of challenging, disagreeing, and managing disagreement.

Interactional Sociolinguistics

In using interactional sociolinguistics, discourse analysts combine the concepts of the anthropologist John Gumperz (1982a, 1982b) and the sociologist Erving Goffman (1967, 1974, and 1981), who both provided a set of notions and tools that constitute a framework within which language in face-to-face interaction can be analyzed. Goffman was not interested in language per se but rather in language as a source of the underlying social order. Moreover, Goffman's notions of face and footing help in understanding of the variation in language use within specific situational contexts. Gumperz, on the other

hand, was interested in discourse strategies (contextualization cues), which speakers rely on to give meaning to utterances, such as intonation, speech rhythm, lexical, phonetic, syntactic, and textual options (Schiffrin, 1994: 402). According to Gumperz (1982a), to interpret the contextualization cues, speakers rely on their culture rather than on their pragmatic knowledge. Although both philosophers focus on the dynamics of language in interaction, Goffman is more interested in the role of language in different aspects of social life, whereas Gumperz puts culture before society (Schiffrin, 1994).

Central to interactional sociolinguistics is the notion of context, which covers a wide range of social and cultural factors, such as personal identity, social relations, cultural knowledge, and social and cultural expectations. 'Frame' is also one of the major concerns of interactional sociolinguistics. According to Goffman (1974), 'frame' refers to how people organize and manage their social interactions. Interactional sociolinguists use these notions as ways to situate or interpret the meaning of utterances and relate these with the social context in which language is used, and attempt to find how the meaning contributed to the process and outcome of an interaction.

Researchers use interactional sociolinguistics to find answers to questions associated with how the social order of people influences their use of language in different types of interactional situations. Because of its importance in presenting self, a number of researchers focused their attention on studying a particular interactional situation, interview. Unlike other types of interaction, interviews, in their various types, provide an excellent example of showing how language is used for self presentation for all its participants- interviewer and interviewees. Self presentation is also important for the participating interviewees because of its reflection on their success or failure in

accomplishing their goals in attending these interviews, whether it was in a job, political, or language proficiency interview. Moreover, discourse analysts attempt to uncover sources of miscommunication that may arise when the contextualization cues are not shared by interactants. Akinnaso and Ajitutu (1982), for example, examined a set of simulated job interviews done by African American students in order to highlight the communicative conditions that can lead to negative evaluation and failure in these interviews. After comparing the interviewees' performance to established conventions of interview interaction, the researchers analyzed the use of culture-specific prosodic cues, such as back channel, vowel lengthening, rhythm, and voice quality, and showed how they negatively influenced their evaluation. Moreover, the researchers analyzed how failure to infer the underlying intent of the interviewer's questions beyond their literal meaning signaled negative presentation of self. This, in turn, could lead to failure in job interviews, because the interviewees did not have shared expectations and assumptions with the interviewers about interview conventions.

The relevance of interactional sociolinguistics in the current study comes from its focus on the situational context in interpreting language use. Hence, it provides us with notions and tools, such as social order, face, and cultural expectations to uncover the impact of cultural background, as well as the situational context of news interviews on the language use by Arabic-and English-speaking participants. Furthermore, this approach enables us to examine the contextualization cues on which interlocutors rely to give meaning to their use of address terms and interruption. The contextualization cues, such as intonation, tone, and syntactic options will also be examined to explore the

moderators' expressive quality in performing the three tasks investigated in the current study in news interviews.

The Ethnography of Communication

Like interactional sociolinguistics, the ethnography of communication approach is not concerned with studying language in isolation but rather within a social and/or cultural setting. However, the ethnography of communication defines context as the main factor in understanding communicative behaviors of a certain group of people (speech community), and it expands its focus to include more communicative usages, forms, and functions available for communication. Instead of focusing on social identity and social life as in interactional sociolinguistics, discourse analysts use the ethnography of communication to analyze patterns of communication of certain speech communities as part of their cultural knowledge and practice.

According to Schiffrin (1994: 185), the ethnography of communication approach “seeks to discover and analyze the structures and functions of communicating that organize the use of language in specific situations, events, and acts.” In this approach, discourse analysts do not just focus on specific structures and forms within different types of speech events, but also on goals, settings, participants, and other acts that constitute the speech events (Schiffrin, 1994). In addition, this approach seeks to analyze patterns of communication as part of cultural knowledge and behavior used by members of a particular culture or background. Examples of studies done using this approach are cultural differences in framing between American and Japanese speakers in group discussion (Watanabe, 1993), differences between native and non-native speakers in language proficiency interviews (Moder and Halleck, 1998), and questions in interviews

(Schiffrin, 1994). By using this approach, discourse analysts, therefore, focus on specific speech acts, such as questions, opening and ending, and answers, in specific speech events, e.g. group discussion, desk interviews, or sociolinguistic interviews, with the emphasis on discovering differences between cultures in using linguistic features in these speech events.

In short, the ethnography of communication approach to discourse attempts to discover how language use is culturally organized. Thus, it helps in understanding how communicative competence (Hymes, 1972) works; how the cultural knowledge of speakers is reflected and integrated with their linguistic competence. It answers questions concerning the relationship between a speech community (a cultural group) and their communicative knowledge (language use) during speech events and situations. In this study, the approach of ethnography of communication contributes by providing theoretical emphasis on the impact of context and culture on language use. Thus, the analysis of the use of interruption and address terms as well as the moderator's performance of their tasks will be based on the contextual influence of news interviews in addition to the cultural backgrounds of Arabic- and English-speaking participants, who may have different rules and norms for communication within such a context. Moreover, using Hymes's SPEAKING grid enables us to look at the various possible variables that would determine the patterns of language use within the context of news interviews.

Political Interview as a Speech Event

As pointed out by Young and He (1998), interviews, whether defined as speech events (Hymes, 1972), or speech activities (Gumperz (1982a) occur within a context of situation and a context of culture, and its frame depends, to a large extent, on the

participants' understanding and interpretation of their expected role and self. Therefore, when studying interviews, scholars attempt to examine the differences between participants (interviewer(s) and interviewee(s) in language use due to unshared cultural expectations concerning their roles, goals, and settings. To accomplish this, researchers employed certain methods, such as the SPEAKING grid, which was developed by Hymes (1972), whose notions and ideas also were used in establishing and developing the ethnography of communication approach. This grid stands for Setting, Participants, Ends, Act sequence, Key, Instrumentalities, Norms, and Genre. Researchers are also interested in analyzing participants' communicative patterns and behaviors in interviews as a result of the fact that interviews, unlike other types of speech activities, such as conversation and group discussion, are governed by some rules and expectations that may vary throughout cultures and can lead to misunderstanding. For example, political interviews reflect the institutional context in which they are represented through their speech exchange system, participants' role, and goals, and participants are expected to perform in a predefined way according to their understanding of the setting, their goals, and roles. Therefore, one of discourse analysts' major goals in examining interviews is to investigate cross-cultural differences concerning these issues, particularly in interviews where participants are usually from different cultures, such as language proficiency interviews and political interviews.

As pointed out by Schiffrin (1994), although interviews, in general, may share some common core, in which one person seeks to gain information from another, they also differ among themselves in many ways in terms of structure and role expectation of participants. Using the approach of ethnography of communication, Schiffrin used

Hymes's SPEAKING grid to describe and compare two varieties of interviews: desk interviews and sociolinguistic research interviews. Schiffrin identified a number of differences between the two types of interviews with regard to their Participants, Ends, Act sequence, and Genre. In terms of Ends, for example, she noted that while reference interviews' participants share a common end (solving the patron's inquiry) participants in the sociolinguistic interview may not both have clear goals for the interview. While the interviewee in the sociolinguistic interview may be aware of the general interests of the interviewer, he or she may not be aware of the specific language patterns or attitudes the researcher is trying to discover or describe. As a result of these asymmetric roles and ends of participants in the sociolinguistic interview, the amount and type of questions used were found to be different from those used in desk interviews.

According to Blum-Kulka (1983: 131), as a type of interview, political interviews "form a highly structured rule-governed speech event, governed by genre-specific discourse rules." Similarly, Al-Aridi (1987), considers political television interviews as forming structured speech events governed by genre-specific discourse rules and norms. Unlike ordinary conversation, participants in news interviews follow an institutional and formal turn-taking system (Roth & Olsher, 1997) in which they have the roles of either the interviewer or the interviewee. Accordingly, participants in news interviews restrict themselves to asking questions or responding to them (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991). One of these discourse rules is that interviewers and interviewees have certain rules and responsibilities that may not be reversed. For example, interviewers have the right to formulate and ask questions, and that right is not expected to be performed by the interviewees. Another rule is that the interviewers and the interviewees adhere to

unwritten or implicit set of communicative norms, which govern how the interviewers and interviewees interact with each other during the interview. An example of these rules is that the interviewer should maintain a neutralistic stance with the interviewees, and that is facilitated by the turn-taking system provided in news interviews in which the interviewer is restricted to asking questions, with limited options for assertions (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991). An example of an implicit norm in news interviews can be the use of address terms (Blum-Kulka, 1983). This claim is based on analysis on political interviews Israeli television in which interviewers are addressed deferentially whereas interviewees are not addressed at all. However, this claim may be limited to the Israeli political program examined by Blum-Kulka (1983) since other studies on other political interviews in other cultures and languages reported the use of address forms to both interviewers and interviewees (e.g., Al-Aridi, 1987 on American TV networks, Al-Rojaie, 2002, on Arab TV network).

Like other types of interviews, the political television interview has many common characteristics. The political television interview usually takes place in a TV setting with two participants: an interviewer and (an) interviewee (s). Unlike other types of interviews, the political TV interview's main purpose is to elicit information on certain disputable issues that could be unclear in the audience's mind as well as that of the interviewer himself (Al-Aridi, 1987). In addition, it is often set up to highlight and discuss a current event that is of interest to the public.

The interviewer and interviewee may have further goals and purposes in addition to the essential and ideal goals of a political TV interview. The interviewer may try to highlight and discuss certain topics or issues according to his/her political views that can

be disputed with the interviewees. An additional aim could be to get a very high viewing rate (Al-Aridi, 1987). The interviewees, on the other hand, may try to explain, defend, and promote their political views and stands by considering the political interview as a valuable opportunity to reach potentially millions of viewers.

Interviewers are usually journalists, reporters, politicians, and celebrities, affiliated with television stations. Some of them have both TV and radio programs at the same time. They are usually experts in the topics they discuss. Moreover, they have a great and long time of experience in the field of interviewing as well as in the political field. With respect to interviewees, they are usually politicians, government officials, professors, journalists, former diplomats, or hosts of similar political TV or radio programs in other television or radio stations.

Unlike other speech events, such as classroom, courtroom, or doctor-patient interaction, political news TV interviews have not been researched as much. Al-Aridi (1987: 1) attributes this neglect “to the researchers’ assumption that media data is not naturally occurring data; i.e. it is contaminated because of editing.” However, exploring political television interviews especially by interviewees from different cultures and backgrounds is important and crucial because it reveals misunderstandings and misconceptions usually related with other cultures.

Recently, there has been an increasing interest in analyzing language use and patterns of communication in a setting like political interviews. Such interest is not only motivated by the fact that political interviews are naturally occurring speech events, but also because there are social, psychological, cultural, and political factors that may influence participants’ use of language in this context. Below, I review some related

studies that examine political interviews, particularly those that are similar to the type of political interviews examined in the current study.

Previous studies on political interviews

According to Elliott & Bull (1996), some historical changes in the conduct of political interviews in British broadcasting attract researchers to analyze certain structures and strategies used by interviewers and interviewees. By the late 1950s, “the era of prearranged and deferential interviewing” (Greatbatch, 1986: 454) ended, and the televised interview became a powerful media instrument with increased popularity and audience, particularly after the introduction of the commercial channel ITV (Bull & Elliott, 1998, Greatbatch, 1986, Harris, 1986). Furthermore, “the emergence of television political interview as the chief vehicle for getting a political message across” (Beattie, 1982: p.95) increased the importance and popularity of political interviews for politicians, interviewers, and audience. As a consequence, the balance of power in TV interviews shifted, giving interviewers, instead of politicians, more authority and power to set the agenda, “pursue answers, and to resist and sanction interviewees’ agenda-shifting maneuvers” (Greatbatch, 1986: 454), and that made the political interview more aggressive and challenging (Bull & Elliott, 1998). Day (1990 cited in Elliott and Bull 1996) claims that in the 1980s there was a further change in the conduct of the political interview once it became a means for propaganda for politicians using certain strategies such as “paying greater attention to impression management, to interview technique, to the rules of engagement under which interviews were conducted, and even to the interview set itself” (Bull & Elliott, 1998: 221).

Early research on political interviews focused on investigating the structure of the political interview, including its discourse rules (Blum-Kulka, 1983), turn-taking system (Beattie, 1982, Greatbatch, 1988), and the overhearing audience (Heritage, 1985). All of these studies have shown that news interview is a specialized form of social interaction for an overhearing audience characterized by having a particular pattern of turn-taking system (speech exchange system), and a set of certain interactional rules and norms that are different from other types of social interactions, particularly ordinary conversation in which the size, content, allocation, and distribution of turns is organized on a turn-by-turn basis (Heritage, et al. 1988), and recognized generally in the format of questions and answers. Another strand of studies were conducted later to investigate the politicians' performance in the interviews, including topical organization (Greatbatch, 1986; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991), and equivocation (Bull, et al. 1996; Bull, 2000; Bull, 1994, 1998; Bull & Mayer, 1993, Clayman, 1993). In these studies, researchers found that politicians in news interviews often seek to avoid directly answering questions that involve supporting or criticizing the positions and views of other politicians. Hence, politicians were often found to be evasive. However, Bavelas et al. (1988) suggest that this is due to the nature of the political interview itself rather than the politicians in which it put pressure on politicians, thereby creating equivocation. Other studies examined language gender differences in news interviews (e.g., Beattie, 1982; Shaw, 2000; Edelsky & Adams, 1990) finding male participants to violate turn-taking rules in order to gain the floor more than females by interruptions and interventions. Moreover, further studies were carried out to extend the earlier work on the organization of news interviews by studying the interviewer's role and performance, focusing on certain issues, including

neutrality (Bull & Elliott, 1998; Clayman, 1988, 1992) and face threats (Elliott & Bull, 1996). The results of these studies demonstrate that the moderator in news interviews display neutrality by employing certain strategies, such as footing, mitigation, and embedding statements within questions. Elliott & Bull (1996) developed a model of face threats to measure the interviewer's neutrality by examining questions posed by interviewers in British news interviews, showing that some questions can have potential threats to the interviewees' face, and thereby violate the expected rule of neutrality. Further description of these studies will be presented in the following sections.

In addition to examining how politicians and interviewers interact in political interviews, some other studies examined cross-cultural communication through analysis of the language use in news interviews by participants from different languages and cultures. In these studies, researchers attempt to identify the divergent strategies and features of different cultures in interaction with each other, and how they result in miscommunication and stereotypes (Zupnik, 2000: 85). Furthermore, researchers examined how the way in which the frame of the interview is realized results in differences across cultures in terms of the participants' expected roles, presuppositions, and norms. As briefly mentioned earlier, the notion of "frame" is used in the literature of discourse analysis to refer to organizing principles, presuppositions, and expectations that govern social interactions, and how the participants should interact accordingly (Tannen, 1993b). Therefore, the concept of frame is a useful tool to investigate how people from different cultures differ in their interpretations and understanding of their interactions in everyday encounters in general and political interviews in specific. For example, Johnstone (1986) analyzed an interview between the Italian journalist Oriana Fallaci and

Iran's late leader Ayatollah Khomeini with the purpose of identifying what went wrong in that interview. Johnstone found that the use of different logical argumentation as well as the use of different persuasive styles resulted in miscommunication between Khomeini and Fallaci.

Political interviews between groups in severe political conflict, such as Israelis and Palestinians have also been examined by a number of researchers. For example, Al-Aridi (1987) analyzed and investigated the dynamics of political television interviews, and the variation in interactants' manipulation of language used by Arab and Israeli interviewees. Moreover, Zupnik (1994) developed the construct of 'discourse space', which is similar to Goffman's (1974) interactional frames in order to better understand and analyze vague first and second person pronouns used by one Arab interviewee in a panel discussion on PBS. Zupnik also demonstrated how the complex pragmatic process associated with using pronouns can result in consequent persuasive functions in political discourse. Furthermore, Zupnik, in a subsequent series of studies (1995, 1999, and 2000) analyzed the conflict discourse of Palestinians and Israelis in their political dialogue events that were mostly in English. Zupnik focused on a number of areas, including the employment of the notion of sociopolitical identity-displays (SPID) as a discourse-pragmatic construct to explain intergroup conflict discourse (1995, 1999) and the differences between Israelis and Palestinians in their use of conversational interruption (2000). The results of Zupnik's (1999) study indicate that the cultural background of participants influence their use of language in which the Israelis were suggested to be motivated by symbolic mobility whereas the Palestinians were motivated by psychological distinctiveness. With regard to the differences in the amount of

interruption, the results of Zupnik's (2000) study show that Israelis employ conversational interruption more frequently than the Palestinians as a result of their cultural and background differences. Further detailed description of Al-Aridi (1987) and Zupnik (2000) will be presented in the section of interruption below.

Similar to Zupnik's studies (1994, 1999) but with Palestinian leadership officials, Suleiman (2000) investigated how the use of one linguistic feature, pronouns, in political television interviews signals self and measures changes of footing of Palestinian participants during the Middle East peace process. On the basis that television interviews are of great importance for politicians to present themselves and ideas, as well as the assumption that pronouns uncover the forms of self presentation, Suleiman argued that the pronominal choices by politicians create and reflect the various footings-the alignments and stances- of self presentation. For example, Suleiman showed how the use of 'we' by one Palestinian official, Ashrawi, reflects her self presentation as a spokesperson for the Palestinian people and cause. She also used other pronouns, such as 'you' and 'one' to mean 'I' and 'one' to mean 'you', which allow her a footing of distance, creating a self that is objective and effective.

Not all political interviews examined by discourse analysts have the same format and context. For example, Simon-Vandenberg (1996) analyzed how politicians use political interviews broadcast on radio to present an image for them. Radio political interviews were also examined by Jucker (1986). Many other studies focused on analyzing televised political interviews, which have a different format. Earlier studies and some recent ones treat political TV interviews in the US and Britain that are set up as an interview with one or more politicians, which are referred to sometimes as broadcast

news interviews (see e.g., Bull, 2000; Dickerson, 2001; Harris, 1986). Some other studies examined televised political interviews that are set up as a debate between two presidential candidates (e.g., Galasinski, 1998; Clayman, 1992), parliamentary debate in the British House of Commons (e.g., Shaw, 2000), political debates between senatorial candidates (e.g., Johnson-Evans, 2000; Edelsky & Adams, 1990) and political debates in panel news interviews (e.g., Clayman, 2002; Greatbatch, 1992; Hutchby, 1997; Scott, 1998). Since the current study involves the examination of panel news interviews, I limit my review below to this type of political televised interviews

Previous studies on televised panel news interviews

As stated above, fewer studies have been carried out to examine televised panel news interviews (sometimes called political debates) compared with single-interview political interviews. According to Clayman (2002), panel news interviews “often consist of two interviewees who represent opposing ideological positions and political interests” (p.1386). In addition, Clayman notes that legislators, certified experts of various fields, and representatives of advocacy groups are the main guests of panel interviews, whereas presidents, prime ministers, and senior cabinet officials are usually interviewed solo, and they rarely participate in panel discussions or debates. Greatbatch (1992) argues that panel news interviews “can be a source of lively and combative interaction without the need for aggressive cross-questioning” (p.272) by the interviewer, and that lead to a greater use of this format in the United Kingdom in recent years.

According to Heritage et al. (1988) American programs, such as *The MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour* and *Nightline* incorporated the structure of panel interviews from their inception. Clayman (2002) confirms this information and adds that panel

interviews, in the US, “have been most ubiquitous since the advent of Ted Koppel’s *Nightline* program” (p.1387). Clayman also adds that panel interviews remain a common format for other programs such as *The NewsHour* (PBS), *Meet the Press* (NBC), *Face the Nation* (CBS), and *This week* (ABC).

Although panel news interviews have been broadcast since the 1970s, no study has been conducted to examine this type of political interview until the 1990s. Hutchby (1997) was the first to analyze how talk is managed in a political panel interview, focusing on the use of conversational resources to build a local alignment between two politicians and sections of the studio audience. Hutchby’s study was based on a single case from the British TV show *Question Time*. Hutchby observed that the format of this program, *Question Time*, in which some of the audience are present in the studio forces the two panel participants to change their way of talking by using more conversational features that build local alignment with not only each other but also with the present audience.

Considering the fact that it is difficult and complex for interviewers to maintain neutrality in panel news interviews by asking questions to different interviewees in succession, Clayman (2002) analyzed one interview in the program *Face the Nation* (CBS) in which two panelists debated about genetic engineering. Clayman compared and contrasted the interviewer’s treatment of one panelist with the other, finding bias in not only the way questions were formed, but even also in facial expression when questions were delivered. Detailed review of the findings of this study will be presented in the section of the role of the moderator below.

To understand the structure and cultural origins of the confrontational and discursive style that is widely used in current Israeli political talk-show debates, Blum-Kulka, Blondheim, and Hacoheh (2002) compared ways of argumentation in these talk shows with such use in the oral study of the pre-modern Talmud through paired study debate (*xavruta*). Close examination and analysis of these two types of debates revealed a series of similarities, including (1) preference for disagreement, (2) high level of dispute manifested by immediate understanding (listening) and responding, (3) acceptability of occasional disruptions of the conversation-flow without breakdowns, and (4) complexity of logic and structure in argument and argumentation. Blum-Kulka et al. suggest that the 'discursive' style might be borrowed from the religious arena to the political discourse, as featured in Israeli political debate, implying the cultural background, specifically the religious one, as well as the participants' framing of these speech events as contexts of dispute can be useful explanatory variables of language use and style in an everyday encounter.

In another study based on a program set up as a political debate, Scott (1998) identified and described the linguistic features of disagreement used by participants in the CNN television news show *Crossfire*. The selection of this program was based on the assumption that it is set up as a debate to discuss controversial topics, allowing participants to develop arguments and to disagree repeatedly throughout the show.

My own pilot study (Al-Rojaie, 2002) could be another example of a discourse analytically-oriented work on panel news interviews. In this study, I compared the Arabic and English speakers' use of address terms and interruption in panel news interviews. To do so, I selected two political interviews: one from Al-Jazeera channel *Akthar min Ra'e*

'More than one Opinion', and another one from The Public Broadcasting System of the United States (PBS) *NewsHour*. Both interviews were about one topic: The Saudi initiative for peace in the Middle East. I first examined the Arab interview, and observed certain linguistic forms and uses, and then compared them with their English equivalents. My initial examination of data revealed that there are some differences between Arabic- and English-speaking participants in terms of their use of interruption. Then, I examined carefully the interviews to find any other cultural variation between the participants, observing another difference regarding the use of address terms. My close examination of the two interviews indicated that my initial guess was correct in that I found that Arabic speakers used interruption and address terms more frequently than English speakers (Americans), and for more and various functions and types. Further description of the findings of this study will be presented in detail in the sections of address terms and interruption below.

Although the results discovered in my pilot study were clear and interesting, they were based on a very small dataset. One interview from each language was not enough to come up with an adequate description of the cultural variation between Arabs and Americans in their use of such features. Therefore, I decided in this study to continue my examination of political interviews but with a larger set of data. However, that does not mean that this study expects to yield widely generalizable results about Arabic and English speakers' use of interruption and address terms. Rather, it will present at least a foundational account based on a larger database within a specific context.

In summary, political interviews in general and panel news interviews in specific form a particular context governed by certain discourse and interactional rules. Thus, the

interviewers and the interviewees adhere to a turn-taking system that is different from other contexts, such as normal conversation and classroom or courtroom encounters. Furthermore, as found in some studies reviewed above (e.g., Blum-Kulka et al. 2002; Zupnik, 1994, 1999, and 2000) participants from different cultures may have different expectations and norms as for their turn-taking rules, structures, and patterns of language use due to their differences in framing of the accepted conversational patterns of interaction in such a context. Therefore, previous discourse analysts point to both culture and institutional setting of political interviews as important influences on the participants' interactional expectations, and these can be of great usefulness as explanatory variables for language use of speakers from different cultures and languages.

Interruption

A large body of research in the sociolinguistic literature has been carried out to study interruption, mostly within the paradigm of power and solidarity. Part of this research was concerned with describing and explaining differences between males and females in their frequency and function of using interruption (e.g., West, 1979; West & Zimmerman, 1983). Since the current study has only male participants, I will not review previous studies about gender-based language differences in interruption. Instead, my review will be limited to describing interruption as a linguistic and conversational phenomenon, particularly in cross-cultural communication, and within similar contexts of the current study.

According to Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson's model (1974), simultaneous speech is considered a violation of turn-taking rules in ordinary conversation in which one speaker is expected to talk at a time. Types of simultaneous speech include overlap

and interruption. Researchers later developed Sacks et al's model by differentiating between overlap and interruption. For example, Zimmerman and West (1975) distinguish between overlaps and interruptions but with more specification of 'possible completion points' using Sacks, et al's (1974) term of transition-relevance place (TRP) instead: an overlap occurs when a speaker starts talking "at or very close to a possible transition place in a current speaker's utterance (i.e., within the boundaries of the last word)" (1975: 114). Interruptions, on the other hand, violate the turn-taking rules, which dictate that transitions from one speaker to another should occur at transitional points (TRPs) or at possible completion points (Zimmerman and West, 1975).

In addition, some researchers argue that not all cases of interruption could be considered disruptive or aggressive (e.g., Roger, Bull, and Smith, 1988; Tannen, 1984, 1989). Close examination of instances of conversational interruptions revealed that there are differences between them in terms of time of occurrence as well as the intended function. Schegloff (1973) distinguishes overlaps and interruptions:

By overlap we mean talk by more than one speaker at a time involving a second one speaking while a first was already speaking, and that the second one has projected his talk to begin at a possible completion point of the prior speaker's talk. If that's apparently the case, if, for example, his start is in the environment of what could have been a completion of the prior speaker's turn, then we speak of it as an overlap. If it's projected to begin in the middle of a point that is in no way a possible completion point for the turn, then we speak of it as an interruption (L1 lecture; quoted by Bennett, 1981).

However, Bennett (1981) criticized Schegloff's definitions of overlaps and interruptions, arguing that although they seem theoretically clear and helpful, they have potential problems practically. To Bennett, one problem with these definitions lies in their ambiguity to explain "possible completion points", and how they are determined and interpreted by particular speakers. Specifically, Bennett argues that:

[i]n order to determine whether an instance of a second speaker's turn start is merely an instance of overlap or an actual interruption, we not only have to be able to identify the nearest possible completion points, but we have to decide whether that start is inside or outside the environment of that point" (p.173).

Therefore, researchers attempt to find other ways to differentiate overlap and interruption by emphasizing the function of their use. In their classification of interruptions and simultaneous speech, Roger, Bull, and Smith (1988) argued that:

Not all simultaneous speech is necessarily interruptive. For example, phrases such as 'yah', 'uh-huh', 'that's fine' and a number of non-verbal cues such as head-nods and smiles may occur at the same time as the other speaker is talking, but they are not interruptive: they signal continued listener attention and interest, rather than disrupting the other speaker's utterance (p.27).

In addition, because of its violation of normal conversational rules, interruption is viewed and interpreted negatively as an undesirable behavior, and constitutes an attempt to exercise power and to dominate the interaction through control of the floor and of the topic of conversation (James & Clarke, 1993: 232). Overlaps, on the other hand, are viewed positively as an attempt, in most cases, to build rapport or show involvement as they "can occur unintentionally due, for example, to the misprojection of TRPs" (Murata, 1994).

According to Tannen (1993), because of the ambiguity of the theoretical paradigm of power and solidarity, linguistic strategies, such as conversational interruptions and overlaps could mean either power or solidarity or both. Therefore, Tannen argues that to better understand interruption, researchers need to distinguish linguistic strategies by their interactional purpose or function. Based on results of analysis of dinner table conversation (Tannen, 1984), Tannen noted that some speakers consider overlapping with another speaker's speech as a way of showing enthusiastic participation and solidarity, whereas other speakers (overlap-resistant speakers, as termed by Tannen) consider it as

interruption. Therefore, Tannen (1993) asserts that context, including textual, relational, and institutional constraints, as well as the speaker's conversational styles, and the interaction between speakers' styles should be taken into account when considering whether an overlap is an interruption. Hence, Tannen (1993) claimed that whereas cooperative overlap is expected to occur more frequently in casual and friendly conversation, it is not expected to occur that much in formal settings like job interviews. Similarly, James and Clarke (1993), suggest that the proportion of interruptions as a way of showing dominance may be low in casual conversation, but may be higher in formal contexts, particularly in interactions which involve competition and conflict. Thus, the proportions of disruptive interruptions and cooperative overlaps have to be observed in the current study to examine these suggestions in a formal setting like political interviews and debates.

In addition to the difficulties associated with determining the function of interruption initiated, James and Clarke (1993) point out that the methodology employed in counting interruptions could be another source for the inconsistencies of the results on interruption by men and women. While most studies counted instances of interruption in raw numbers, some other ones used a rate by dividing the number of interruptions by the amount of time the other speaker talked. Although James and Clarke indicate that the use of rate would yield more accurate measurement of interruption than just using raw numbers, they also noted the use of this methodology would make it difficult to compare the results with other studies. In addition, James and Clarke point out that while some studies vary in including simultaneous talk functioning as supportive rather than disruptive, and mistiming error termed as an 'overlap' by Schegloff (1973), most studies

ignored the existence of a different type of interruption, silent interruption, which occurs when “the interrupter begins speaking during a slight pause in the interrupter’s talk-so that no simultaneous speech occurs”, which can be one form of “successful” interruptions (James and Clarke ,1993: 266). Silent interruption is also different from another feature termed, latching, which occurs when a new speaker immediately takes the turn after the prior speaker has just finished his/her turn, without noticeable pause between the turns (Scott, 1998). To solve these difficulties, James and Clarke call for observing the multifunctional nature of interruption by taking into account the larger context in which the interruptions occur as well as the semantic content of the interruption and the conversational style of the interrupter.

Accordingly, the perception of interruption may be subject to potential cultural variation as the result of differences in norms, assumptions, presuppositions, and expectations. In addition, most early studies intended to examine the underlying rules and factors governing the use of language in various types of interaction largely were based on the view and norms of western societies, and their use in other societies and languages might not be valid. Therefore, researchers began to pay more attention to identifying cultural differences in the use of not only interruption but also for other “discourse strategies and paralinguistic devices” (Zupnik, 2000: 85) employed in interaction in naturally occurring settings. For example, researchers investigate the differences between members of culturally divergent groups in their use of various speech acts in other languages, such as directness or indirectness in making requests (e.g., Blum-Kulka, 1990; Weirzbicka, 1985; Upadhyay, 2003), showing disagreement (e.g., Schifrin, 1984; Katriel, 1986; Kotthoff, 1993). All of these cross-cultural linguistic

studies have shown that the way speech acts are viewed as inappropriate or impolite in English-speaking society might not necessarily be shared with speakers of other languages, who belong to different cultures. Similarly, interruption is one of these devices in which speakers from different cultural communities could vary in their functional use and interpretation in cross and intercultural speech events. For example, it has been found that African Americans and New York Jewish Americans use interruption more than Caucasian middle-class Americans (Kochman, 1981; Tannen, 1984, cited in Zupnik, 2000). Moreover, researchers found that speakers of different cultures employ and interpret conversational interruptions differently as a result of their different conversational norms, and interactional presuppositions and expectations (e.g., Scollon & Scollon, 1981; Tannen, 1984), and these differences in interaction promote miscommunication and stereotypes.

In sum, through their study of conversational interruptions in natural settings, researchers call for differentiating between two types of simultaneous speech: overlap, usually employed by 'high-involvement speakers' (Tannen, 1993) to show solidarity and cooperation and to build rapport, and interruptions, usually having the function of obstruction to hold the floor or to show dominance. Moreover, cooperative overlaps are suggested to happen more frequently in casual conversations with friends, whereas obstructive interruptions are suggested to occur with high proportions in formal contexts. Among the various methods reviewed to code interruption, the current study will use the same methodology used by James and Clarke (1993: 247), in their well-known critical review of prior research on interruptions in gendered speech, in which the larger context of interaction will be taken into consideration to code instance of cooperative overlaps

and obstructive interruptions, including the semantic content of the interruption, the general trend and content of the conversation, and the conversational style of the interrupter. Further, recent studies contend that cultural background of speakers should be taken into consideration in explaining the frequency and function of use of interruption in intercultural and cross-cultural communication. The results of these studies also cast doubt about the universality of frameworks and rules of interaction that are largely based on the norms and expectations of Anglo-American culture. In the addition to the influence of cultural factors that would determine the use of interruption, situational and contextual variables could also play a part in shaping the conversation style of a certain group of speakers. In what follows, I review previous studies on the use of interruption in political news interviews since it is the context investigated in the current study.

Interruption in Political Discourse

As stated earlier, researchers argued that interruptions are expected to occur more frequently than cooperative overlap in formal settings, like job interviews and political interviews. For example, Bull and Mayer (1988) noted that in political TV interviews, a high frequency of interruptions occurs. Bull and Mayer explain the high incidence of interruptions as the results of the following reasons: (1) since politicians usually do not answer questions, interviewers, therefore, may need to reformulate their questions and ask follow-up questions, (2) interviewees prefer to interrupt in order to disagree effectively rather than waiting for the other interviewees to come to a possible completion point (Yemenci, 2001). Karavit (1986) suggested that an additional reason for interruption is when interviewees provide untruthful information.

Because of the high frequency of interruptions within the context of political interviews, a number of studies emerged in the 1980s to investigate the uses of interruptions by both interviewers and politicians. In a well-known case study, Beattie (1982) analyzed in detail two political interviews: one between Margaret Thatcher and Denis Tuohy, and the other between Jim Callaghan and Lieu Gardner. Beattie found that the interviewer interrupted Margaret Thatcher almost twice as often as she interrupted him, and Jim Callaghan interrupted his interviewer more often than the interviewer interrupted him (Bull & Mayer, 1988: 35). Beattie went on and claimed that Margaret Thatcher is interrupted so often following the display of a number of misleading turn-yielding cues, based on the analysis of turn-yielding cues by Duncan (1972) and Duncan and Fiske (1977). Turn-yielding cues refer to certain signals that indicate that the speaker is ready to offer the turn to the other speaker, including a rise or fall in pitch at the end of a clause, a drawl on the final syllable, the termination of hand gestures, fillers and some expressions such as 'you know', and the completion of a grammatical clause.

However, Bull and Mayer (1988) criticized Beattie's work on many grounds, including that his study was based on only one interview, having no evidence for his claims, the use of inappropriate statistical analysis. Bull and Mayer's criticism was based on a study similar to Beattie but it involved eight political interviews with four different interviewers to make a much more systematic analysis of interruptions in interviews with Margaret Thatcher, compared with Neil Kinnock. The results of their study provided no evidence to support Beattie's hypothesis of turn-yielding cues. According to Bull & Mayer, Thatcher was interrupted more as a result of her tendency to personalize issues, taking questions as accusations, and her frequent use of address and title names with her

interviewers, “as if they need to be called to account for their misdemeanors” (Bull and Mayer, 1989: 44).

In their analysis, Bull and Mayer (1988) coded each occasion on which a politician was interrupted according to whether or not they thought the politician had finished speaking, using cues such as speech content, continuation of speech, intake of breath, use of hand gesture, and trunk movement. They distinguished between overlaps and interruptions in which overlaps occur due to simultaneous speech, where the second speaker begins while the first speaker does not complete her/his turn. Bull and Mayer (1988: 37) claimed that overlaps may be used as a reflection of the hearer’s “enthusiasm and involvement”, and they should not be seen as “intrinsically interruptive”. Similarly but with different terms, according to Al-Aridi (1987: p.349), there are two types of interruptions: “constructive”, when the interviewer helps the interviewee from embarrassment and silence (overlap), and “de-structive”, when the interviewer stops the interviewee from continuing her/his message. The first type is seen as having positive connotations, whereas the second one is seen as having negative connotations.

To analyze and investigate the types and functions of interruptions used in political interviews, Yemenici (2001) examined seven full interviews recorded from two private Turkish TV channels. Yemenici also examined the data to see whether participants in political interviews uphold or violate the maxims of politeness by making interruptions for particular reasons. The results of the study showed that both interviewers and interviewees use interruptions as a strategy to achieve their goals. Interviewees use it with the other interviewees to: (1) disagree with a co-interviewee’s

opinion; (2) terminate a dispute; (3) escalate disagreements; (4) ask ironical questions; (5) take the floor; (6) project hypothetical statements; and (7) counter co-interviewees.

As stated earlier, the use of interruption in conversation can be the product of differences in cultural conversational style and norms of interaction. Findings of earlier cross-cultural studies indicated that members of different cultures have different norms for interpreting and producing linguistic devices and strategies. For example, previous research (e.g., Greifat and Katriel, 1989) showed that Arabs employ the conversational *musayra* style, which refers to “accompanying one’s interlocutor in conversation” (Zupnik, 2000: 87), to promote and maintain social harmony and traditional patterns of social interaction in various settings (Zupnik, 2000). The Arab *musayra* style is characterized as being indirect, rhetorically complex, repetitive, and concerned about saving the listener’s face (Griefat and Katriel, 1989, cited in Zupnik, 2000), particularly in diverse settings. Researchers argued that the employment of this style would influence the Arabs’ interpretation and use of certain communicational devices like interruption.

In an excellent and recent study, Zupnik (2000) studied the stylistic differences between Israelis and Palestinians in their use of conversational interruptions during their participation in political dialogue events, which were held during the Palestinian Uprising. Specifically, Zupnik investigated whether the Israelis and Palestinians would employ their *dugri* (straight) interruptive style, and ‘*musayra*’ (not interruptive) style, respectively within the context of political debates with each other (intergroup) and within each group (intragroup), i.e. Israelis- Palestinians, and Israeli-Israeli, Palestinians-Palestinians. In contrast to the Arab ‘*musayra*’ conversational style, the Israeli *dugri* style is characterized as having the features of: directness, simplicity, aggression, and

being concerned for the speaker's face (Zupnik, 2000: 87). Given that Israelis and Palestinians have a severe political conflict with each other, Zupnik predicted that this fact would influence their use of these styles during such a political event. The results of the study showed that the political context influenced the participants' communicative patterns, which they modified in the intergroup interaction. Specifically, Israelis and Palestinians were found to interrupt at similar frequencies, which indicated that both groups violated their stylistic norms as a result of political influence. Moreover, ethnographic interviews with Palestinians indicated that the *musayra* style was "not intended to be employed in cases of extreme political conflict" (p.106). In intragroup interactions, the study showed that the two groups differ: Israelis were found to interrupt whether or not Arabs maintain the *musayra* style. Zupnik, however, suggested that there are additional factors that influenced the use of interruption in addition to the political context: the use of English, which is not the native language for most participants, and the mediated nature of the dialogue. In the current study, these two factors may not influence the use of interruption since all participants speak their native languages.

Above, previous research showed that interruption is highly expected in the context of news interviews. The political context of news interviews, as well as the cultural background represented in the conversational style of the participants, have been suggested as explanatory variables for the frequency and functions of using interruption. Furthermore, interruption has been observed to carry out a number of functions by both the interviewer and the interviewees, some of which are for strategic purposes. With the exception of Zupnik's (2000) and Al-Aridi's (1987) studies, there have been no previous studies that examined the cultural variation in the use of interruption within the context of

news interviews. Further, there has been no single study that compared the use of interruption by Arabs and Americans in such a context. The current study, therefore, will attempt to fill this gap in the literature. Next, we review the literature on the tasks that encompass the moderator's (interviewer) role.

The Moderator's Role

In general, the interviewer's role in political news interviews includes the selection of questions to be posed, the movement of topics to be discussed (i.e., shifting of topics in the flow of discussion), the selection of who should answer a question, and monitoring the time of the interview. Taking this role into account, interviewers have the authority to interrupt the interviewees to either change the topic being discussed or to maintain the time limit of the interview.

As stated above, there have been some historical changes in the conduct of political interviews in both the U.S. and U.K., giving the interviewer more power to not only ask questions and monitor the interview, but also to ask challenging questions, pursue answers, and resist 'agenda-shifting maneuvers' (i.e., attempts to shift topics discussed). These changes in turn influenced the role of the moderator by adding a new challenge to compete with. Heritage (2002) described it by saying that interviewers, in designing questions, attempt to make a balance between two competing journalistic norms: neutrality (impartiality) on the one hand and adversarialness on the other hand. In other words, interviewers are expected to be objective and unbiased with respect to the interviewees' perspectives and works. And, at the same time, they are expected to actively challenge the interviewees and not to make it "a kind of platform or soapbox

from which public figures can get away with their own spin on events” (Heritage, 2002:1).

Taking the new role of the interviewer into account, a line of research has been carried out by discourse analysts to examine the interviewer performance. Researchers vary in their examination of the new role of the interviewer. Early research has focused on examining the interviewer’s neutrality and the procedures employed to achieve this stance (e.g., Clayman, 1988, 1992; Bull & Elliott, 1998). Later, researchers examined questions and their effect on both the interviewers’ and interviewees’ face (e.g., Elliott & Bull, 1996; Heritage, 2002; Harris, 1986; Jucker, 1986). In what follows, I review these studies with an attempt to relate the findings of these studies with the current study.

In describing the turn-taking organization and structure in news interviews, researchers highlight the differences between the turn-taking system employed in news interviews and other speech activities, particularly mundane conversation (e.g., Greatbatch, 1985, 1988; Clayman, 1988) in that the news interview places constraints and certain procedures shaped by the institutional identities and roles expected from the interviewer and interviewee (Greatbatch, 1992). These procedures establish the local role of the interviewer as report elicitor by asking questions and interviewee as report producer by making responses (Greatbatch, 1992). However, this type of system does not mean that the interviewer cannot make “statement-formatted utterances, such as assertions, assessments, and the like” (Clayman, 1992:168).

Either in formulating and asking questions or in producing statements, the interviewers can exercise their role through meeting certain expectations and assessment matters according to measures of journalism. One of the most important assessment

issues in journalism is being objective and neutral when dealing with perspectives as well as the interviewees' points of view. Actually, interviewers in news interviews are expected to be more cautious in displaying their neutrality and objectivity than other reporters in the journalism sphere. Clayman (1992) outlined the reasons for why it is much harder for news interviewers to be neutral in their work:

While neutrality is a concern for reporters generally, it is a particularly pressing issue. For those who interview for television. Their work practices are commonly broadcast "live" without the benefit of editorial review, and are thus immediate scrutiny of fellow journalists, government officials, social scientists, and a mass audience with diverse interest and ideological sympathies. Many viewers have a practical interest in monitoring news programming for the presence of bias (pp.163-164).

Using a data set from a variety of U.S. news interviews programs, Clayman (1988) identified three procedures that interviewers employ to display neutrality in television news interviews when producing evaluative or controversial statements: (1) embedding statements within questions, (2) attributing statements to third parties, and (3) mitigating. To achieve the first procedure, interviewers usually insert statements in the format of questions that have evaluative, opinionated, or challenging points to the interviewees' views. In the second procedure, interviewers shift their footings in relation to controversial and challenging points by distancing themselves and attributing these remarks to third parties. For the final procedure, mitigation, interviewers attempt to make evaluative and challenging statements to appear less strong and more acceptable and mild language, and with caution. These three procedures are not only used to display neutrality, but also to manage the conflicting demands placed on interviewers to be "interactionally adversarial while remaining officially neutral" (Clayman, 1988: 490). Moreover, the first two procedures were found to be used more in hostile environments,

suggesting that they serve a defensive function. However, Clayman argues that the use of these procedures does not mean that they constitute the definition of being neutral, but they are employed as the primary means for achieving neutrality.

In a later study, Clayman (1992) employed Goffman's (1981) interactional concept of footing in analyzing how interviewers use it to manage and maintain a neutralistic stance with interviewees. Footing is introduced by Goffman to explore the nature of involvement and participation in social interaction (Clayman, 1992). It refers to the degree speakers distance themselves in their speech as well with others' sayings by producing various forms. Although earlier research indicated, among other things, that interviewers shift their footing (e.g., Greatbatch, 1986; Harris, 1986; Jucker, 1986), Clayman (1992) expanded earlier works by examining the contexts and uses of footing shifts, as well as the ways that interviewees may respond to an interviewer's footing shift "by either ratifying it, contesting it, or ignoring it, thus shaping the trajectory of the interaction" (Clayman, 1992:167). Clayman identified four environments in which interviewers usually shift footing, including: presenting a topic, presenting the other side, generating disagreement between the interviewees, and defending criticism. Moreover, Clayman argued that employing footing shifts to display neutrality is a joint practice by both the interviewer and the interviewee in that the interviewer shifts footing, while the interviewee regularly declines to hold the interviewer responsible for the reported statements.

In a recent study, Heritage (2002) argued that "news interviews questioning cannot be neutral but only naturalistic" (p.86). His argument is based on the observation that the interviewer holds the initiative in questioning to select topics, and incorporates

presuppositions and preferences in favor of one type of answer over another. Thus, Heritage suggested more use of prefaced questions; that is, questions that are preceded by one or more statements, instead of simple questions in order to allow the interviewers to construct a context of their own to present their questions, and that would provide a justification and cover for the interviewers' hostile and aggressive questioning.

Drawing on the previous research on politeness (e.g., Goffman, 1967; Brown & Levinson, 1979; Leech, 1983), other researchers incorporate the results of the development of the face model and the face-threat typology into the analysis of the role of the interviewer in the political television interview. Jucker (1986) and Bull, Elliott, Palmer, and Walker (1996), for example, argued that the management of face during news interviews is of high importance to achieve the participants' goals of interaction. Thus, interviewees try to maintain their positive face, i.e., to be approved by others, to build and maintain their image through political interviews. Interviewers, on the other hand, can influence that by using face-threatening acts, specifically questions and statements addressed to the interviewees. Jucker (1986) analyzed interviewers' face threatening acts during political interviews and developed a typology of 13 ways that can threaten the interviewee's face, including: (1) making a commitment; (2) stating a personal opinion on a sensitive issue; (3) confirming an opinion which has negative connotations; (4) accepting a discrepancy between your opinion and your actions; (5) accepting a discrepancy between your opinion and reality; (6) accepting that the reason for doing something is demeaning; (7) stating or else; (8) confirming that an action undertaken is demeaning, or (9) taking responsibility for or (10) justifying that action; (11) failing to take action against a negative state or affairs; (12) demeaning the face of an

other; and (13) stating something demeaning concerning your own face. To investigate this issue further, Elliott & Bull (1996) and Bull & Elliott (1998) employed a typology developed by Bull et al. (1996), based on Jucker's (1986) typology, to analyze face threats in questions to assess interviewers' style and performance, particularly in terms of toughness and neutrality. In addition to the finding that the typology of face threat developed by Bull et al. (1996) works effectively in assessing the face threat associated with the interviewer's questioning in political interviews, these studies indicate that the face threats are associated with the interviewer's tough style, particularly in questions that cast doubt about the interviewee's credibility and controversial issues. Although these studies have developed and applied the effectiveness of a typology of face threats associated with questioning, their findings may be limited to the British political interviews since they did not examine the potential cross-cultural difference in realizing face threat in political interviews. Therefore, the current study would touch on this issue by investigating the cultural differences associated with the interviewer's practice of certain tasks that may threaten the interviewees' face, particularly showing disagreement and challenging.

Further analysis of the interviewers' practice of questioning indicates that the interviewers' role is not only limited to eliciting information and opinion from interviewees for the benefit of an "overhearing" audience (Heritage, 1985), while maintaining a neutral stance towards interviewees, rather, the interviewer's practice of questions can involve additional goals. In a detailed analysis of instances of questioning in American and British political news interviews, Roth (1998) showed that interviewers, through questioning, "depict interviewees' public personae, including especially their

alignments as actors, whose own conduct is newsworthy, or as commentators, whose observations of, or experience on, third parties' conduct is newsworthy, and solicit explanations of newsworthy action" (p.382). That is, the interviewers' questioning involves the presentation of interviewees' social identities by aligning them with the news in question as those who make the news (actors), or experts who can provide important observations and explanations of their own or third parties actions. Roth also noted that the most explicit way by which interviewers can depict the public personae of the interviewees can be through personal introductory descriptions that usually are done in the beginning of the interview.

In sum, previous research has expanded the description of the role of the interviewer by examining the complex obligation placed on interviewers to maintain a neutral position in performing their role, particularly in selecting and shifting topics, formulating and asking questions, and managing disagreement between interviewees. In addition, interviewers are expected by the audience to be adversarial with their interviewees to make the interview more entertaining, and that would put interviewers between two conflicting norms: being neutral and adversarial at the same time. Analysis of interviewers' performance in achieving this role revealed that maintaining neutrality by interviewers is a complex matter and may be impossible since questions produced by interviewers would usually involve opinionated and challenging statements, and may threaten the face of the interviewees. Displaying neutrality becomes more complex within panel news interviews where interviewers ask questions to different interviewees (Clayman, 2002). Through close examination of interviewers' questioning, researchers also add the projection of the interviewees' social identity to the interviewer's role.

Nevertheless, there have been no previous studies that examined in detail the cultural variation in the moderator's performance of certain tasks, such as encouraging disagreement, challenging the interviewees, and managing the escalating disagreement and dispute between the interviewees. The current study will attempt to fill this gap by exploring the extent to which cultural background can influence the moderator's use of language in panel news interviews based on the assumption that speakers from different cultures may have different expectations and norms about their participation in any speech event.

Address Terms

Unlike research on news interviews, there has been an extensive amount of previous inquiry mostly in the sociolinguistics literature devoted to studying how people name and address each other, and what the factors and contexts are that govern such a use. The importance of studying address terms in sociolinguistics lies in its reflections of the speakers' social relationship with others as well as their cultural beliefs and values. Thus, address terms can be linguistic indicators by which sociolinguists can explore the impact of social, situational and cultural variables that influence the use of language. According to Parkinson (1982), "the study of address terms of various languages is not new; numerous studies are available on a great many languages. The earliest were done by anthropologists as part of a more general study of the kinship systems of various peoples" (p.2). The earliest work by sociolinguists and social psychologists on address terms was done in the works of Brown and his associates (Brown & Ford, 1961; Brown & Gilman, 1960). In these pioneering works, Brown and his associates claimed that the

use of address terms and pronouns between interlocutors is based on two aspects of the relationship between the speaker and the addressee: solidarity and power.

According to Brown and Ford (1961), two factors influence the use of address terms: the degree of intimacy and familiarity (solidarity), and the degree of social status (power) between speakers. Furthermore, address terms portray “exactly who and what the speaker thinks the addressee is” (Koh, 2002:1). Hence, a person with high status will address another person with equal status differently than addressing a person with lower status, and vice versa. Similarly, addressing familiar and close persons is different than calling unfamiliar and people with no close relationship.

In fact, the earliest attempt to understand the process of the use of address terms was not intended to study address terms per se, but rather to investigate the use of reference pronouns. Brown and Gilman (1960) investigated the influence of social distance (solidarity) and social rank (power), on the use of the pronouns *tu* (T) and *vous* (V) in 20 different languages of Europe and India. Wardhaugh (1998) described the origin of the two forms:

[B]y medieval times the upper classes apparently began to use V forms with each other to show mutual respect and politeness. However, T forms persisted, so that the upper classes used mutual V, the lower classes used mutual T, and the upper classes addressed the lower classes with T but received V. This latter asymmetrical T/V usage therefore came to symbolize a power relationship. It was extended to such situations as people to animals, master or mistress to servants, parents to children, priest to penitent, officer to soldier, and even God to angels, with, in each case, the first mentioned giving T but receiving V (p.256).

Brown and Gilman’s (1960) study on T/V usage was very influential to the extent that it triggered a line of research by sociolinguists and social psychologists to investigate not only the influence of social rank and distance in determining the use of reference, but also the use of address terms. Researchers then focused their investigation on studying

the use of address, and testing the claims presented by Brown's model of solidarity/power in many languages.

Brown's model was not without criticism. McIntire (1972) criticized Brown's model based on a study on American address terms. McIntire found Brown's model to be inadequate when she found that in many cases the lower member of a dyad initiated the use of the intimate form in contrast to Brown's claim that the higher member of an unequal dyad would have the authority to initiate intimate usage. Detailed description of this study will be presented below in previous studies on American English.

Further criticism to Brown's model came from Moles (1974, 1978), who treated address term use by bilingual Indians in Peru. Moles found that the concepts of power and solidarity were not enough to explain the use of address without another concept, variation. Similarly, Parkinson (1982) showed that although Brown's concepts of power and solidarity are useful means to explain address terms use in Egyptian Arabic, they do not help in predicting the type of address terms that the speaker would use in any situation. Therefore, these studies call for looking at general tendencies, as well as absolutes in identifying the rules that govern the use of address terms (Parkinson, 1982: 4).

In English, there is no "active T/V distinction" (Wardhaugh, 1998: 261). However, speakers of English, like speakers of many languages, can use address terms in a similar way to the use of T and V forms. In general, speakers of English can be addressed by: nickname and diminutive forms, e.g. Gazza and Jenny; first name, kinship terms, e.g. father, mother; title and last name, professional title, e.g. nurse or doctor; general title, e.g. sir or madam; honorific titles, e.g. your majesty or your grace (Ervin-

Tripp, 1972). Like T/V forms, the use of these terms is based on the social relationship between the speaker and the addressee. Thus, first name, nickname and diminutives are used with familiar addressees, whereas people with higher status (superior) are addressed formally using a title and last name, honorific name, kinship term, general name, or a professional name. Of course, there is variation in using address terms from one community to another and from one context to another according to the social norms of the speakers. According to Holmes (1992), the solidarity between speakers is given more weight than status in many western communities in the second half of the twentieth century. For example, employees generally use first name when addressing their bosses, especially if they talk with them regularly.

In addition, many other researchers examine the use of address terms with respect to social relationship in many languages such as Arabic, Chinese, English, French, etc. (see Koh, 2002: 13, and Parkinson, 1982: 7-8 for a list of previous studies in different languages). Other researchers also compare the use of address forms in two or more languages. For example, Braun (1988) compared the use of address terms in Portuguese, Georgian, Norwegian, and Arabic, based on interviews with native speakers of these languages. Cooke (1968) compared and contrasted the use of address terms in Thai, Burmese, and Vietnamese. All of these languages have a very large system for address terms similar to Arabic, which will be the focus of the current study. In what follows, I will review previous studies on the address terms in American English and Arabic since the current study involves both languages.

Address terms in American English

As stated earlier, the classic work by Brown and Ford (1961) was pioneering, and marked the beginning, not only as the first treatment of address terms in American English but also as one of the first published works on the use of address terms. The data used in their study were collected primarily from three volumes of American plays, and supplemented with (1) actual use in a Boston business firm, (2) reported use of executives, and (3) recorded usage by children in the Midwest. According to Brown and Ford, there are three possibilities for the use of address terms in English: reciprocal first name (FN), reciprocal title and last name (TLN), and a non-reciprocal pattern in which a person uses FN and receives TLN. The examination of plays demonstrated that speakers in most cases used mutual FN, whereas mutual TLN is used in few cases usually between newly introduced adults. Furthermore, Brown and Ford noted that the change from mutual TLN to mutual FN is based on 'the degree of acquaintance'. Younger speakers as well as same-sex dyads were found to switch to mutual FN more quickly than older speakers and opposite-sex dyads, respectively.

According to Brown and Ford, there are two factors that lead to asymmetrical addressing: difference in age and in occupational status. For example, young speakers use TLN with adults and receive FN. Similarly, employees use TLN with their bosses and receive FN. These two factors, however, may lead to a conflict in the use of address terms. A conflict may arise between age and rank in dyads that consist of, e.g. an adolescent girl and her family's middle-aged cook, or between a young executive and an elderly janitor. Close examination of data showed that speakers in these conflicted cases follow rank not age. Brown and Ford describe and explain these cases by saying that

“[I]t would appear that there is a normative rule of priority for the two criteria. It is to be expected in a society whose values are more strongly linked to achieve personal attributes than to ascribed attributes that occupation would prevail over age...” (p. 237).

In a subsequent study, Slobin, Miller, and Porter (1968) studied the use of address terms by workers in the corporate world. The results of their study confirmed Brown and Ford’s (1961) findings in which workers with equal occupational status use FN with each other, while superiors were addressed with TLN. This study’s results also support the finding that occupational rank significantly influences the choice of address terms more than other factors, such as age or experience.

McIntire (1972) investigated the use of address terms in academia by professors, teaching assistants, and students, finding Brown and Ford’s model to be ineffective, with minimal predictive use. McIntire explains the failure of the Brown and Ford model as the result of the participants’ common avoidance of using address terms as well as the change in context.

Instead of approaching address terms in the dimensions of power and solidarity as investigated in the studies reviewed above, Ervin-Tripp (1972) developed and presented a theoretical model to explain the usage of address based on earlier works in social psychology. Using a flowchart, Ervin-Tripp formalized the rules an individual uses to choose an appropriate address term at a specific speech event. Because of its emphasis on individual’s choice, Ervin-Tripp’s model was considered inadequate by sociolinguists, who consider rules to work across whole communities of different types of speakers instead of individuals as Ervin-Tripp argues. Parkinson (1982) describes the problems of this model “that it requires binary answers to questions that reflect situations that are not

binary but rather a complex set of interacting continua” (p.8). Because of its inadequacy from a sociolinguistic point of view, this model will not be taken into account in explaining the usage of address terms in the current study.

In summary, the extensive amount of previous studies conducted to explore address terms used in American English provide important findings to understand the factors that influence address terms usage. Despite the subsequent criticism to the claims of Brown and his associates that the aspects of solidarity and power between the interlocutors determine the use of address terms between them, these studies provided initial explanation and framework to examine the factors governing the use of address terms, mostly from the view of the relationship between the speakers. However, as pointed out in some subsequent studies (e.g., McIntire, 1972; Moles, 1974, 1978), the claim of Brown and his associates could not explain adequately the use of address terms in various contexts and settings examined. Therefore, context needs to be given further consideration to understand and explain the variation in using address terms that can be obtained by just looking at the aspects of solidarity and power in the relationship between the speakers. In addition to context, as we will see next, culture and background knowledge can be of great importance in explaining and predicting the use of address terms across cultures and languages. Having reviewed the research on the use of address terms by speakers of American English, let us now turn to the literature to review previous studies on address terms in Arabic.

Address terms in Arabic

Several published studies have been conducted to study usage of address terms in various Arabic dialects. In most of these studies, a discussion of the vocative system in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) is presented. Thus, in what follows, I will describe briefly the vocative rules in MSA discussed in literature, since they are employed in formal contexts like the focus of this study, political interviews. Related findings of studies on dialects will then be presented.

The vocative in MSA is often preceded by the particle *ya*, as in *ya Yousef* '(Oh) Yousef, which is optional in English (Quirk et al. 1985: 773, cited in Potter, 1994). The vocative form (particle + vocative) may precede masculine or feminine, singular or plural names (Potter, 1994). In contemporary dialects, the vocative particle *ya* is still preserved and used in everyday talk, as in Kuwaiti Arabic (Yassin, 1978), or abbreviated to *a*, as in Moroccan Colloquial Arabic at most times (Potter, 1994: 219). This particle may be followed by first name, title and first name, kin term (e.g., father, mother), or non-kin term (e.g., *sidi* 'sir', *akhi* 'brother'). The choice of what is to follow the particle *ya* is context-dependent, and may vary from one dialect to another, in some cases according to the social dimensions of respect, formality, and intimacy that govern the use of address terms. However, the particle is not used at all times, and the vocative can be used with first name, kin, or non-kin term only.

In two excellent studies, Parkinson (1982, 1985) provides a comprehensive account of terms of address in Egyptian Arabic from a sociolinguistic point of view. Unlike other dialects of Arabic, Egyptian Arabic (EA) has a very large system of address terms (262 terms of address), which was developed and added to the basic system of

family terms and terms of respect in two ways: borrowing from high prestige languages, such as Turkish, French, English, e.g. *basha* ‘master’, *misyu* ‘Mr.’, *madaam* ‘Madam’, respectively; and phonological reduction of terms usually by low class people, e.g. *usta* ‘teacher’, *raais* ‘boss’). Parkinson collected his data through observation of naturally occurring situations in Cairo, as well as through some interviews with native speakers of the dialect. Most of the address terms in EA discussed by Parkinson are limited in most cases to the speakers’ dialects; however, there are some terms of address that are commonly used in most other dialects as well as in MSA, as we will see later. In general, the address terms system in EA “is structured on the level of sex, age, social class, degree of intimacy, and role of addressee in relation of the speaker” (Parkinson, 1985: 222).

Address terms like *baasha* ‘Pasha’, *beeh* ‘Bey’ were found to be used most frequently in formal situations compared with *sidi* ‘Mr.’, which found as not used at all, and *akh* ‘brother’, which is used frequently with family members, and sometimes used as the most appropriate and polite term for an unknown addressee of approximately the same age and social class as speaker. If *akh* ‘brother’ is used with unknown or less acquainted addressees, it is usually preceded by the vocative particle *ya* ‘oh’, and sometimes followed by first name if known by the speaker. The use of *akh* ‘brother’, as the most polite term with unknown or less acquainted addressees, is similar to the use of *akhi* ‘my brother’ as found in Al-Rojaie (2002), whether preceded by *ya*, or followed by first name or not. In this study, I examined the use of address terms in political interviews at Al-Jazeera TV channel, and found that the term *ya akhi* ‘oh my brother’ was used to show solidarity with addressees before introducing disagreement. Similarly, Hassanain (1988) also supports the observation that the term *akh or akhi* was used as a

way of showing solidarity even with non-family members and strangers, based on his investigation of the use of address terms in the speech community of Makkah, western Saudi Arabia. Moreover, Hassanain concluded that the two social dimensions of solidarity and familiarity play an important role in the usage of address by Makkans, as stated by Brown and his associates (1960, 1964), but with much consideration being taken of the context of address use as well as the social factors of age and educational level, which both significantly influence the choice of address terms.

Whereas the core of the EA system of address terms is for the purpose of showing respect, some other terms are also used for other purposes, such as joking and abuse. Terms of address are used for these purposes only in certain situations and contexts according to the relationship of the speaker to the addressee. Of course, these terms are not expected to be used in a formal context like a political interview; therefore, I will not discuss their use. Although Parkinson's study was detailed and comprehensive, it did not cover in much detail the function of address terms in certain situations to perform particular speech acts, like agreement, or disagreement.

Potter (1994; 1999) has conducted two interesting studies of terms of address in Moroccan Arabic (MA), but at a smaller level compared with Parkinson's study (1985). Based on the analysis of the Moroccan film *Dmu al-Nadam2* (Tears of Regret), Potter (1994) showed the various address terms used in customary conversation in MA and compared them with their equivalents in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). Potter noted that speakers of MA, like speakers of EA (Parkinson, 1985), follow the same rules and social dimensions when addressing someone, including respect, acquaintance, no respect or acquaintance. Furthermore, Potter quoted Nydell (1987:48) that in most Arab societies

the first name will be used between new acquaintances from the moment of introduction, which he also found in his study. In addition to describing address terms only used in MA, such as *si* 'mr.' *sidi* 'sir', and first name, Potter noted that speakers of MA, in their use of address terms, code switch from MA to MSA to produce a variety of effects, such as closeness, distance, etc. These effects have to be observed in the current study.

In a subsequent study, Potter (1999) described names and their use in MA. He noted "using a title plus first name is probably the most appropriate form of address in most situations because it is respectful to addressees of different ages and of different occupational status, and maintains a suitable distance between the addresser and the addressee" (p.170). The use of title and first name as the most appropriate term in formal settings has to be observed in the current study of political interviews. The interesting point presented in Potter's study is the finding that speakers of MA used the address *si Muhammad* 'Mr. Muhammad' for different functions. It is ordinarily used to address a man unknown to the speaker, and in some cases, it is used by younger speakers to address one-time male acquaintances who are younger or at the same age to show solidarity. The use of *si Muhammad*, however, is not expected in a formal setting like political interviews.

In short, although previous studies of address terms in major Arabic dialects provided a substantial description of the uses and functions of address terms, they, however, did not look at the functions of address terms in conversation between interlocutors. In other words, their focus was limited to when, to whom, and for what function an address term is used in ordinary conversation. There has been no previous study, to my knowledge, that examined the use of address terms of Arabic in settings

other than mundane conversation, such as interviews, debates, and courtroom talk. In what follows, we present a review of prior research on the use of address terms within the context of news interviews mostly by English speakers.

Address terms use in political interviews and debates

As stated above, terms of address reflect the positioning of the speakers' social identity in relation to the addressee, particularly in terms of the social dimensions of solidarity and power. Moreover, the choice of address terms is sensitive to the context of interaction that may vary from one situation to another and from one culture to another based on the social norms of speech interaction. Political interviews and debates exemplify two formal situations in which language use is different according to the participants and audience expectations and norms. Like other linguistic forms and structures, the use of address terms is influenced by these expectations. Although political interviews and debates present an excellent opportunity to study the uses and functions of address terms, there have been very few studies conducted for this purpose. By my extensive search, I found only two studies. In the following, I review these studies in addition to other unpublished papers that I found during my search.

In an interesting study, Jaworski & Galasinski (2000) investigated the role of vocative address terms by participants of political debates in Polish TV networks (in Polish language). The researchers were interested in examining how politicians strategically employ address terms as a means of gaining advantage over their opponents. They found that the role of address forms in political debates is significant; in which politicians used them to "define the social space between them" (p.49). Thus, "the choice of vocatives enables them, firstly, to regulate and establish the local orientations and

stances (footing) that form part of their lived ideologies and, secondly, to legitimize their formal systems of belief and value, or intellectual ideologies” (p.49). Moreover, the choice of vocative forms of address was used strategically to build a positive image for the politician. For example, Walesa, the former leader of Poland, employed “distancing vocative forms of address and downward-looking vocatives to reinforce his image as a strong national leader and lone fighter against (the shadow of) Communism” (p.50). The strategic employment of vocative forms of address in the context of political interview has to be observed in the current study.

The strategic use of address terms within the context of political interviews was found to be not only limited to the interviewees. In fact, previous studies showed that interviewers also employ them for a variety of functions. For example, Al-Aridi (1987) analyzed and investigated the dynamics of political television interviews, and the variation in interactants’ manipulation of language used by Arab and Israeli interviewees. Among other things, Al-Aridi examined the use of address forms in opening (questions) and closing (answers) moves. He showed how American interviewers used address forms more with Israeli politicians than with Arab ones to show closeness, familiarity, and intimacy. He considered this in his argument, among other things, as an indicator of how the American media was biased in displaying Arab politicians during political interviews. Furthermore, Al-Aridi (1987) differentiates between two types of address forms used in political television interviews: initial and embedded. Initial address forms include, *Mr. Ambassador*, *Dr. Smith* etc, embedded address forms include the use of *sir* at the beginning or the end of the question. Al-Aridi, however, did not examine the use of address forms in responding moves. According to Al-Aridi, the original purpose for the

use of address forms is to show intimacy, familiarity, and closeness. However, address forms can also be used to indicate that there is something wrong with the interaction, especially if they are used in an embedded position. In addition, the use of address forms can lead to interruptions, as it has been suggested by Bull and Mayer (1988) in their study of Margaret Thatcher, which will be described in detail in the following section on interruption.

My own pilot study (2002) on political television interviews can be another example of discourse analysis research on political interviews. In that study, I examined the differences between Arabic and English speakers in their use of address forms. The results of the study clearly showed that Arab participants used address terms more frequently than American ones, and for a variety of functions. Whereas the American participants used address terms only to direct questions, Arab participants used them to interrupt, to show disagreement, to end conversation, to interrupt for topic limit or time limit, to extend a turn (hold the floor), and to initiate an argument. All of these functions of using address terms will be examined in the current study.

Probably the most related observations about the usage of address terms by English speakers are presented by Clayman (1998; 2002) in two unpublished papers. Despite that fact that Clayman's observations were tentative and not fully developed, they however covered the many uses of address terms in news interviews. The main observation stated by Clayman related to the study was that address terms are more common in a range of interactional environments in news interviews, including showing disagreement, challenges, topic shifts, and floor fights. In addition, address terms are observed to be common in ordinary conversation in different environments, including

expressing strong or personal opinions, telling troubles and complaints, making promises, and sympathetic receipts. That does not mean, however, that the use of address terms in news interviews or ordinary conversation is limited to these environments. Rather, the use of address terms in the two contexts can be found across these environments. As mentioned earlier, although Clayman's observations are interesting and much related to the current study, they are not fully developed with description and analysis of examples that show the use of address term in each environment, particularly those employed in news interviews. In his later paper (2002), Clayman expanded investigating an interesting observation that he briefly mentioned in his previous paper about the usage of address terms in news interviews related to the relationship between the positioning of address terms within a turn of interaction and their intended function of use. He noted that when an address term precedes the main point to be presented, it usually functions as a means of reinforcing the attention to the talk in progress. All points observed by Clayman will be examined in the current study to find whether both Arabic and English speakers use address terms for the same functions or not.

In the preceding section, we have outlined the prior research on the phenomenon of address term usage. We paid more focus on studies involving the examination of address terms use by English or Arabic speakers, and in the context of news interviews.

To summarize, in this chapter, I have reviewed three related approaches to discourse analysis, which will contribute in our analysis in this project (namely, speech act theory, interactional sociolinguistics, and the ethnography of communication). I have also reviewed previous research on news interviews as a speech event, with much emphasis on panel news interviews since it is investigated in the current study.

Additionally I reviewed studies on the moderator's role and the use of address terms and interruption. Throughout my review, I have paid more attention to studies that involve the examination of cultural variation, particularly between Arabic and English speakers in their patterns in language use within the context of news interviews. In the next chapter, Chapter III, I present the research methodology used in this study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Having reviewed the related literature to the current study in Chapter II, this chapter describes the methodology utilized in the study. Specifically, a number of methodological issues will be discussed, including data selection and collection, description of data, and data analysis. First, I describe the procedures employed in the data selection, with a detailed account of the variables that have been taken into consideration, and how they were controlled. Next, a comprehensive and thorough description of the Arab as well as American panel programs will be presented, covering their format, content, and hosts (moderators). The rest of the chapter will be devoted to illustrate the process of data analysis, including the preparation of data for analysis, which involves the transcription and coding of the data, and the process used to locate sequences that contain the use of address terms and interruption. Detailed description of the analysis employed to answer the three research questions will also be presented, particularly the selection of the moderator's tasks that will be examined in this project.

Data Selection

In order to come up with a descriptive, comparative, and analytical account of how Americans and Arabs employ address terms and interruption in their interaction, a source of natural and face-to-face interaction is required. To this end, I tried to find a

source of data that would not only meet my initial measures, but also provide ample opportunities for participants to use the linguistic features investigated in this study. The aftermath of the attacks on September 11th, 2001, as well as the beginning of the second war on Iraq later in 2003 at the time of data collection, made me a frequent viewer of televised political programs and shows on both Arab and American TV networks. Throughout the long time that I spent watching TV, I became more aware of political programs of every channel and their hosts. Moreover, I paid more attention to Arab interviewees, and how they use language in political interviews not only on American TV channels, but also on Arab satellite channels, such as Al-Jazeera and Abu-Dhabi TV. I also started observing the differences between American and Arab political programs in terms of their organization, the role of their moderators, and the type of questions asked and how they are answered. From one day to another, I became certain that there were certain differences between Americans and Arabs in their language use during political interviews that would require careful examination and analysis.

Before moving on to describe the procedures of the data analysis, let us first describe the process that I employed in selecting my data. I first decided to find at least five interviews from political programs in Arab TV channels that are set up as panel interviews involving two or more interviewees with different opposing views. Selecting at least five interviews from two programs in each language would give us more insights and opportunities to examine the language use of the features investigated. Moreover, observing the most common patterns and functions of using such features might be possible by just examining five interviews.

Because of the difficulty of viewing most Arab channels during my stay in the United States, as well as the fact that most Arab TV channels belong to governments, and do not have programs that are similar to American programs, I decided to limit my search to the Al-Jazeera channel since it has a number of political programs that meet my initial criteria. Another important factor for my selection of Al-Jazeera TV channel was its targeting of the Arab World as its primary audience, rather than a specific Arab country as is the case for most Arab TV channels, which are mostly limited to the people of their governments. Furthermore, after its introduction in November 1996, Al-Jazeera TV channel also made a very big impact on the industry of news media not only within the Arab countries, but also in the whole world, which would make it necessary and interesting to examine the language use in its programs. Moreover, unlike other government-based Arab TV networks, and even new independent news networks, such as *Al-Arabia*, and *LBC*, Al-Jazeera channel has a website that contains an archive for all of their programs, with audio and video recordings of every edition of each program. This feature for Al-Jazeera not only limited my focus to it, but also saved time and effort by offering access to previous editions of programs to search for interviews that share similarities in terms of their topic, format, and the other criteria that I developed throughout my data collection.

Once I decided to make Al-Jazeera my data source for the Arab interviews, the next step was to choose which program to select. Unlike other Arab TV channels, Al-Jazeera is broadcast 24 hours, offering a variety of programs that are mostly politically oriented. Among the political programs broadcast in Al-Jazeera, there are two that are organized as panel political interviews: *Akthar min Rae* 'More than one Opinion, and *al-*

Itjah al-Muakis 'The Opposing Views'. Both of these two programs are similar in terms of their format, content, and the role of their moderators (hosts). Since I decided in advance to select at least five interviews from one program that discuss one general topic, I made this measure as my guide in selecting which program to be used. Due to the fact that my data collection coincided with the first days of the second war in Iraq during March, 2003, and because the war was a hot topic in most national and international TV networks before and at that time, I decided to make the war on Iraq the general topic on which my selection of interviews would be based. Another reason for my selection of this topic was the fact that both Arabs and Americans were involved in that war, which would make this topic hot and intense for all participants from the two cultures.

Through my search for interviews in the two Arab programs mentioned above, I noted that one of the them, *al-Itjah al-Muakis* 'The Opposing Views', discussed the war in Iraq in more than five editions, while the other program, *al-Rae wa al-Rae al-Akr*, 'The opinion and the other opinion', discussed this topic in only three editions, thereby I excluded the latter program from my selection. Before I started selecting five editions (interviews) from the program, 'the Opposing Views', I decided to wait until I found similar ones in an American program discussing the war in Iraq with similar secondary topics.

Unlike Arab TV networks, there are a variety of political programs in American networks that are set up as panel political interviews. In my search for programs, I found a number of them that had discussed the war on Iraq, including CNN *Crossfire*, PBS *NewsHour*, ABC *Nightline*, FOXNEWS *O'Reilly Factor* and *Hannity and Colmes*, and MSNBC *Hardball*. However, few of these programs resemble the Arab program in

terms of format, the number of moderators (hosts), topic discussed, and length of the program. For example, both the CNN *Crossfire* and FOXNEWS *Hannity and Colmes* have two hosts and have a different format; therefore, I excluded them from my list. Although ABC *Nightline* and MSNBC *Hardball* sometimes present panel interviews with two or more interviewees with opposing views about the war in Iraq, I was not able to find five editions of these programs that contain discussion of the war in Iraq in the format required. In addition, these programs involved a variety of segments that are not necessarily designed as a panel interview, and then the interviews themselves would last for a very short time. Similarly, FOXNEWS *O'Reilly factor* shows sometimes have very short segments that are organized as a panel interview. Consequently, I excluded these three programs, FOXNEWS *O'Reilly Factor*, ABC *Nightline* and MSNBC *Hardball*, from my search.

The only program left that had some resemblance to its Arab equivalent was the PBS *NewsHour*. It involves at most times a segment for 10-15 minutes that is designed as a debate normally between two interviewees about a recent controversial topic in the news. In contrast to the Arab program, the PBS *NewsHour* was presented by a number of different moderators who differ from one edition to another. To solve this problem, I decided to select five editions of this program presented by the same moderator. I also attempted to control the gender of the moderator. Since the Arab program was always presented by one male moderator, I decided to exclude all editions of the PBS *NewsHour* hosted by female moderators. To select from the remaining editions hosted by male moderators, I tried to find five editions presented by a male moderator in which the war

in Iraq was their general topic. Fortunately, I found more than five editions presented by one male moderator: Jim Lehrer.

Once I found enough editions from the English program, the PBS *NewsHour*, I turned back to the editions of the Arab program, and started looking for similarities between the editions of the Arab and American programs in terms of the topic of each edition, and the number of interviewees. I noted that the majority of editions of both programs, the Arab and American ones, had two interviewees; therefore I decided to eliminate all editions that had more than two interviewees. Despite the exclusion of many editions from both the Arab and American programs, I was successfully able to find more than five editions from each program. To refine my data set, I also attempted to find the editions in the American program that had the most resemblance to their equivalent in the Arab program in terms of topic discussed. After making my last attempt to refine my data, I was finally able to collect five editions from each program hosted by the same moderator, and during almost the same developments of the war in Iraq.

One last variable to control in the data was that of face-to-face interaction. During the process of data collection, I had the assumption that the use of the linguistic features investigated in the current study might change if the interaction was not in the same setting. Specifically, in some editions of both the American and Arab programs, one or more guests were linked up to the other participants via satellite, or over the phone. However, once I watched a couple of editions from both the Arab and the American programs, I found out that my earlier assumption was wrong. I discovered that because of the technological developments in Satellite transmission, I could not observe any noticeable difference in language use between the participation of interviewees

linked via satellite and others at the same studio. In other words, the participating interviewees, who were linked via a satellite, acted in a similar way as if they were in the same studio. Therefore, I decided not to exclude editions in which not all the interviewees were present in the studio. In addition, I deleted all phone calls that occur during the interviewees by the audience, especially in the Arab program since my focus was limited to the examination of the use of language by the moderator and the interviewees.

However, my close examination of the data set collected revealed that not all editions of the Arab program met my measures in terms of the participation of the interviewees. For instance, in one edition intended to discuss the dangerous effect of the American propaganda against Arabs, more than half of the edition's time was spent with phone callers, giving less time for interviewees to participate compared with other editions. Thus, I excluded this edition and replaced it with another one that had fewer phone calls. After doing all the procedures intended to refine my database, I collected the final set of editions. From the Arab program, I selected five editions that have the following titles: (1) *al-Tahalif al-Dawli al-mutaziad dhid Amreka*, 'The Increasing International Alliance against America', (2) *al-Muaradh al-Iragiah*, 'The Iraqi Opposition', (3) *al-Akrad wa al-Tagheurat al-Mutwagah fi al-Irag*, 'Kurds and the Expected Changes in Iraq', (4) *al-Shuob al-Arabia wa munhadat al-Khutat al-Amrekiah*, 'Arab Peoples and the Resistance of American Plans', and (5) *al-Dual al-Arabia wa al-Hujoom al-Amreki ala al-Irag*, 'Arab Countries and the expected American Attack on Iraq.'

From the English program, I selected five editions that have the following titles: (1) War or Diplomacy, (2) After the War: The U.N.'s Role, (3) Shields & Brooks, (4) Talk of War, and (5) Shields & Brooks #2. Although the titles of these editions may not show similarities with Arab interviews, the content of each edition has some resemblance. In the first Arab interview, 'The Increasing International Alliance against America', the content of the interview include the discussion of the increasing rejection of some countries like, Russia, France, and Germany, as well as people all over the world, to America's plan to go to war against Iraq. In addition, throughout the interview, the two interviewees (IEs) debate the superiority of America and whether or not America can do whatever it wants at any time, particularly raging a war at any country without getting the approval of the United Nations. These topics have been discussed directly and indirectly in the first English interviews about war or diplomacy and the fourth interview about talk of war.

In the second Arab interview about the Iraqi opposition, the participants discussed the Iraqi-opposition movements, which helped the United States in its war against Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq, and whether or not these movements will continue the culture of eradication of other opposition movements after they become in charge of Iraq. The English participants discussed these topics briefly throughout all the five interviews, particularly those by Shields and Brooks. Similarly, the third Arab interview addressed the issue of the Kurdish opposition movement in north of Iraq, and the choice that they have to make whether to join the efforts led by the United States to liberate Iraq and remove the current Iraqi regime, or be neutral. This topic in general has been discussed shortly in some English interviews, especially the interviews by Shields and Brooks.

In the fourth Arab interview, the participants discussed the controversial topic about the role of the Arab street to change or resist the American plans to start a war against Iraq. This topic was very controversial, and had been discussed widely in most Arab media before the war on Iraq started. This topic also has been addressed generally in three English interviews: the one discussing talk of war, as well as the two editions by Shields and Brooks. Also, this topic has been briefly debated in the second English interview about the U.N.'s role.

The role of Arab countries to avoid the war on Iraq by America and Britain has been discussed in detail in the fifth Arab interview. In specific, it discusses the possible procedures that the Arab League could and have done towards the Iraqi case. Although this topic has been targeted in all English interviews selected, it has been mentioned in most English interviews as a concern for the American politicians toward the war in Iraq.

Description of the Arab program: Al-Jazeera '*The Opposing Views*'

As stated above, after its introduction in the middle of the 1990s, Al-Jazeera channel made a powerful impact on the media industry in the Arab World not only in its new feature of broadcasting news for 24 hours every day, but also with new programs that most Arab viewers were not used to in terms of their format and content, particularly its famous programs: *Al-Itjah Al-Muakis* 'The Opposing Views', and *Akthar min Rae* 'More than one Opinion'. In addition, these two programs attracted most viewers of the channel due to this discussion of topics that are seldom addressed in other Arab government-based channels, such as freedom of speech, and criticism of the policies of Arab governments. Another advantageous feature for the newly introduced programs in

Al-Jazeera was their ability to interview political leaders, celebrities, or princes, which rarely occurred in other channels.

In the Al-Jazeera website at *www.aljazeera.net*, the popular program, 'The Opposing Views', is described as a "live dialogue-based program that is open to the audience to participate. It discusses issues of the hour in all disciplines by interviewing two guests, who have opposing views about an issue of interest. Each one of these interviewees tries to win the approval of the audience by presenting their view about the edition's topic." This program is hosted by Faisal Al-Gassim, who is also in charge of preparing the program, including the topic to be discussed, and questions to be asked. Although this program is intended to discuss various topics from different fields and areas of concern, most topics discussed are politically oriented, and usually reflect the moderator and the channel's interests. Most topics discussed in this program are of course of concern to the viewers in the whole Arab World, such as the Middle East conflict between Israelis and Palestinians, wars in the region, and different political ideologies. The program sometimes discusses local and controversial problems in most Arab countries by allowing members of the opposition in certain Arab countries to present their views via this program, and that put the channel sometimes under huge pressure from Arab governments, which sometimes led to the closing of their local offices in these countries.

'The Opposing Views' is a weekly program that is broadcast every Tuesday at prime time in the evening when most Arabs are expected to watch TV. It also is replayed twice a week at different times on Wednesdays and Thursdays to allow more viewers to watch the program. Further, the topic of each edition to be discussed is usually

announced a few days before the broadcasting of the edition in most programs of Al-Jazeera, and sometimes in other similar programs in other Arab TV channels.

This program seems to meet different goals for the participating interviewees, audience, and the moderator. The interviewees usually perceive their participation as a golden opportunity to send their views to reach millions of Arabs especially in the Middle East, and in the rest of the world, and as an arena for debating their political views. On the other hand, the moderator seeks to put further focus on certain topics that he selects for discussion, and attempts sometimes to comment on them through his questioning as we will see in this study. For the audience, this program gives them a chance to participate in debating a hot and controversial topic via phone calls, e-mail, or fax in a way that is rarely offered in other Arab TV channels that they are used to watch. In other words, it offers them some kind of exceptional freedom to discuss topics of interest and importance for them individually and collectively. For these reasons, the number of viewers of this program probably exceeds most other programs in other Arab TV channels as displayed in the number of phone calls attempted, as well as the e-mails and fax messages sent.

With regard to the format of the program, 'The Opposing Views' is similar to most panel political programs broadcast in British and American TV networks in terms of its general organization and structure. It is an unscripted program designed to address the two conflicting views of a political issue. However, the program has certain unique features that would make it look different from other similar programs in terms of time of duration, and the role of the moderator. Unlike most American and British panel programs, 'The Opposing Views' is a live program that has a fixed time for

approximately an hour and 6 minutes. In addition, in most editions, phone calls from the audience are allowed, but they are sometimes pre-planned by the program's moderator with a well-known person who usually has a particular view about the edition's topic. Thus, one to two calls are usually allowed, which last for a few minutes, and are mostly discussed later by the guests.

After a brief greeting, the program's moderator begins each edition with questions that address the views of the two guests. These questions may last for a few minutes, and of course are not expected to be answered. The moderator uses these questions as a strategy to acquaint the audience with the two opposing views about the edition's topic based on his knowledge of the guests' opinions and beliefs. For example, in the edition about the Iraqi opposition, the moderator begins the interviews by presenting several questions that represent the views of those in favor of the movements of the Iraqi oppositions. Examples of these questions include the following: Isn't it unfair to judge the performance of the Iraqi opposition movements before they take the authority in governing the country? Why do some people accuse these movements that they came with the help of American tanks? After presenting a couple of similar questions, the moderator then shifts his questions using phrases, such as "in contrast", "conversely", or "but", to present the other view about the edition topic that will be discussed. Note that the moderator sometimes attempts to shift his footing from some questions, particularly those that seem strong or biased by distancing himself in relation to the view he is presenting in the question as an attempt to maintain neutrality with both interviewees. Not all the questions represent the views of the guests; the moderator sometimes adds some questions to make the edition's topic look more controversial.

After this relatively long introduction that may last for a couple of minutes, the moderator introduces the participating interviewees, including their names and previous and recent positions that they had. For example, in introducing the participating interviewees in the edition about the growing alliance against the American plans to conquer Iraq, the moderator introduces the names of the guests and their current positions: the first guest: Mr. Tala'at Rumaih, the editor-in-chief of the *al-Sha'ab* Egyptian Newspaper, and the second guest: Mr. Hassan Sati, a researcher in international affairs. The moderator then picks one of the guests and asks him a question. In some cases, the moderator selects one of the questions posed in the introduction and addresses it to one of the guests. The first turn for each guest is relatively long (for up to 5 minutes) so that the guests have enough time to present their views without interruptions. After the quiet beginning, the moderator then usually starts asking quick questions by opposing one guest's views to the other one, and sometimes asks follow-up questions to each guest in an attempt to clarify their points, or challenge them with unexpected relevant points.

In the second half of the program, the moderator answers phone calls from the audience, which are usually pre-arranged, as stated earlier. In addition, the moderator selects one or two questions sent to the program at the time of its broadcasting via fax or e-mail, and asks the guests about them. These questions or comments are usually directed to one of the program's guests.

Before the time of the interview is over, the moderator usually tries to speed up the flow of discussion by asking quick questions that normally are associated with interruption to limit the participants from talking for too long. Then, in the last few minutes, the moderator usually gives a final question for each participant, or asks them to

summarize their views. Finally, the moderator thanks the guests for their participation and the audience for watching the program.

Description of the English program: PBS *NewsHour*

Unlike Al-Jazeera '*The Opposing Views*', the PBS *NewsHour* is not entirely designed to be a panel interview. Rather, only the last 15-20 minutes of the program are devoted as a panel interview. In fact, the rest of the program is a presentation of newsworthy topics as well as some commentary reports about news headlines. Most topics discussed in the panel interview in this program are political. As mentioned above, this program, unlike the Arab equivalent, is presented by more than one moderator. Jim Lehrer, however, is the principal one in this program. In general, the organization of this program is similar to the Arab one, in which two interviewees with ideologically opposing views present and debate a particular topic.

Like the Arab program, the PBS *NewsHour* is introduced with a brief description of the participating interviewees, including their names and previous and recent jobs. The program's moderator then begins the interview by asking one of the interviewees a question. The questions asked by the moderator are usually general in nature, and sometimes are followed up with one or two questions that are for clarification in most cases.

It is important to note that the English program, PBS *NewsHour*, varies in its time contrary to the Arab one, which its time is almost fixed at one hour and 6 minutes. Table 1 illustrates the different times of the English editions.

Table: 1 Times of the editions of the English program

Edition	Time
War or Diplomacy	15.15
After the War: The U.N.'s Role	13.57
Shields & Brooks	11.50
Talk of War	10.15
Shields & Brooks # 2	12.30
Average	12.53

Data Analysis

Having illustrated the process of data selection and collection, I will describe in this section the methodological procedures employed in the current study to find answers to the three research questions posed in the beginning of the study. Before I do that, a few issues will be illustrated concerning how the data were prepared for analysis.

Transcription

In order to examine language use in spoken interaction, discourse analysts require transcription of the data being collected, including written, audio-taped, and even videotaped recordings of the data. As mentioned earlier in the section on the data selection process, an archive for recent and previous editions of both the Arab and English programs was provided by the two channels: Al-Jazeera and PBS in their websites.

As noted by Scott (1998: 111), these transcripts present a general report for each edition of a program; however, they do not provide detailed information for analysis since they do not show important aspects of the spoken interaction, such as false starts and simultaneous talk. In contrast to what Scott did, these transcripts will not be disregarded; rather they will be used as a general starting point for transcription,

especially since they are accompanied with audiotaped and videotaped recordings of the editions of these programs. Thus, I made detailed transcription for each edition in the data by comparing these transcripts with the audiotaped and videotaped versions of these programs, paying much emphasis to the linguistic features investigated in the current study, such as interruptions, overlaps and address terms. To do so, I repeatedly played the audiotaped and videotaped versions of the data while I was reading the written transcripts of the data and modified the final transcription to capture the spoken interaction in each edition.

During the process of making the final transcription of the data, I encountered a number of problems that may affect our understanding of the spoken language. Some of these problems are similar to the ones I faced in my pilot study (Al-Rojaie, 2002), which involved the use of similar data. One of these problems is how to decide a turn, an overlap or an interruption. There have been multiple methods for this discussed in the literature, as discussed in Chapter two. However, I will use the same coding system that Bull and Mayer (1988) used in analyzing their data, in which they coded each occasion on which a politician was interrupted according to whether or not they thought the politician had finished speaking, using cues which include speech content, continuation of speech, intake of breath, or use of hand gesture. In this and all subsequent excerpts, the transcription is presented using the system of Clayman and Heritage (2002), with some differences. Table 1 demonstrates the major transcript symbols employed in the current study.

Table 2: Transcript Symbols adapted from Clayman & Heritage (2002: 347)

IE1: The first interviewee.

- IE2: The second interviewee.
- IR: The moderator.
- IE: That's our policy. Colon (s) indicates the prior sound was prolonged.
- IE: THAT'S our policy. Capital letters indicate increased volume.
- IE: That's (.) our policy. Numbers in parentheses denote elapsed silence in seconds
- IE: That's our policy + Plus signs indicate that one sound followed the other with no intervening silence. (latching)
- IE: That ['s our policy] Brackets mark the onset and termination of
- IR: [But should it] be? simultaneous speech.
- IR: But (should it) be.? Words in parentheses represent a best guess as to what was said. In the Arabic version of examples, parentheses mark overlapped talk.

Another important point to note is that I marked overlapped talk in the Arabic example with parentheses instead of brackets because the Microsoft Word editor by which the transcription is created does not allow the use of brackets in Arabic editing.

As a result of the fact that the current study is designed to examine the use of certain linguistic features, which might not all be directly related to other features, such as intonation and stress, we decided not to use all the symbols used by Clayman & Heritage (2002). Rather, we decided to use only the symbols mentioned above. Furthermore, symbols that mark elapsed time in tenth of second or micropauses of less than 0.2 second will not be used based on the assumption that there is no noticeable impact of such a very short time on the linguistic features investigated in the current study. Moreover, it might be very difficult to include short symbols with the available player at the time of transcription. However, longer times of two seconds or more will be marked using the same symbol. Perhaps the main change that would be implemented in

transcribing the data concerns the use of interruption and overlap. In Clayman and Heritage's convention of transcription, there is no clear symbol that would signal an interruption; therefore, we decided to create a new symbol (the equal sign) that would mark the occurrence of such a feature. The use of a new symbol was also motivated by the strong interaction between overlap and interruption, which would make it important to do so. In excerpt (1), one example of an interruption taken from one of the English interviews is presented.

Excerpt: (1)

1. IE1: ...or the Harim Al-Sharif which they thought they would [as you said]
2. IR: [let's not]
3. let's not revisit Camp David..but the other thing that we would
4. like to know...(the IE1 continued).

In this example, the IR interrupted the IE1, and cut him off from continuing his talk when the IR realized that the IE1 mentioned issues beyond the focus of the program's topic.

Note that we used the brackets to mark the slight overlap between the two speakers, followed by an interruption, as demonstrated by the IE1's stop of talking. In Excerpt 2, an example of an overlap taken from one of the English interviews is illustrated.

Excerpt: (2)

1. IE1: I think it has to come from us. [I think]
2. IR: [the U.S.]=
3. IE1: I think the U.S, has to think in terms of two critical elements...(the IE1 continues)

In this example, the IR overlapped with the IE1 by mentioning the word *the U.S.* as a clarification question for the pronoun *us* mentioned in the interviewee's first turn. What makes this example an overlap rather than an interruption is the fact that the IE1

did not stop his talk. Rather, he continued incorporating the word *The U.S.* instead as a clarification for his intended meaning of the pronoun *us*. To differentiate overlapped talk from interruption in transcription, we used the equal sign to indicate that the overlapped talk of the IR did not stop him from continuing his talk. Note that we put the equal sign next to the overlapped talk by the IR, rather than next to IE1's turn on the basis that the IR is the one who overlaps.

Although the method of differentiating interruption and overlap seems simple and straightforward in some situations, we have encountered a number of problems in determining their number and function of use. The method that will be used in deciding the function of interruptions as well as address terms use depends largely on the content of the turn in which they are used, and comparing that with the preceding and subsequent turns to look for cues that determine the actual function. To illustrate, examine the following example (excerpt 3) from the Arab interview about the increasing international alliance against America:

Excerpt: (3)

(Al-Jazeera '*The Opposing Views*', 'The increasing international alliance against America', 18 Mar 2003). IR: Faisal al-Gassim, IE1: Hassan Sati, IE2: Tala'at Rumaih

1. IE1: You noticed in the address of Bush after Sep.11th Bush jr who in my point
2. of view is the worst president who will drag the world into a catastrophe
3. [and American]= [itself]=
4. IE2 [great :great great]=
- 5. IR: [That contradicts] with [your] earlier statement.
5. IE1: It does not contradict it doesn't He he is practicing the superiority
6. which is done by super country it is now a super power=

(قناة الجزيرة: 18 مارس 2003; الاتجاه المعاكس: التحالف الدولي المتصاعد ضد أمريكا)
مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.) الضيف الأول: حسن ساتي (ض1) الضيف الثاني: طلعت رميح (ض2)

1. ض 1: أنت لاحظت خطاب بوش بعد 11 سبتمبر بوش الابن وأنا في رأيي هذا أسوأ الرؤساء الذين سيجرون
 2. الكارثة بالعالم (وبأميركا) = (نفسها) =
 3. ض 2: عظيم : عظيم : عظيم) =
 4. م.ق: (هذا يناقض (كلامك) الأول
 5. ض 1: لا يناقض لا يناقض: هو هو يمارس السوبارية التي تمارس الدولة العظمى هي الآن دولة عظمى.

Here, although the IR's interruption (line 5) overlaps with the IE2's turn (line 4), and most of it overlaps with the last words in the IE1's turn (line 3), I consider this practice as an interruption because the IE1 responds immediately to the IR's challenge before the IR can hold the floor and continue illustrating his observation. The IE's immediate response indicates that he heard the IR's challenge, implying that he turns the floor for a very short time in order to hear the IR. The use of the equal sign in lines 2 and 3, and not using it in line 5 shows clearly which turn or a part of a turn is overlapping with the other speakers' turns. I applied this rule in all similar situations. With regard to the function of interruption, the moderator interrupts (as shown in line 5 in the English translation) the IE1 to challenge him about the inconsistency of his statement. The use of interruption to function as a challenge is clearly shown in the meaning of the IR's turn by emphasizing the observation that the IE2's view contains contradiction.

The same method is employed in identifying the other functions of interruption found in this study, including changing a turn, showing disagreement, limiting topic of discussion, holding the floor, asking a follow-up question, clarifying, limiting time of discussion, managing disagreement, announcing the results of a poll, commenting, and closing. The functions of interruption employed by the moderator were easy to identify since they were usually associated with tasks that constitute the moderator's role, such as changing the turn, limiting time and topic of discussion, managing disagreement,

announcing the time of a poll, asking a clarifying question, and closing. Identifying these functions is straightforward in most times by examining the moderator's semantic meaning of his turns, which include direct cues related to these functions. The only exception is to differentiate between the functions of clarifying and asking a follow-up question, which probably would be unclear. Interruption to clarify occurs usually in the form of a question about an unclear or ambiguous point mentioned by the interrupted speaker. On the other hand, asking a follow-up question is not necessarily about an unclear point; rather, the moderator cut off the interviewee to further describe or explain a point or incident that he just mentioned.

Similarly, we determine the function of address terms by not only looking at the meaning of the interrupter's turn, but also by examining the preceding turns, and sometimes the reaction of the interruptee. Examine the following example, which shows how we concluded that the function of interruption is to show sarcasm to the interruptee.

Excerpt: (4)

(Al-Jazeera TV 'The Opposing Views': 18 March 2003: 'The Increasing International Alliance against America': IR: Faisal al-Gassim IE1: Hassan Sati IE2: Tala'at Rumaih)

1. IE1: The shine of the United States has ended:its local shine has ended as a
 2. result of what's going on within the United States:racial and religious
 3. :::the repression of freedom:rules against freedom and the control of the
 - 4. Zionist lobby::the American project has become
 5. isolated:which::*akhuna al-azizi*: you know: is fascinated by the
 6. Americans [from inside (....)]=
 6. IE2: [don't mistake: say just your opinions: may Allah protect you]
- (4) مقتطف

1. ض1: انتهى بريق الولايات المتحدة: بريقها الداخلي انتهى بما هو حاصل داخل الولايات المتحدة:
2. عنصر ديني ::: وقمع الحريات: وقوانين ضد الحريات وسيطرة اللوبي الصهيوني:: انعزل
3. المشروع الأمريكي : اللي :: اخونا العزيز: يعني مقتون بالأمريكان (من جوه. =..)
4. ض2: (بلاش تغالط: قول ارأك بس)

Here, the IE2 refers to the IE1 and his perspectives by using the address term: *akhuna al-aziz* ‘our dear brother’ (lines 4-5 in the English translation), which initially seems to be as a formal way for referring. However, when we examine the response of the IE1 in line 6, as well as the tone of the IE1 in producing this address term, it becomes clear that the IE1’s intended function of using such an address term is to show his sarcasm about the IE2’s perspective. This was also confirmed by the IE1’s employment of the sarcastic conversational style in some parts of the interview. We can conclude that our method of determining the function of the interruption and address terms used involves the examination of the larger context in which they are used by looking at the semantic content of the speaker’s turn and his conversational style. Also, we examine the preceding and subsequent turns to find any cues that would indicate the intended function of interruption and address terms. In some cases, we also look to the response of the other speaker to find whether it has some indicators for the intended meaning, as we have shown above. This procedure has been employed in identifying all the functions for address terms examined in the current study, including directing or changing a turn, showing disagreement, challenging, managing a disagreement, introducing an argument, holding the floor, showing sarcasm, showing agreement, and referring. Similar to interruption, some of these functions are mostly employed by the moderator as a means to fulfill the tasks of his role, such as directing or changing a turn, and managing a disagreement. Identifying these functions is simple and straightforward by examining the semantic content of the moderator’s turn. Showing disagreement and challenging by using address terms may appear overlapped in the first glance. However, the difference

between them is that using address terms to show disagreement is associated by an opposing or different point of view mentioned in the turn where the address term is used, and which is different from the point of view stated in the prior turn. On the other hand, using address term to challenge is mostly associated with objection, dispute, or contest of a point mentioned in the prior turn. Similar to that but with slight difference is the function of introducing an argument. To employ this function, speakers use an address term usually before introducing an argumentative point, mostly in the middle or at the end of the turn to call the attention of the addressees that the speaker is about to introduce an important argument. These three functions are very close to each other to the extent each one can fit the fulfillment of the other function. However, showing disagreement is always associated with presenting a different point of view, and more associated with other disagreement features, such as affixal negation (e.g., mis-, un-, dis-, or –less), and nonaffixal negation (e.g., no, or not). Examine the following example (excerpt 5) to illustrate the identification of these functions:

Excerpt (5):

(Al-Jazeera TV *'The Opposing Views'*: 27 May 2003: 'The Iraqi Opposition'
 IR: Faisal al-Gassim IE1: Muhammed al-Tamimi IE2: Sadiq al-Musawi

1. IE1: ...You are saying to me that whatever happened:: Saddam is criminal: no
2. matter how unjust he was: what happened in Iraq is not justified::does not
- 3. justify what happened in Baghdad:: **rajul**: now an environmental disaster:
4. the IRAQI people are THREATEN: threaten to be...(the IE1 continued)

مقتطف (5)

(قناة الجزيرة: 27 مايو 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: المعارضة العراقية)
 مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.) الضيف الأول: محمد التميمي (ض1): الضيف الثاني: صادق الموسوي (ض2)

1. ض 1: ...تقول لي مهما كان صدام مجرماً كان:: صدام مجرماً: مهما كان ظالماً: لا يبرر ما حصل في العراق: لا يبرر ما حصل في بغداد: يا رجل الان كارثة بيئية: الشعب العراقي مهدد: مهدد... (ض 1 اكمل حديثه)

As shown in line 3, as soon the IE1 shows his disagreement with the IE1's point that the cooperation of the Iraqi opposition with America to start a war against Saddam's regime is justified because of previous crimes, he immediately remembers a point by which he can challenge the IE1's perspective (the environmental disaster in Iraqi at that time). To do so, he introduces his challenge with an address term, 'man', which cannot be viewed as an introductory and helping way to present a challenge since it is used in the first place to show disagreement with the Iraqi opposition's views.

Excerpt (6):

- 1. IE2: ...What's going on in Iraq now which is wanted to be in Iraq: **ustaze Faisal**
 2. is a new example in the region: similar to Al-Jazeera channel when it first
 → 3. introduced all people showed enmity to it:: and **al-ustaz** is talking to me
 4. like the Libyan channel:: that means I'm Al-Jazeera channel and he is the
 → 5. Libyan Satellite channel: I want to tell the democratic truth **akhwan** the
 6. Americans came because we lost hope in the Arabian system: and we lost
 7. hope even in the Arab street...(the IE2 continued)

مقتطف (6)

1. ض 2: ...الذي يجري في العراق والذي يراد له أن يصبح في العراق: أستاذ فيصل نموذج جديد على المنطقة:
 2. شبيه بقناة الجزيرة اول ما انطلقت كل الناس عادوها:: والاستاذ بيكليمني زي القناة الليبية:: يعني أنا قناة
 3. الجزيرة وهو قناة فضائية ليبية:: أنا عايز أقول الحقيقة الـديموقراطية يا اخوان جاءوا الأمريكان لأننا
 4. ايسنا من النظام العربي: و ايسنا حتى من الشارع العربي... (ض 2 اكمل حديثه).

As shown in this example, the IE1 first uses the address term, *ustaz*, (line 1) which literally means master, to function as a means of getting the IR's attention to listen carefully to the argument that he is about to say. Then, he uses the same address term (line 3) but to refer to the IE1's perspective in a sarcastic way, then followed immediately with the use of a collective address term, 'brothers' (line 5) to introduce and try to

persuade the audience, including the IR and the IE1, with his perspective toward the crisis in Iraq. It is also interesting to note, however, that the IE2 uses the three address terms without pauses, even after each use, which is possibly because the IE2 wants to hold the floor without interruption from the other participants.

The other functions of using address terms, such as referring and showing agreement are easier to identify compared with the three functions that we just described. The use of address terms to show agreement is employed rarely, and it is mostly associated with an attempt by the speaker to agree with a point mentioned by the other speaker in prior turns. Examine the following example (excerpt 7) for further illustration.

Excerpt (7):

(US PBS *NewsHour*: 4 April 2003 : Shields & Brooks
IR: Jim Lehrer: IE1: Mark Shields: IE2: David Brooks)

1. IR: Mark more images: this has been a week of images on this war has it not
- 2. IE1: It sure has **Jim**: aah and and the confusing images I guess from from
3. Iraq... (the IE1 continued)

It is clearly obvious that the IE1 wants to emphasize his agreement with the IR's comment stated in his question. Note, the term used, "Jim", follows the expression of agreement by saying, "it sure has". This usage would not be for the purpose of introducing or expressing an argument about the images since such argument is delayed and it comes after a pause (line 2).

As its name suggests, using an address term for the function of referring to another person is usually employed by the moderator by mentioning other interviewee's name or any other address that can be understood as an attempt to make reference to his. As will be demonstrated in Chapter IV, the moderator frequently employs THIS function

to help him in fulfilling the task of generating disagreement. Excerpt 8 illustrates this function.

Excerpt (8):

(Al-Jazeera TV *'The Opposing Views'*:11 Mar, 2003: 'Kurds and the Expected Changes in Iraq': IR: Faisal al-Gassim. IE1: Kamal Majeed)

- 1 IR: Ok Mr. Berfikani you heard this view and I want: you
- 2 know Mr. **Kamal Majeed** talked about mistakes: about horrible...
3. (the IR continues his talk).

مقتطف (8):

قناة الجزيرة: 11 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: الأكراد والتغيرات المرتقبة في العراق
المقدم: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.). الضيف الأول: كمال مجيد (ض1) الضيف الثاني: عبد القادر البيرفكاني (ض2)

1. م.ق.: كويس جداً سيد بيرفكاني سمعت هذا الكلام، وأنا أريد يعني السيد كمال مجيد تحدث عن أخطاء: عن
2. أخطاء فظيعة... (أكمل مقدم البرنامج حديثه).

Here, after the IR directs the turn to the IE1 by mentioning his name, he then refers to the IE2 by name so that he can create a potential attempt for generating disagreement. As we will see in the results of this study, the use of address term to perform this function is not limited to the moderator; rather, the interviewees sometimes use it to refer to each other to emphasize their disagreement.

The final function of address terms identified in this study is associated with holding the floor. To perform this function, interlocutors usually call the other speaker mostly by name or any other way of addressing as a means to stop him from continuing his talk, and seize the floor. Let us look at the following example (excerpt 9) to show this function is fulfilled by using an address term.

Excerpt (9)

1. IE2: ...Do Arabs and Arab public benefited from oil: do the oil money get in
2. the pockets of Arabs if we now want [to detail...]=

3. IE1: [This is description this is description]
4. IR: [Ok sayyd sayyd sayyd Faig
5. al-Shaikh Ali (IE2) a lot of points let's respond to them one by one how do
6. you respond to this view why the public get out *sayyad* Yassir alZaiatra
(IE1)
7. IE1: *s:idi* [...]
8 IR: [He is] asking ::a question you know: just to what they go out::to what
9. they defend
10. IE1: *S:idi*: the public the public [the Arab public: the Arab public::]=
→ 11. IE2: [I want to interrupt **doktor. Faisal** one question:
12. one question: one question]
→ 13. IE one [moment *sidi*]
14. IR: [One minute]::only one minute

مقتطف (9):

(قناة الجزيرة: 4 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: الشعوب العربية ومناهضة المخططات الأمريكية)
مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.): الضيف الأول: ياسر الزعاطرة (ض1): الضيف الثاني: فائق الشيخ
على (ض2)

1. ض1: هل النفط استفاد منه العرب والشارع العربي؟ هل دخلت أموال النفط إلى جيوب الشارع العربي؟ لو أردنا
2. (الآن أن نفصل.)
3. ض2: (هذه عملية توصيف.. هذه عملية توصيف)
4. م.ق: (طيب سيد.. سيد.. سيد فائق) (الشيخ علي الكثير من النقاط دعنا نرد عليها واحدة واحدة
5. كيف ترد على هذا الكلام لماذا يخرج الشارع سيد الزعاطرة..
← 6 ض1: (يا سيدي.)
7. م.ق: (يعني يسأل):: سؤالاً سؤالاً يعني عم ماذا يخرج:: عن ماذا يدافع
8. ض1: يا سيدي: الشارع:: الشارع:: (الشارع العربي)
← 9. ض2: (بأقاطع دكتور فيصل: بس سؤال سؤال واحد: سؤال واحد)
10
← 11. ض1: الشارع العربي:: (لحظة ياسيدي)
12. م.ق: (بس دقيقة:: بس دقيقة)

As shown in this example in line 10, the IE1 uses the same address term used in line 5 but for a different function: to hold the floor so that he can continue presenting his argument. Similarly, such usage can be considered from another angle as a way of expressing complaint about the IE2's interruption. The moderator then intervenes (in line 8) to manage the potential occurring fight to hold the floor. As the results of this study will show, the use of address terms can be employed to hold the floor as an interrupter, or as a counter way to regain the floor once interrupted, as seen in this example.

As indicated by James and Clarke (1993), written transcripts of conversations may not capture the prosodic and nonverbal turn-yielding signals at all times to differentiate overlaps and interruptions, and more importantly the intended function of interruption or address term compared with listening to the audio and video recordings of the data. For these reasons, we did not depend entirely on the written transcripts in determining the functions of interruption and address terms used; rather, we go back to the original data and listen carefully to find how exactly the conversation has occurred, especially in instances that may be determined of fulfilling more than one function. Going back to the original data does not mean that our written transcription is not accurate; instead it serves as a means to capture all the important cues that may signal the actual intended meaning of the feature investigated, particularly nonverbal ones that may provide the final word in deciding the intended function.

Another important issue related to interruption is the consideration of turns. After transcribing the data, they were then divided into turns. In considering each turn, the system used by Moder and Halleck (1998) was implemented in which each turn is considered a single one whenever a speaker held the floor. Overlaps in which two or more speakers talked simultaneously and did not interrupt the current speaker's discourse were not counted as separate turns. Backchannel cues like *uh-huh* or *yeah* were also not counted as single turns.

The features of overlapping and interruption have been described and differentiated in detail above. However, there is one feature that is related to these features: latching, which requires further clarification. According to Scott (1998: 119), latching refers to "talk by a new speaker which immediately follows the prior speaker's

talk, with no noticeable pause separating the two turns.” Although latching is considered as a potential disagreement index by Scott, it is not included as one of the features examined in this dissertation simply because its use is infrequent compared with overlapping and interruption, particularly in intense disagreement sequences. As has been illustrated in Table 1, the use of this feature is marked by the plus sign (+).

Although highlighting the difference between interruption and overlapping is important, it is not expected to be a big source of difficulty in interpreting the results of the data within the context of political panel interviews. As shown in the literature (e.g., Scott, 1998; Al-Rojaie, 2002), cooperative overlapping is not expected to occur frequently during political interviews, compared with other settings like ordinary conversation.

Having the final transcription of the data in hand, let us now turn to the methodology utilized in the study to find answers to the three research questions. The first question is about the similarities and differences in the role of the moderator (host) of the Arab and American programs. To answer this question, a close examination of the moderator’s contribution to the spoken interaction is required. This will involve of course reading and re-reading of each turn by the moderator to examine how the moderator performs his role. As discussed in Chapter II, the moderator within the context of panel political interviews can carry out a number of tasks, including asking questions, allocating turns, backchannelling, limiting time and topic of discussion, achieving neutrality, and challenging interviewees. Taking into account the fact that this dissertation examines other features in addition to the examination of the moderator’s role, I therefore decided to limit my discussion to certain tasks, namely, encouraging

disagreement and challenging the interviewees. My decision is in part based on the fact that these two tasks have not been studied before in detail. Moreover, these two tasks are related to the other features investigated in this dissertation, particularly interruption and address terms.

In order to study these two tasks, a close examination of the moderator's turns is needed so that these tasks can be highlighted to show how the moderators handled them. For each one of these tasks, a detailed description will be presented, showing how the moderators performed them with examples. Then, a comparison between the moderators in the Arab and American programs will be made in order to illustrate the commonalities as well as the differences in the two moderators' achievement of their role.

The second and third research questions are about the use of address terms and interruptions. The first step in addressing this question is to locate all instances of use of these features. To do so, a quantitative computational analysis by which frequency distributions of both interruptions and address terms are computed and analyzed. In addition, a qualitative analysis is presented for some examples extracted from the data. Next, a close examination of these instances will be made to find the common patterns, particularly in terms of the function and uses of such features. This of course will involve examining the context in which each one of these features is used, and attempting to predict the function of its use based on examining the content of the turn in which it is used as well as the preceding and following turns. In the Arab interviews, I will use my knowledge of Arabic as a native speaker in determining the function of using each feature. I will of course explain the reasons behind my judgment using particular examples from the data. To relate the moderator's tasks being examined in the first

research question with address term usage, special attention will be made to describe the use of address terms by the moderator to show disagreement and challenge to the interviewees. Once I come up with numbers showing the frequency of use of these features as well as the common patterns and function for using them by Arabic and American English speakers, the following step is to compare and contrast the results in order to come up with a cross-cultural examination of the similarities and differences between Arabic and American English speakers in their use of these features.

In this chapter, I have illustrated the methodology employed to analyze the data, including the procedures utilized to select the data, and to prepare the data for analysis. In the next chapter, I will present the results of my analysis of the data, covering the three areas of interest in this dissertation: the role of the moderator, the similarities and differences in the usage of address terms and interruption, and the use of disagreement, respectively.

CHAPTER IV

INTERRUPTION

Introduction

This chapter will be devoted to studying the practice of interruption in the setting of panel news interviews, with special focus on finding the similarities and differences with which Arabic and English speakers use them. As stated in Chapter III, the investigation of interruptions will involve the examination of their relative frequency as well as their functions. Based on these two levels of usage, a comparison between Arabic and English speakers will be made. Because of the powerful overlap between interruption and disagreement, there will be an emphasis on investigating the extent to which disagreement may play a role in changing the level of frequency and the function of use of interruption.

As we have discussed in Chapter II, interruption is one of the common practices used in news interviews by the moderator, as well as the interviewees. It can be used for a variety of functions, such as showing disagreement, taking the floor, challenging, and limiting time or topic or discussion, and correcting, and its use may differ according to specific situational and cultural factors. In addition to examining frequency and functions of using interruption, we will attempt in this chapter to examine and highlight the cultural backgrounds of Arabic and English speakers to find out

whether their background influences their usage of interruption. Determining the function of an interruption depends largely on the examination of the content of the turns and where it occurs, with some other behavioral resources, such as tone, pitch, etc. In addition, we will examine the usage of interruption in each edition, beginning with Arab interviews. Before proceeding on to do so, it is very essential to examine first the differences between Arab and American participants in their framing of panel news interviews, and show how that significantly would influence the participants' use of the features investigated in the current study. To do so, I will first begin with Arab participants, followed by English ones, with an attempt to identify any potential differences between them.

Participants' framing of the context

As stated in Chapter II, 'frame' refers to how people organize and manage their social interactions (Goffman, 1974) in terms of their expected roles, norms, and presuppositions associated with turn-taking rules, engagement, disagreement, and level of directness in a specific encounter of communication. The results of the close examination of Arab and American interviews in this study confirm our hypothesis that Arabic and English speakers have different expectations about their framing of the context, resulting in differences in the features investigated: interruption, the moderator's role, and address terms. In the following section, I present an overview of the differences in framing between the two groups, beginning with Arabic speakers.

Arabic speakers' framing of panel news interviews

As stated in Chapter II, after its introduction in the middle of the 1990s, Al-Jazeera TV channel made a powerful impact on the media industry in the Arab World in particular. In addition, Al-Jazeera TV channel introduced new features, to which most Arab viewers were not used, such as the introduction of panel news interviews as a way of debating a recent political topic by two speakers from two different ideological points of view. From the first editions of the panel news program, *al-Itijah al-Muakis* 'Opposing Views', the participants as well as the audience started to create their frame expectations of the program about its different features, such as turn-taking rules, level of engagement and directness, and disagreement. Over the years, Al-Jazeera 'Opposing Views' program, became for most Arabs like an arena for controversy and dispute in which some of the communicative features that are not preferred or acceptable in normal encounters, such as mundane conversation and service encounters, become acceptable and common, including challenge, disagreement, dispute, fight for floor, and directness.

The participants (the moderator and the interviewees) in Arab interviews appear generally in the five interviews examined to follow the turn-taking rules of news interviews in which the moderator has a particular role and tasks to fulfill, such as asking questions, changing turns, and opening and closing the interview. Similarly, the interviewees limit their role to a specific task- answering question. However, in some cases, the participants violate these rules by directing their talk to each other rather than to the moderator, particularly when they engage in hot and intense dispute.

With regard to disagreement, the interviewees generally showed a high level of disagreement not only on the main topic of the interview but also on secondary topics

that the moderator or one of the interviewees raised to support his position. In some editions, e.g., in the one about Iraqi opposition, the interviewees had a very fierce dispute with each other, manifested by frequent overlapped talk, exchange of accusations, and loud talk. Although this kind of dispute was not shown in other interviews, the level of disagreement seen in other editions was still high, indicating that the participants were expecting hot disagreement to be common and acceptable in this context. They might be influenced by the fact that their participation in this program offered them a valuable opportunity to reach most Arabic speakers in the world in general and in the Arab World specifically, motivating them to present their positions in any possible way even if it involved violating the rules of communication in this context.

The high level of disagreement shown in the Arab interviews might be largely motivated by the frequent attempts by the moderator to challenge the interviewees and encourage disagreement between them. Specifically, the moderator's method of encouraging disagreement by using terms, such as *Kifa tarud* 'how do you respond' might result in further confrontational talk due to its motivation to engage in confrontation with each other rather than in mere disagreement. Although challenges and encouraging disagreement were expected to be used by the moderator as part of his role, the participating interviewees showed greater disagreement than anticipated in that they reached a high level of disagreement that required the intervention of the moderator in some cases.

In short, the Arab participants in Al-Jazeera 'Opposing Views' framed their expectations to include intense disagreement in presenting their viewpoints in a direct and mostly confrontational way of talk. These expectations might be motivated by the

moderators' attempts to encourage disagreement and confrontation between the interviewees. As we will see in our analysis of the following chapters, the participants' framing of this context had a great influence on their use of the features investigated in this study.

English speakers' framing of panel news interviews

In the English interviews, on the other hand, the participants had different expectations than those seen in Arab interviews. In terms of turn-taking rules, the participants in general followed the expected rules in which they always directed their talk to the moderator. The moderator exercised his role by performing basic tasks, such as asking questions, changing turns, opening and closing the interview. In performing the task of challenging and encouraging disagreement, however, the American moderator had different framing in performing these two tasks. Instead of challenging the interviewees frequently as seen in the Arab interviews, the American rarely challenged his interviewees, and if he did, his challenge were mitigated and indirect. Similarly, the American moderator's attempts to encourage disagreement were for the purpose of mere disagreement rather than confrontation, as seen in the Arab interviews.

Consequently, the participants expected to show a lower level of disagreement than that seen in Arab interviews, with no expected engagement in disputes of confrontational talk. In addition, the English participants showed their disagreement to each other indirectly by inserting their opposing points within their turns rather than presenting them directly, as in Arab interviews. Due to the different framing of participation in the English program, PBS *NewHour*, this might have resulted in

influencing their language use in this context, particularly in the features investigated in this study.

Having described the different framing of Arab and English participants in panel news interviews, let us now turn to the results starting with an overview of the general findings and common patterns used by each group, Arabic and English speakers. The overview will include a summary of the relative frequency for the average usage of interruption by all participants. Then, a summary of the functions by which each group used interruption will be presented including the frequency and percentage of using each function. Finally, a brief discussion of the general tendencies and patterns of usage will be illustrated.

Arab Interviews

Overview of the results

As Table 1 shows, the average usage of interruption by the moderator (hereafter, IR) is 20.8, accounting for 40.4 percent of all turns taken. The IEs have an average of 9.8, which is less than half the IR's average, occurring in 13.5 percent of turns, indicating that the IR relies heavily on interruption to help him carry out the various tasks of his expected role in such a particular context. The overall average for all Arabic speakers participating in the five interviews is 30.6 times of occurrence, with a 24.7 percent of turns taken.

Table 1: The average relative frequency of using interruptions in all Arab interviews

Speaker	Number of Turns	Interruptions used	Percentage of turns
IR	51.4	20.8	40.4%
IEs only	72.2	9.8	13.5%
IR & IEs	123.6	30.6	24.7%

At the level of function of usage, Arabic speakers employ interruption for 13 functions. These functions vary from one interview to another according to numerous reasons, such as the topic of discussion, participating interviewees, the moderator's involvement, etc. In addition, there is a noticeable difference in the functions of using interruption between the IR and the IEs. As Table 2 illustrates, the most frequently used functions for the purpose of interruption by the IR are challenging, changing the turn, and asking a follow-up question, respectively. Conversely, showing disagreement is the most frequently used function for interruption by the IEs. We have explained such a discrepancy as a result of the different tasks the IR and the IEs are entitled to perform in this particular context. For example, we would not expect any interviewee to interrupt to change a turn since this is not part of his role in the interview. Likewise, the IR is not expected to use interruption for the most part to disagree because this would violate his institutional role.

Table 2: The average use of each function of interruptions in all Arab interviews

Speaker	IR	IEs	IR & IEs	Total %
To change a turn	2.8	0	2.8	9.1%
To disagree	1	8	9	29.4%
To challenge	6.6	0.4	7	22.8%
To limit topic	2.2	0	2.2	7.1%
To correct	1	0.2	1.2	3.9%
To take the floor	0	0.4	0.4	1.3%
To follow-up	2.6	0.6	3.2	10.4%
To clarify	2	0	2	6.5%
To limit time	0.6	0	0.6	1.9%
To manage disagreement	0.2	0	0.2	0.6%
To announce the results of a poll	0.4	0	0.4	1.3%
To comment	0.2	0.2	0.4	1.3%
To close	1.2	0	1.2	3.9%
Total	20.8	9.8	30.6	100%

With regard to the general use of interruption by all participants, the functions of showing disagreement and challenging are the most frequent, occurring in 29.4 % and 22.8 %, respectively, of all interruptions used, which accounts all together for more than half the total number of all instances of interruption. Another important point to note is that showing disagreement is the most common function of interruption, particularly by the IEs, confirming the great relationship between interruption and disagreement in panel news interviews. For the remaining functions, they are used for small percentages, and mostly employed by the IR to carry out the various tasks he is in charge of during the interview. In the following section, I will present an in-depth analysis of the use of interruption in each Arab interview, focusing on two levels: frequency and functions of use.

1. ‘The Increasing International Alliance against America’

The two participating interviewees (hereafter IEs) in this edition are: Tala’at Rumaih (henceforth IE1), the editor-in-chief of the Egyptian newspaper *Al-Sha’ab*, and Hassan Sati (henceforth IE2) Sudanese expert in international affairs. Both IEs are highly educated, speaking modern standard Arabic (MSA) throughout most of the edition, but with some frequent use of their own dialects, especially the use of Egyptian dialect by IE1. This edition is set up to discuss the increasing rejection of some countries like, Russia, France, and Germany, as well as people all over the world, of America’s plan to go to war against Iraq. In addition, throughout the interview, the two IEs debate the superiority of America, and whether or not America can do whatever it wants at any time, particularly waging a war against any country without getting the approval of the United Nations. IE1 supports the view that America is in its worst situation at that time,

and that can be an indication of its close collapse as long as it continues in its irrational policy. On the other hand, IE2 is in favor of the idea that America is a super power, and its policy of starting wars is based on an accurate study of its interests in the region only, and it does not need permission from the United Nations or any other country to fulfill its political agenda in the region. However, he changes some of his views at the end of the edition as a result of the constant assaults by both IE1 and the moderator (hereafter IR).

This edition has a fair amount of dispute and disagreement, resulting in frequent interruptions by all participants. As Table 3 shows, the total number of interruptions in this edition by all speakers is 38, accounting for 22.7 percent per turn. Also, the IR has the highest number of interruptions, 19 times, which equals the total number of interruptions by the two IEs. As we will see later, the IR's high frequency of interruptions is due to his framing of his role to constitute an employment of interruption to fulfill the various tasks of his role, such as directing and changing a turn, and opening and closing the interview.

Table 3: The frequency distribution of interruptions in 'The Increasing Alliance'

Speaker	Number of Turns	Number of Interruptions	Percentage of turns
IR	63	19	30.1%
IE1	44	9	20.4%
IE2	60	10	16.6%
Total	167	38	22.7%

As demonstrated in Table 4, the practice of interruption was employed for a variety of functions, related in most cases to the participants' roles. For example, the majority of interruptions utilized by the IR are for tasks, such as changing a turn, closing, or limiting the topic of discussion. On the other hand, the IEs used interruptions mainly

to show disagreement. Thus, the participants employed interruption to help them fulfill their roles within the turn-taking system employed in news interviews.

Table 4: The functions of using interruptions in Arab interview #1

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To change a turn	6	--	--
To show disagreement	5	9	7
To challenge	2	--	1
To limit topic of discussion	2	--	--
To correct	2	--	1
To take the floor	--	--	--
To ask	--	--	1
To close	2	--	--
Total	19	9	10

A powerful illustration of the participants' framing of their role is manifested in the IEs' failure to use interruption for functions that are part of the IR's responsibility, such as changing the turn or closing. However, there are some cases in this edition in which the participants break the frame by violating the rules of turn taking by interrupting for functions that are not part of their role. For instance, as excerpt 1 shows, IE1 interrupts IE2 to ask him a question about specific information that he mentioned in prior turns in violation to the rule that the IR is the only one to perform such as task. To illustrate, observe the following example (excerpt 1).

Excerpt (1):

(Al-Jazeera TV *The Opposing Views*: 18 March 2003: 'The Increasing International Alliance Against America': IE1: Hassan Sati: IE2: Tala'at Rumaih)

1. IE2: If *Ustaz* Tala'at wants to record this he can do that:: this is the economical
2. status of the [world]
3. IE1: [yes] =

4. IE2: the United States the overall production level 10 trillion and 885 billion
 5. dollars the average personal income is 37, 600 dollars the census is 289.5
 6. who [...]
 → 7. IE1: [the] development index how much
 8. IE2: the development index is 2.6...(IE2 continued)

مقتطف (1):

{ قناة الجزيرة: 18 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: التحالف الدولي المتصاعد ضد أمريكا
 مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.). الضيف الأول: طلعت رميح (ض1) الضيف الثاني: حسن ساتي
 (ض2) }

1. ض2: إذا أراد.. إذا أراد أستاذ طلعت أن يسجل فليسجل، دي الواقع الاقتصادي (للعالم)
 2. ض1: (ايوه)=
 3. ض2: الولايات المتحدة، الناتج الإجمالي 10 ترليون 885 مليار دولار متوسط دخل الفرد من هذا 37
 4. ألف دولار 600، تعداد السكان 289.5، الذين (...)
 ← 5. ض1: معدل التنمية قد آيه
 6. ض2: معدل التنمية 2.6، معدل.. (اكمل ض2 حديثه).

Here, despite the fact that IE2 directs his talk to the IR in line 1 (English translation) his reference to IE1 to take note of what he is about to say appears to shift the interaction in lines 3-8. Here the two interviewees seem to be talking to each other in a normal conversation frame rather in an interview frame. The IEs adopt the rules of interaction common in normal conversation, allowing IE1 to interrupt to ask a question.

Among the various functions for which interruption is employed by the IR, changing the turn from one interviewee to another appears to be the most frequent type. The reason behind that lies in the fact that news interviews are limited to a specific time for broadcasting, making the IR responsible for managing the time since he is the representative of the TV station (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). To perform such a task, the IR normally interrupts the IEs to keep the discussion moving, and to give equal opportunity for each interviewee to present his/her perspective. At the same time, the IR tries to encourage disagreement between the interviewees. To do so, the IR usually interrupts, particularly after the interviewee mentions a potential point for disagreement.

As we have seen in Table 2, the most frequently occurring function of using interruption was to change a turn. This case occurs usually after the interviewee who is holding the floor has taken a long turn, or has presented an opposing point that can be used by the moderator to challenge the other interviewee. Therefore, we can say that the IR's decision to interrupt varies from one case to another according to his understanding of what can be employed as a means of moving the discussion or encouraging disagreement between the IEs. In some cases, the IR interrupts for both reasons. Let us examine the following example (excerpt 2) to illustrate the use of such a practice.

Excerpt (2):

(Al-Jazeera TV *'The Opposing Views'*: 18 March 2003: 'The Increasing International Alliance Against America': IR: Faisal al-Gassim IE1: Tala't Rumaih IE2: Hassan Sati)

- 1 IE2: ...if we have a wise super power it wouldn't use this power excessively in
2. the absence of other powers
- 3 IR: [good ok]=
- 4 IE1: [great :great]=
- 5 IR: [OK]Tala'at Rumaih You heard this view you can respond
6. IE 1: Ah but I want to take my time
7. IR: Go ahead go: take your time go ahead

مقتطف (2):

قناة الجزيرة: 18 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: التحالف الدولي المتصاعد ضد أمريكا
مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.). الضيف الأول: طلعت رميح (ض1) الضيف الثاني: حسن ساتي
(ض2)

1. ض2: ...لو ربنا ابتلانا بدولة عظمى عاقلة لما كانت استخدمت هذه القوة هذا الاستخدام المفرط في غياب
2. قوى اخرى
3. م.ق.: (طيب كويس جداً)
4. ض1: (عظيم :عظيم =)
- ← 5. م.ق.: كويس جداً طلعت رميح سمعت هذا الكلام لك أن ترد
6. ض1: أه بس لو سمحت بقي أخذ وقتي
7. م.ق.: اتفضل خذ خذ وقتك اتفضل

In this example, the IR interrupts IE1 once he presented his evaluation of the American decision to invade Iraq in a long turn, which also includes a potential point for disagreement. Note that IE1 shows his enthusiasm to take the floor (line 4) saying, *adheem...adheem* 'great...great' to comment on the shift in the position of IE2 compared with his earlier comments in prior turns. Another interesting point to note is that IE1 (line 6) asks the IR to give him enough time to respond without interruption, indicating the IEs are aware that the IR will challenge them about their views.

In this edition, we observed as a general finding that participants interrupt to fulfill tasks associated with their expected role in the context of panel news interviews. Whereas the IR usually interrupts for tasks, such as changing a turn, limiting time or topic of discussion, or closing, the IEs interrupt to show disagreement to each other in most cases. In this edition, interrupting to challenge was the most frequent type used by the IR. We have also observed that in some cases that the IEs broke the frame of the interview by violating the turn-taking rules in they interacted with each other as if they were in a normal conversation frame by asking each other directly rather than making the IR do so.

1. 'The Iraqi Opposition'

Two Iraqi nationals with opposing views participated in this edition: Muhammed al-Tamimi, an Iraqi expert in Arab affairs, and Sadiq al-Musawi, director of public relations in the Royal Constitutional Movement. The topic of discussion in this edition is the Iraqi-opposition movements, which helped the United States in its war against Saddam Hussain's regime in Iraq, and whether or not these movements will continue the culture of eradication of other opposition movements after they take charge of Iraq. Muhammed

al-Tamimi (henceforth IE1) supports the view that the Iraqi opposition is created by the United States in a planned attempt to destroy the Iraqi nation and its history, and open the door for the members from Israeli Mossad to loot the most important Iraqi documents. On the other hand Sadiq al-Musawi (henceforth IE2) is in favor of the Iraqi opposition, insisting that they help the Iraqi people in the removal of Saddam's regime, which killed thousands of people, and the reason for helping the United States is because it is the only country which offered to change the ruling regime in Iraq. Unlike other editions of the program, this edition witnesses the fiercest dispute between the IEs, resulting in very frequent overlapped talk, with relatively high use of address terms.

As mentioned earlier, this edition witnessed the fiercest disagreement and dispute between the IEs compared with the other five interviews, particularly in the beginning of the program. Despite the fact that we have excluded the periods of discussion in which the overlapped talk made it difficult to recognize the speakers, this edition still has the highest frequency of interruption. As Table 5 illustrates, the total number of interruptions is 36, in 34.6 percent of the total number of turns. As in Arab interview # 1, the IR has the highest number of interruptions, 23 times on more than half the turns he took.

Table 5: The relative frequency of using interruptions in 'The Iraqi opposition'

Speaker	Number of Turns	Interruptions used	Percentage of turns
IR	43	23	53.4 %
IE1	29	6	20.6%
IE2	32	7	21.8%
Total	104	36	34.6%

The examination of the content in which interruptions have occurred indicates that they are used for more functions in addition than those found in the first interview,

particularly by the IR. As Table 6 shows, the IR employed interruption to accomplish the various tasks for which he is responsible, such as limiting time of discussion, & asking a follow-up question.

Table 6: The function of using interruptions in ‘The Iraqi Opposition’

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To change a turn	2	--	--
To show disagreement	--	4	6
To challenge	6	--	1
To limit topic of discussion	2	--	--
To correct	--	--	--
To take the floor	--	1	--
To ask a follow-up question	7	--	--
To limit time of discussion	2	--	--
To manage disagreement	1	--	--
To announce the results of a poll	2	--	--
To comment	--	1	--
To close	1	--	--
Total	23	6	7

In addition, the IR interrupted the IEs for other functions that are part of the format of the edition, such as announcing the latest results of a poll about the edition’s topic. Such polls also might be used by the IR to put more pressure on the IEs about the credibility of their views in relation to the point of view of the audience. Observe the following example (excerpt 3) to better understand this usage.

Excerpt (3):

(Al-Jazeera TV *‘The Opposing Views’*: 27 May 2003: ‘The Iraqi Opposition’
 IR: Faisal al-Gassim IE1: Muhammed al-Tamimi IE2: Sadiq al-Musawi)

1. IE2: ...there is one ruling from the council of the revolution leadership that

2. says that anyone who insults or says a word to the president will be killed
3. where this is the law of [()]
- 4. IR: [ok] but one minute the result of the poll this far are
5. the groups of Iraqi opposition that returned to the country better than the former regime:: unfortunately your situation does not have good news [1300]
6. IE2: [I don't] want it to have good news [because I I]
7. IE1: [They don't] look for good news
8. they don't [look for]= [good news]=
9. IE2: [no I I..]
10. IR: [one minute] the number of voters is one thousand
11. 1391: 71% of them say that Saddam Saddam's regime is better than the
12. opposition 29% say the opposition groups are better than Saddam
13. Hussein...(the IR continued)

مقتطف (3):

{ قناة الجزيرة: 27 مايو 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: المعارضة العراقية
مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.). الضيف الأول: محمد التميمي (ض1) الضيف الثاني: صادق الموسوي(ض2)

1. ض2: على قرار واحد من مجلس قيادة الثورة الذي يقول إعدام أي إنسان يشتم أو يقول كلمة على
2. رئيس الجمهورية أين.. هذا(قانون الغاب)
- ← 3. م.ق: (طيب بس.. بس دقيقة، نتيجة التصويت حتى الآن هل جماعات
4. المعارضة العراقية التي عادت إلى البلاد أفضل من النظام السابق للأسف الشديد لسه وضعك
5. لا يبشر بالخير (1300)
6. ض2: (لا أريد) يبشر بالخير (لأنه أنا أنا)
7. ض1: (هم ما بيدوروا) على الخير هم(ما بيدوروا) على الخير
8. ض2: (لا أنا أنا)
9. م.ق: (بس)
10. دقيقة.. عدد المصوتين ألف.. عدد المصوتين 1391 71% من المصوتين يقولون أن
11. صدام.. نظام صدام حسين أفضل من المعارضة، 29 يقولون إن جماعات المعارضة أفضل من
12. صدام حسين (أكمل م.ق. حديثه)

Here, the IR interrupts IE1 (arrowed line 4) to announce the latest results of a poll of voters while IE1 is in the middle of his turn criticizing the former Iraqi president's policies. Although the announcement of the poll's results may not have a strong relationship to the ideas that have already been presented by IE2, the IR uses them to attack the credibility of IE2's position in support of the Iraqi opposition groups. IE2 then interrupts the IR to express his anger and dissatisfaction about that (line 6), particularly

since IE2 stated in previous turns that the poll's results are not valid, and has many flaws from his point of view. Although the literal meaning of IE2's reaction in line 6 does not seem to have clues for showing anger and dissatisfaction, the pragmatic meaning of it, however, clearly shows this function when we know that denying to hear good news is not an acceptable behavior in Arab culture unless the speaker is in anger condition. Further, the loud tone and pitch of IE2 in presenting this response confirms the identification of interruption to function as a means of showing anger. Once IE2 resumes explaining his denial of the results of the poll, IE1 exploits this opportunity by interrupting IE2 to retaliate against him in the form of a comment that involves some kind of ridicule (classified here as a way to comment). Similar to the previous interruption by IE1 to show anger, the literal meaning of IE1's statement (in line 6) might not carry all the pragmatic meaning associated with his intended meaning of it. Since it is not acceptable to deny hearing good news in Arab culture, IE1 interrupts IE2 to put extra pressure on IE2 by commenting that they do not want to hear good news. IE2's comment also has a sense of ridicule in that IE1 intends to make fun of IE2 by asserting that IE2 hates to hear good news. Note that IE1 used the demonstrative plural pronoun, "those", instead of the demonstrative singular pronoun when referring to IE2 to make his comments stronger by including not only IE2, but to include all members of Iraqi opposition movements. The IR then interrupts again to announce the latest number of the poll's results before answering a phone call. It is very important to note that all the interruptions in this example occurred in a very fast and immediate way, indicating the extent to which interruption is expressed and utilized in this situation involving extreme disagreement and confrontation.

The IR's interruptions to ask a follow-up question are very few in the previous interview about the increasing alliance; however, the IR in this edition utilized interruption for this function in many cases. In some other cases, the IR interrupts to ask a question for the purpose of clarification about unclear points mentioned by the IEs about a specific topic. For example, when IE2 mentioned the support of official regimes to Saddam in the past, the IR interrupts him to make sure he means the Arab official regimes in specific. However, in some other instances, the IR interrupts to ask a question involving an opposing point of view that already has been presented by the other interviewee. In some cases, the IR raises the challenging points of one interviewee to another for the purpose of encouraging disagreement between them. Let us examine the following example (excerpt 4) to illustrate the practice of interruption for generating disagreement.

Excerpt (4):

(Al-Jazeera TV *The Opposing Views*: 27 May 2003: 'The Iraqi Opposition'
 IR: Faisal al-Gassim IE1: Muhammed al-Tamimi IE2: Sadiq al-Musawi)

1. IE2: ...where is the educated Arab to [tell us...]
- 2. IR: [Ok very] nice very important view but I
 2. wish there is a very important point [I want]
3. IE1: [let me respond] =
4. IR: [only one minute to clarify it to you
 5. know as Mr. Tamimi (IE1) has just said : and there is a point that I want
 6. you to clarify : you you know what is your position in the Iraqi (political)
 7. arena you represent nothing but yourselves is that right

مقتطف (4):

{ قناة الجزيرة: 27 مايو 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: المعارضة العراقية

مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.) الضيف الأول: محمد التميمي (ض1) الضيف الثاني: صادق الموسوي (ض2)

1. ض2: أين المتقف العربي كي (يقول لنا)
- ← 2. م.ق: (طيب كويس جدا) كلام مهم جداً بس يا ريت فيه نقطة مهمة جداً
3. (أريد =)
4. ض1: (خليني أرد)
5. م.ق: (بس دقيقة) أن توضحها كي يعني قال السيد تميمي وهناك نقطة أريد أن توضحها أنكم يعني ما هو
6. محلکم من الإعراب على الساحة العراقية أنتم لا تمثلون إلا أنفسکم هل هذا صحيح

The IR here interrupts IE2 (arrowed line 2) to raise a point previously mentioned by IE1 (Mr. Tamimi) in the form a clarification question. Note that the IR precedes his question with a comment that he has a point that needs clarification. The IR's intended meaning of clarification here seems to mean making response to it rather merely elaboration, as evidenced by mentioning IE1 as the author of this point. In such situations, the IEs usually take turns without giving any signs for ending their talk unless they have been interrupted. Thus, I would hypothesize that the IR's employment of interruption increases in cases where disagreement is intense. The usage of such a practice seems to be the only way to perform the task of encouraging disagreement, particularly in editions that have high and intense level of disagreement between the IEs like the one discussed here.

Above, we have illustrated that because this edition has the fiercest dispute between the IEs, this contributed in having the highest frequency of interruptions. For the functions of interruptions, we noted that the IR interrupts to announce the latest result of a poll about the topic of the edition to add extra pressure on the IEs' views and their credibility. We also noted that the IR interrupts to ask a question involving different purposes, such as to follow-up, clarify, or challenge for the purpose of encouraging disagreement.

3. 'Kurds and the Expected Changes in Iraq'

In this edition, another controversial topic related to the war in Iraq has been discussed: the Kurdish opposition leaders' decision to cooperate with the Americans to topple the Iraqi regime led by Saddam Hussain. Like other editions, a number of secondary issues have been raised, including the mistakes committed by the Kurdish leaders in the past, the reasons behind the Kurdish leaders' alliance with America, the history of the wars between the two main Kurdish parties led by Jalal al-Talabani and Masud al-Barazani and other Kurdish parties. Two IEs have participated in this edition: Kamal Majeed (henceforth IE1), and AbdulGader al-Berfikani (henceforth IE2). Kamal Majeed (IE1) disagrees with the cooperation of the two Kurdish parties' leaders with the United States, asserting that they repeat the same old mistakes by making an alliance with foreign countries, as a part of their constant search for their own benefits instead of their people's interests. On the other hand, AbdulGader al-Berfikani (IE2) favors the two leaders' decision because it offers a valuable opportunity for the Kurdish people to establish an independent country in northern Iraq for not only Kurds in Iraq but for Kurds all over the world. As a result of the extremity of these two views about this issue as well as the continuing criticism of the leaders of the two main Kurdish parties by IE1, and the refusal to do so by IE2, a number of hot disputes occurred with frequent interruptions and overlapped talk. However, this edition is relatively quiet compared with the two previously discussed interviews, specifically the one about the Iraqi opposition. Another point to note about this edition concerns the dialect spoken by the two IEs; they speak the MSA very fluently though they are Kurds in origin. Their use of such a dialect would

result in a difference in their use of address terms, possibly in a decrease rather an increase.

Before moving on to present the relative frequency and functions of the use of interruptions in this edition, let us first describe in a very brief way the overall evaluation of the level of disagreement and interruption seen in this edition. Unlike the second interview, ‘Iraqi Opposition’, this edition has fewer incidents of extreme disagreement or dispute. Nevertheless, the IR in this edition uses almost the same percentage of interruption as in the second interview, 35 times, with a total percentage of 50.7 per turn, as shown in Table 7. Another important point to note is IE1’s failure to use interruption at all the interview, despite the high number of turns he took. As we will see later, this is possibly due to his belief that interruption should not be used in this context. It is important to note that the IR in all Arab interviews is the same, and his variation in using interruption across editions is likely due to contextual variation associated with the topic being discussed as well as participants. For the IEs, they are all different, suggesting that their variation in using interruption is likely due to personal factors.

Table 7: The frequency of using address terms in ‘Kurds’

Speaker	Number of Turns	Interruptions used	Percentage of turns
IR	69	35	50.7%
IE1	61	0	0.0%
IE2	39	9	23%
Total	169	44	26%

In previous editions, interruptions are rarely employed for the function of clarification. In this edition, however, the IR has used interruption to clarify in many cases, 10 times, as shown in Table 8. However, a close examination of these instances

reveals that the IR might have other purposes in addition to clarification. Let us examine the following example (excerpt 5) to show how this function is used.

Table 8: The function of using interruptions in ‘Kurds’

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To change a turn	--	--	--
To show disagreement	--	--	9
To challenge	14	--	--
To limit topic of discussion	2	--	--
To correct	2	--	--
To take the floor	--	--	--
To ask a follow-up question	4	--	--
To clarify	10		
To limit time of discussion	--	--	--
To manage disagreement	1	--	--
To announce the results of a poll	--	--	--
To comment	1	--	--
To close	1	--	--
Total	35	0	9

Excerpt (5):

(Al-Jazeera TV *The Opposing Views*: 11 March 2003: ‘Kurds and the Expected Changes in Iraq’: IR: Faisal al-Gassim: IE1: Kamal Majeed : IE2: AbdulGader al-Berfikani)

1. IE1: ...He (IE2) told me that he took a course in the American
2. Department of State so [he]
3. IE2: [I didn’t] say this statement
4. IE1: You wrote and wrote [it in front of you]
5. IE2: [I didn’t say this] if you don’t understand Arabic
6. very well don’t put words on my tongue
7. IE1: Please don’t [lose your temper]
8. IE2: [I’m a nationalist] Kurdish I carried the banner of Kurds to
9. [defend them against all what has been mentioned in history]
- 10. IR: [one minute one minute one minute sir one minute] go ahead

11. IE1: In fact the brother mentioned the incident [of *al-Anfal*]
 → 12. IR: [you mean] that they (IE1)
 13. who deal with intelligence agencies not you (IE2) who say what they say
 14. IE1 I'm convicted to death by Saddam Hussein...(IE1 continued)

مقتطف (5):

{ قناة الجزيرة: 27 مايو 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: المعارضة العراقية
 مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.) الضيف الأول: كمال مجيد (ض1) الضيف الثاني: عبدالقادر البيرفكاني
 (ض2) }

1. ض1: هو أخبرني قبل قليل بأنه دخل في دورة في وزارة الخارجية الأميركية (فعليه)
 2. ض2: (لم أقل) هذا الكلام
 3. ض1: أنت كتب وكتبته (أمامك)
 4. ض2: (لم أقل هذا) الكلام إذا لم تكن تفقه اللغة العربية فلا تسجل عن لساني شيء
 5. ض1: أرجو منك ألا تفقد (أعصابك)
 6. ض2: (إنني وطني) كردي قد حملت راية الكرد (للدفاع عنهم في جميع ما جاء للتاريخ)
 7. م.ق: (بس دقيقة بس دقيقة بس دقيقة سيد دقيقة)
 8. تفضل
 9. ض1: الحقيقة أنه الأخ ذكر حادثة (الأنفال)
 ← 10. م.ق: (يعني) هم الذي يتعاملون مع أجهزة الاستخبارات وليس أمثالكم الذين
 11. يقولون...(أكمل م.ق. حديثه)

Here, in line 10, the IR uses interruption to manage the disagreement that erupted between the IEs (in lines 3-9) as a result of IE1's comment (line # 1). In line 12, the IR then interrupts IE1 to ask a 'clarification' question about IE1's relation to foreign intelligence agencies to support him in denying IE2's accusation mentioned in previous turns that IE1 is spreading out the same rumors mentioned by foreign intelligence agencies against Kurdish opposition leaders. At the same time, such a question is embedded with an accusation about IE2, which could be seen as a biased attempt to support the claims of IE1. As will be discussed in detail in Chapter V, the IR interrupts IE2 twelve times out of 14 to challenge his views, compared with only mitigated challenges directed to IE1, adding another biased attempt by the IR. In addition to his bias in asking challenging questions repeatedly of IE2, the IR also in one particular example interrupts IE1 to ask a clarification question in the form of an inference, giving

unnecessary and biased support to the IE1's point of view at the same time. Look at the following example (excerpt 6) to see how the IR exercises this function of interruption.

Excerpt (6):

(Al-Jazeera TV 'The Opposing Views': 11 March 2003: 'Kurds and the Expected Changes in Iraq': IR: Faisal al-Gassim:IE1: Kamal Majeed :IE2: AbdulGader al-Berfikani)

1. IE1: ...and it has been attended by the American Secretary of States Schultz
2. and in his address he asserted that he did not want to blame any body
3. and he meant that he did not want to blame Saddam Hussein and to
4. discharge Saddam Hussein and the reason is simple because the
5. American government was who sold the American companies are who
6. sold those chemical weapons to Saddam [Hussein]
- 7. IR: [and now] Kurds now
8. put their hands in the hand of the government that gave Saddam Hussein
9. the chemical weapon.

مقتطف (6)

{ قناة الجزيرة: 27 مايو 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: المعارضة العراقية
مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.) الضيف الأول:كمال مجيد (ض1) الضيف الثاني: عبدالقادر البيرفكاني }

1. ض1: وقد حضره وزير خارجية أميركا (شوتس) وفي خطابه أكد بأنه لا يريد أن يلوم أحداً وكان
2. يقصد أنه لا يريد أن يلوم صدام حسين وأن يبيري ذمة صدام حسين، والسبب كان بسيط
3. لأن الحكومة الأميركية هي التي باعت.. الشركات الأميركية هي التي باعت هذه الأسلحة
4. الكيماوية إلى صدام(حسين)
- ← 5. م.ق.: (وها هم) الأكراد الآن يضعون أيديهم بأيدي الحكومة التي زودت
6. صدام حسين بالكيماوي

To support his perspective for criticizing the decision made by the leaders of the two main Kurdish parties to join the United States in launching a war against Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq, IE1 claims that particular American companies are those who provided Saddam Hussein with chemical weapons, which Saddam used later in the massacre of Halabja in northern Iraq in 1988. Instead of giving IE1 enough time to complete his argument, the IR cuts him off (arrowed line 7) to draw the conclusion that

IE1 seems to suggest, adding further support to IE1's claim. As shown in line 7, once IE1 makes the connection between America and Saddam's chemical weapons, the IR jumps in to relate that with the situation in Iraq at that time in which the Kurdish opposition movements join America in its war against Iraq despite American previous support to Saddam with chemical weapons. The IR's interruption is biased because of two reasons: First, the IR should not draw conclusion from the interviewees' points of view. Rather, he should let the interviewee makes his point without supporting it, and drawing conclusion should be left to the audience. Secondly, the IR's attempt would not be considered biased if he usually uses it in the same way with other interviewees across interviews. In fact, the IR's attempt used here is the one that I found in the five interviews examined in this study.

Therefore, we have found so far that although interruption can help the IR achieve the tasks combining his role in this context, its usage sometimes may violate the rules of neutrality, particularly if it is used with one interviewee rather than with both of them. The task of challenging the IEs by interrupting them to present opposing points would be likely for showing bias. In this edition, the IR interrupts IE2 in most times he used such a function, providing further evidence for the biased position of the IR. The excessive use of interruption with one interviewee can generate bias in a similar way to how address terms might do, as will be shown in Chapter VI, and to how challenging the IEs, as will be illustrated in Chapter V.

IE1's failure to use interruption at all in the interview is unusual in the setting of news interviews, specifically in the type of interviews that are broadcast on al-Jazeera Channel. However, there may be cultural reasons behind that, taking into account that

IE1 is Kurdish, whereas all the other participants in the five interviews are Arabs. However, IE2 is Kurdish too, and he uses interruption in the interview. Thus, this would refute the idea that cultural background alone is the source of such failure. It is possible that the bias shown by the IR throughout the interview may be the reason that IE1 did not use interruption, since he was not challenged or interrupted by the IR.

As the result of the constant attacks and challenges initiated by IE1, IE2 has no choice but to interrupt. This is why all the instances in which IE2 interrupts are directed to IE1 to show disagreement about a point that he raised or to challenge his credibility. To show disagreement, IE2 usually denies the statements or the challenges presented by IE1, generating in some cases a series of later interruptions, specifically if IE1 complains about that. Consider the following example (excerpt 6) that shows how IE2 interrupts for this function.

Excerpt (7):

(Al-Jazeera TV *'The Opposing Views'*: 11 March 2003: 'Kurds and the Expected Changes in Iraq': IR: Faisal al-Gassim: IE1: Kamal Majeed :IE2: AbdulGader al-Berfikani)

1. IE1: ...he cannot give an answer to the ruling the bond which has been signed
2. by Masaud and Jalal in 94/11/21 about about the prohibiting of killing
3. and he cannot answer to how the killing has continued between the two
4. parties from 94 after forbidding and making it a crime it continued till
5. 22/9/98 in in Washington agreement and it has been killed and he
6. cannot answer to how in the castles of *Disa and Rania* killed 500 kurds
7. from the party of PKK Kurds of Turkey and he cannot answer to what
8. has been said by [Dr. Mahmood Uthman]
9. IE2: [brother these are illusions] these are illusions and
10. is mistreatment to the Kurdish history mistreatment to the Kurdish
11. history
11. IE1: and he did not learn until now not to interrupt the speaker
12. IR: Ok go ahead go ahead
13. IE1: I interrupt those who stand against the holy Kurdish case

{ قناة الجزيرة: 27 مايو 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: المعارضة العراقية
مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.) الضيف الأول:كمال مجيد (ض1) الضيف الثاني: عبدالقادر البيرفكاني }

1. ض1: ..ولا يستطيع حتى الجواب على القرار الميثاق الذي وقعه مسعود وجلال في 94/11/21 حول
2. تحريم القتل ولا يستطيع أن يجيبنا كيف أن القتل استمر بين الحزبين من 94 بعد تحريم وتجريمه
3. استمر إلى غاية 98/9/22 في.. في.. في اتفاقية واشنطن، وقتل.. ولا يستطيع أن يجيب كيف أنهم في
4. قلع ديزا ورائيا قتلوا 500 كردي من حزب بي كي كي حزب أكراد تركيا ولا يستطيع أن يجيب ما
5. قاله لي (الدكتور محمود عثمان)
6. ض2: (أخي هذه أوهام وإساءة وإساءة للإساءة للتاريخ الكردي إساءة إساءة للتاريخ
7. الكردي
8. ض1: وهو لم يتعلم لحد الآن ألا يقاطع المخاطب
9. م.ق: طيب تفضل تفضل تفضل
10. ض2: : أقاطع من يقف أمام قضية كردية مقدسة

Here, due to the continuous attacks by IE1 (lines 1-9) IE2 does not have any other choice except to interrupt IE1 to deny his claims, which involve direct challenges to him, taking into account the limited time of the program. It is unusual that despite the observation that IE1's attacks are constant and direct to IE2, he complains about IE2's interruption considering it as a rude conduct, forcing IE2 to interrupt again to give a reason to defend himself by relating that to the Kurdish case. My explanation of IE1's complaining is that it is a strategy to stop IE2's interruption so that he can present his claims with no disputes.

In this edition, we have observed lower use of interruption by participants compared with previous editions. For the functions of use, we have observed high use of interruptions by the IR for the purpose of clarification. However, the close examination of some of these instances revealed that they involved biased attempts to support the claims of one interviewee, particularly when they are mostly used with this interviewee than the other. We have concluded that the use of interruption to clarify or challenge is common in the context of panel news interviews; however, the overuse of them with one

particular interviewee than with the other may violate the rules of maintaining neutrality in such a context. Similarly, when the IR interrupts an interviewee to complete his point of view to support it may involve bias.

4. 'Arab Peoples and the Resistance of American Plans'

The topic of this edition is about the role of the Arab public view in changing or resisting the American plans to start war against Iraq. This topic was very controversial, and was discussed widely in most Arab media before the war in Iraq started. The two guests participating in this edition are: Yasser al-Za'atra, a Palestinian writer and a political analyst, and Fa'eg al-Shaikh Ali, an independent Iraqi-opposition member. According to the view of Yasser al-Za'atra (hereafter IE1), the American plan to attack Iraq was not intended to target the corrupted regimes in the Middle East; rather, it was intended to target the Arab and Muslim people in the region. Moreover, he insists that the Arab public view is not quiet, as shown in the many demonstrations in most big cities with thousands of people attending. On the other hand, Fa'eg al-Shaikh Ali (hereafter IE2) supports the view that the Arab people should not resist the United States' plans in the region since it would help in the removal of all the unjust and dictatorial regimes in the region. He also thinks that the Iraqi people will act in the same manner as he did in 1991 when the Americans troops reached the southern parts of Iraq, with no resistance. Rather, they will rise up against Saddam's regime.

This edition's topic was very controversial at its time and raised a lot of debate in the Arab World. Hence, this edition depicts a sample of how this type of debate is carried out in the TV media in the Middle East. Unlike previous editions, this topic addresses the reaction of the Arab public view in general to the war on Iraq rather than

the Iraqi people, who would be influenced the most and possibly the first by the American plans to change the map of the Middle East. To argue their perspectives, the IEs relied on interruption in a number of cases but not to the level found in previous editions, resulting in the fewest total percentage of interruption per turn among all the previous interviews examined thus far, only 21.9%. As illustrated in Table 9, the IR remains the most frequent user of interruption at 18 times, accounting for 37.5% percent of all his turns.

Table 9: The frequency of using interruptions in ‘Arab Peoples’

Speaker	Number of Turns	Interruptions used	Percentage of turns
IR	48	18	37.5%
IE1	35	4	11.4%
IE2	31	3	9.6%
Total	114	25	21.9%

As Table 10 shows, the participants’ usage overall in this edition is similar to how speakers used interruption in previous interviews. However, the types of functions used frequently by the IR in this interview are not the same as those used in other interviews. For example, while the IR in the interview about the Kurds frequently used interruption to ask clarification questions, he did not use this function in this interview at all. This indicates clearly that IR usage of interruption varies from one edition to another based mainly on the participants and topic of discussion.

Table 10: The function of using interruptions in ‘Arab Peoples’

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To change a turn	5	--	--
To show disagreement	--	2	2
To challenge	5	--	--
To limit topic of discussion	5	--	--
To take the floor	--	--	1
To ask a follow-up question	2	2	--
To close	1	--	--
Total	18	4	3

In this edition, the most frequent types of interruption used by the IR are challenging and changing turns, both of which are related to parts of the fundamental tasks of his role and have been used frequently in other prior editions. The IR’s interruption for the purpose of limiting the topic of discussion is rarely employed in previous editions. However, as Table 10 shows, the IR in this edition used interruption for this function five times, which is the same frequency of the two highest used functions: changing a turn and challenging. There is no clear explanation for that other than the observation that the edition’s topic is so general that it makes the participating interviewees digress to describe secondary topics, which the IR does not want to discuss. In some other cases, the IR interrupts to limit the topic of discussion when the interviewee repeats his views. Consider the following example (excerpt 8) that shows how the IR interrupts IE1 after his repeated presentation of a specific view.

Excerpt (8):

(Al-Jazeera TV 'The Opposing Views': 04 March 2003: 'Arab Peoples and their Resistance to the American Palns': IR: Faisal al-Gassim: IE1 Yassir al-Za'atra IE2: Fa'ag al-Shaikh Ali)

1. IE1: The Arab public realizes that the American targeting is not for regimes
2. rather to it to its countries to its identity the Arab public realizes that the
3. Americans are coming for more milking and humiliation [this is]
- 4. IR: [Ok]
5. you said this view you said this view Faiag al-Shaikh Ali (IE2) you
- heard
6. this view the Arab person is still dignified and strong: how do you
7. respond

مقتطف (8):

{قناة الجزيرة: 04 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: الشعوب العربية ومناهضة المخططات الأمريكية
مقدم البرنامج: فيصل القاسم (م.ق.): الضيف الأول: ياسر الزعائرة (ض1): الضيف الثاني: فائق الشيخ
علي (ض2)}

- 1.ض1: الشارع العربي يدرك أن الاستهداف الأميركي ليس للأنظمة وإنما له لأوطانه لكيوننته الشارع
2. العربي يدرك أن الأميركيين قادمين لمزيد من ابتزازهم لمزيد من إذلاله (هذا هو)
- ← 3.م.ق: (كوبس جداً) قلت هذا
4. الكلام قلت هذا الكلام فائق الشيخ علي سمعت هذا الكلام الإنسان العربي مازال عزيزاً قوياً كيف
5. ترد

Here, in line 4, the IR interrupts IE1 once he repeated his view mentioned in earlier turns that the American attack on Iraq is not against the current Arab regimes; rather, it is targeting the Arab peoples for more humiliation (lines 1-3). The IR then interrupts, asserting that IE1 said this comment before, and turns to IE2 to dispute it, as if it is an attempt to encourage disagreement. The IR's interruption in this instance would be also the result of the constraint of time provided in the program, as well as an attempt to move the flow of discussion.

In some other cases, the IR interrupts to limit the topic of discussion when the interviewee avoids or misunderstands the question being asked. In the following

example (excerpt 9), the IR repeats his interruption (line 4) to force IE2 to answer a question about one theme that the IR is trying to infer.

Excerpt (9):

(Al-Jazeera TV *'The Opposing Views'*: 04 March 2003: 'Arab People and their Resistance to the American Palms': IR: Faisal al-Gassim: IE1 Yassir al-Za'atra IE2: Fa'ag al-Shaikh Ali)

1. IE2: ...who is supporting Israel and who is the first country in the world and
2. in the history to recognize Israel is the Soviet Union not the United
3. States of [America the first country]
- 4. IR: [ok ok but but] Faiag this is not our subject
5. [o' Fa'ag]
5. IE2: [no no] this is our subject Dr. Faisal [I'm now
6. IE1: [I don't defend the Soviet
7. Union in the first place]
- 8. IR: [Fa'ag this is not our subject]
9. let us be on the subject of the public Fa'ag I want to ask you a
10. [question]
11. IE2: [the subject is our subject]
- 12. IR: [only one minute one minute] how do you respond
13. [to those who say]
14. IE2: [this Arab public is mislead mislead]
- 15. IR: [but one minute do you mean] do you want to [tell me]
16. IE2: [Go] ahead
17. IR: Do you want to tell me that if the Arab area has been occupied again
18. this time the Arab people will go out to liberate their land...
19. ((22 lines omitted))
- 20. IR: [but you did not answer my question I want] I want you to answer
21. my question briefly
22. IE2: Which question
23. IR: That the Arab peoples will not be mistaken once again in liberating
24. their lands if they have been occupied again

مقتطف (9):

{قناة الجزيرة: 04 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: الشعوب العربية ومناهضة المخططات الأمريكية
مقدم البرنامج: فيصل القاسم (م.ق.): الضيف الأول: ياسر الزعائرة (ض1): الضيف الثاني: فائق الشيخ
علي (ض2)}

- 1.ض2: ... من الذي يدعم إسرائيل ومن الذي أول دولة في العالم وفي التاريخ اعترفت بإسرائيل الاتحاد
2. السوفيتي وليس الولايات المتحدة (الأميركية أول دولة)
- 3.م.ق: (طيب طيب بس بس يا) يا فائق هذا ليس موضوعنا

4. (يا فائق)
5. ض:2 (لا لا) هو هذا موضوعنا دكتور فيصل(أنا الآن)
6. ض:1 (أنا لا أدافع عن الاتحاد السوفيتي أصلاً)
7. م.ق: (يا فائق هذا ليس موضوعنا) نبقى في
8. موضوع الشارع يا فائق أنا أريد أن أسألك(سؤالاً)
9. ض:2 (الموضوع موضوعنا)
10. م.ق: (بس دقيقة.. دقيقة) كيف ترد على
11. (الذين يقولون)
12. ض:2 (هذا الشارع العربي مضلل مضلل)
13. م.ق: (بس دقيقة يعني) هل تريد أن تقول لي
14. ض:2 (تفضل)
15. م.ق: هل تريد أن تقول لي إنه فيما لو أعيد احتلال المنطقة العربية هذه المرة لن يخرج الشعب العربي
16. لتحرير أرضه ...
17. ((22 سطر محذوف))
18. م.ق: (بس لم تجب على سؤالي أريد) أريد أن تجيب على سؤالي باختصار
19. ض:2 أي سؤال
20. م.ق: إنه الشعوب العربية لن تخطئ مرة أخرى في تحرير أرضها فيما لو أعيد احتلالها

The IR here interrupts five times. In the first (arrowed line 4) he reminds IE2 that he moved away from the central topic of discussion. Unexpectedly, IE2 denies that and asserts that he is addressing the subject, without even asking which topic the IR is talking about. Note that the IR and IE2 use address terms to help them in their interruptions, as we will discuss in Chapter V. Due to the continuous assertion by IE2 that he is addressing the same subject, the IR (arrowed line 9) utilizes another interruption involving the use of the strategy of announcing that he has a question, which he usually employs to manage disagreement and overlapped talk, as we will discuss in detail in Chapter VI. At the same time when the IR begins the third interruption by presenting the opposing point that would force him to discuss, IE2 simultaneously repeats the repeated answer, making the IR change his strategy. Once IE2 gives the IR the floor, the IR shifts to the fourth interruption by reformulating his earlier question in the form of an inference about what he is trying to focus on so that IE2 can answer it. Unfortunately, IE2 again (in the omitted lines) misses the point, and the IR interrupts him again (line 20), a fifth

time by announcing explicitly that he (IE2) does not answer the right question. As can be seen in this example, the IR interrupts IE2 five times to limit the topic of discussion to the main theme that this edition is centered around.

Above, we have found that the use of interruption in this edition is lower than its use in all previous studies analyzed so far, despite the fact that this edition discussed a controversial topic and the IEs had extreme disagreement with each other. In addition, the IR did not interrupt to clarify in contrast to the previous interview, which saw frequent use of this function, suggesting that the IR's use of interruption varies according to contextual variables, such as topic of discussion, participants, and flow of discussion.

5. 'Arab Countries and the Expected American Attack on Iraq'

The final edition of the Arab program discusses the role of Arab countries in avoiding the war on Iraq by America and Britain. In specific, it discusses the possible procedures that the Arab League can and has used in the Iraqi case. The participants in this edition are: Dr. Nassif Hatti, the Arab League ambassador in Paris, and Mansour Saifudaid, the former member of the Jordanian parliament. During the interview, a number of secondary topics were debated about which participants have distinctive views. For example, when the interview begins discussing the possible role which Arab regimes can perform in the Iraqi case, Mansour Saifudain (hereafter IE1) calls all leaders of Arab regimes traitors to their peoples for making secret agreements with enemies, specifically America and Israel, which in turn will harm all the important resources in the Arab World. On the other hand, Dr. Nassif Hatti (hereafter IE2) supports the view that Arab leaders are looking at the Iraqi case from a realistic point of view, asserting the point that the situation in the Arab World at that time is the same as what it was before the Iraqi

problem. When the IR raises the issue of not having any Arab summit to discuss the Iraqi issue, IE1 asserts that some Arab regimes are expected to participate actively in making any Arab summit to find a realistic solution to the problem, specifically if we know that some of them are helping the United States to attack Iraq by giving them their permission to use their military bases. IE2, on the other hand, thinks that Arab countries, through the Arab League, did their best to avoid war. On the final issue of discussion, the call by some Arab leaders to Saddam Hussain to step down so that the war can be avoided, IE2 thinks that it is a rumor, whereas IE1 asserts that some Arab leaders did call on Saddam Hussain to step down.

Compared with the previous editions, this interview does not have frequent interruptions and disputes between the participants, as shown by the relatively long turns as well as the smooth flow of discussion throughout the interview. It is important to note that this edition is the earliest among all the interviews in terms of its date of conduct. In addition, this edition was conducted before the war started, which would influence the way the participants presented their ideas in a relatively calm condition. Therefore, the participants were not influenced by the war atmosphere yet, unlike those who participated in previously discussed editions. Another potential reason for the apparent calmness in this edition is the result of the fact that the participants are officials in governments or semi-governments, so they use their language very carefully in a way that does not generate hot dispute and frequent interruptions. To conclude, the combination of all the reasons mentioned above as well as the calm direction of the interview by the IR, all contributed to making the interview calm.

In this edition, the relative frequency of interruption by all participants, as shown in Table 11, is the lowest among all other interviews, occurring only 10 times, in just 15.6 percent of the total number of turns taken. This is possibly due to the fact that this edition was broadcast nearly two months earlier than other interviews, which all were aired in either the middle of the war or shortly after its end. Another demonstration for the low level of interruption is the low number of turns taken by the IEs compared with other interviews, suggesting that the IEs in this edition take long turns with less reliance on interruption to project their views. This is probably due to the low number of interruptions used by the IR. An additional reason for that could be related to the participants in this interview, suggesting that personal differences could play a role in creating variation.

The low use of interruption in this edition also would suggest that the context of panel news interviews alone does not necessarily facilitate the frequent production of interruptions compared with other encounters, such as job interviews, and conversation, specifically if other factors, such as topic of discussion, timing, the IR's involvement are less than the normal level manifested in other interviews. For example, the low involvement of the IR in discussion, as shown in the low number of turns taken, indicates this would also contribute to lowering the use of interruption and address terms by not motivating the IEs to disagree and engage in argument with each other.

Table 11: The frequency of using interruptions in 'Arab countries'

Speaker	Number of Turns	Interruptions used	Percentage of turns
IR	34	9	26.4%
IE1	17	--	0.0%
IE2	13	1	7.6%
Total	64	10	15.6%

By looking at the functions in which interruption is used shown in Table 12, it is clear that the IEs almost never used interruption despite the IR's attempts to challenge them. Let us examine the following example (excerpt 10) to show how the IEs react to the IR's challenges.

Excerpt (10):

(Al-Jazeera TV : *The Opposing Views*':21 January 2003: 'Arab Countries and the Expected American Attack on Iraq': IR: Faisal al-Gassim: IE1: Mansour Safidain Murad: IE2: Nassif Hitti)

1. IE2: ...we should concentrate by a practical policy by a very practical policy
2. [toward these issues]
3. IR: [ok but Dr. Hitti Dr. Hitti] please please Dr. Hitti do you hear me Dr.
- 4. Hitti [a very good view]=
5. IE2: [I can hear you go ahead]
6. IR: By God I want you to answer [this question]
7. IE2: [go ahead]
- 8. IR: Don't you think that your view you know can be considered in the
9. framework of composition all becoming reconciled with the identity
10. and interest whatever etc is COMPOSED VIEW COMPOSED
11. VIEW that has no benefit and nobody is buying it ever
11. [I want you to ask you you know an idea that Mr Murad (IE1) has just
12. addressed where one minute one minute why the international capitals
13. are full] =
- 14 IE2: [By God you are free Sir I say composed view go ahead let me just
15. answer]
16. IR: with demonstrations for Iraq and for stopping war (the IR continued)

مقتطف (10):

{ قناة الجزيرة: 04 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: الدول العربية والهجوم الأمريكي المحتمل على العراق
مقدم البرنامج: فيصل القاسم (م.ق.): الضيف الأول: منصور سيف الدين مراد (ض1): الضيف
الثاني: ناصيف حتي (ض2) }

1. ض2: ... علينا أن نركز بسياسة عملية بسياسة عملية جداً (نحو هذه الأمور (
2. م.ق.: (طيب بس بس دكتور حتي دكتور حتي)
3. أرجوك أرجوك دكتور حتي اسمعني دكتور حتي (كلام جميل جداً) =
4. (أنا عم بأسمعك اتفضل)
5. م.ق.: بالله أريد أن تجيبني على (هذا السؤال)
6. ض2: (اتفضل)

7. م.ق: ألا تعتقد أن كلام حضرتك يعني يدخل في إطار الإنشاء ليس إلا كل التصالح مع الذات والمصلحة ما
 8. بأعرف شو وإلى ما هنالك كلام إنشاء كلام لا يقدم ولا يؤخر ولا أحد يشتره أبداً
 9. (أنا أريد أن أسألك يعني فكرة طرحها السيد مراد قبل قليل أين دقيقة دقيقة لماذا تعج العواصم العالمية)
 10. (والله أنت حر يا سيدي أنا أقول كلام إنشاء تفضل بس اسمح لي أجاب بس
 11. بالمظاهرات من أجل العراق ومن أجل منع الحرب (أكمل م.ق. حديثه)

This example illustrates how the IR positively evaluates the interviewee's view in prior turn to soften subsequent criticism. Here, the IR (arrowed line 4) describes IE2's earlier comment as a nice view. Then, he, in lines 8-11 attacks harshly the credibility of IE2's perspective, describing them as a "composed view". At the moment IE2 starts reacting (lines 14-15) to his criticism, the IR immediately announces a question involving a distance footing shift to IE1, Mr. Murad, to avoid the risk of further attack by IE2. The IR's distance footing shift consequently calms IE2 down, and he stops trying to interrupt again. The IEs in other interviews do not usually stop after such an attempt by the IR, indicating that the IEs in this edition do not reach the same level of argument and dispute manifested in other interviews involving frequent interruptions and overlapped talk.

Table 12: The function of using interruptions in 'Arab Countries'

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To change a turn	1	--	--
To show disagreement	--	--	1
To challenge	6	--	--
To limit topic	--	--	--
To correct	1	--	--
To take the floor	--	--	--
To ask a follow-up question	--	--	--
To clarify	--	--	--
To limit time	1	--	--
To manage disagreement	--	--	--
To comment	--	--	--
To close	--	--	--
Total	9	0	1

In this interview, we have observed the lowest use of interruption among the entire five Arab interviews examined, particularly by the IEs, suggesting that the context of panel news interview alone does not necessarily encourage the IEs to interrupt. Rather, personal differences as well as the low level of disagreement and dispute seen in this interview might contribute the most in lowering the use of interruption.

Summary and Discussion

Above, we have described and analyzed in depth the frequency and functions of interruption used by Arabic speaking participants in the five panel news interviews examined in this study. The careful exploration of each interview reveals a number of observations and general patterns in using interruption. One of these observations concerns the variation that the participants have shown in using interruption from one interview to another, particularly by the moderator.

In addition, our detailed analysis of some examples of interruption, particularly in the edition about Kurds, indicates that the excessive use of interruption by the IR for any function with one panelist rather than both of them would possibly violate the rules of neutrality that the IR should maintain toward the IEs. We have seen in our analysis that this would include functions like asking for clarification, which is considered one of the fundamental tasks for the IR.

Another observation to mention is that the high use of interruption to show disagreement in certain editions is not only due to the IEs tendency to do so. Rather, it is the result of the reaction of one interviewee to the other co-IE's attacks normally involving accusations, which usually leads to a series of interruptions, as clearly shown in the first four editions. However, the absence of attacks and accusations between the IEs

would result in less interruption for the purpose of showing disagreement, as seen in the fifth edition. Moreover, we have observed that even the frequent attempts by the IR to interrupt to present a challenging point do not necessarily generate interruption by the IEs, possibly because the employment of such a task by the IR seems to be accepted by the IEs, and does not produce the same reaction when one of the interviewees is using it.

English Interviews

Overview of the results

Before analyzing each interview, let us first take a look at an overview of the general findings and patterns of using interruption by English participants in terms of their frequency and functions of use. Table 13 summarizes the relative frequency for the average use of interruption by all English participants. It is very obvious from Table 13 that the frequency of using interruption is relatively low, specifically by the IEs, accounting only for 6 percent of the total number of turns. In addition, by taking the various tasks that would require the use of interruption into consideration, the IR's use of interruption in general appears to be low, especially within the context of news interviews.

Table 13: The average relative frequency of using interruptions in all English interviews

Speaker	Number of Turns	Average of Interruptions used	Percentage of turns
IR	17.8	3.6	20.2%
IEs only	19.8	1.2	6%
IR & IEs	37.6	4.8	12.7%

The breakdown of the total use of interruption in terms of the function of use indicates that interruption is utilized for all functions with very low frequency. For example, the IR's use of interruption for functions such as changing the turn or closing, which are considered fundamental tasks of his role in news interview, is very rare, occurring only once or twice in all the five interviews, which would suggest that the IR does not rely on interruption very much to carry out his various duties. The same thing can be said about the IEs, who unexpectedly used interruption in very few instances and only for certain functions. Additionally, the IEs' use of interruption as a way of showing disagreement to each other occurred only twice in all the five interviews, which also would indicate to which extent interruption is drawn upon as a resource for such a function by English speakers. Thus, our general conclusion based on the results of the data examined so far would suggest that English speakers do not use interruption very frequently to show disagreement, despite the numerous opportunities offered frequently throughout the interviews via the IR's attempts to challenge them and encourage disagreement between them, as well as by the context of news interviews, which encourages participants to interrupt by considering it as a common practice in this context. Instead, the English speakers, particularly the IEs appear to display their disagreement within the limits of their turns, with very low reliance on interruption.

Table :14 The average use of each function of interruption in all English interviews

Speaker	IR	IEs	IR & IEs	Total percentage
To change a turn	0.2	0	0.2	4.1%
To show disagreement	0	0.4	0.4	8.3%
To challenge	0	0	0	0.0%
To limit topic of discussion	0.8	0	0.8	16.6%
To correct	0	0	0	0.0%
To take the floor	0	0.6	0.6	12.5%
To ask a follow-up question	0.8	0	0.8	16.6%
To clarify	1.2	0	1.2	25%
To limit time of discussion	0.2	0	0.2	4.1%
To manage disagreement	0	0	0	0.0%
To announce the results of a poll	0	0	0	0.0%
To comment	0.2	0.2	0.4	8.3%
To close	0.2	0	0.2	4.1%
Total	3.6	1.2	4.8	100%

1. War or Diplomacy

This edition is set up to discuss whether the United States should continue its diplomatic efforts through the United Nations giving more time for Saddam Hussein to comply with the inspectors in disarmament, or should go to war with Iraq. This topic was very controversial at its time to the extent that it divided the United Nations, Security Council, NATO, and Europe. The participants in this edition are Samuel Berger, the former security advisor for President Clinton, and James Schlesinger, the former secretary of defense in the Nixon and Ford administrations. This edition is in a sense designed to discuss the views about Iraq presented by the two participants, who represent the positions of their political parties. Samuel Berger (hereafter IE1) represents the

Democratic Party, whereas James Schlesinger (hereafter IE2) presents the view of the Republican Party. Consequently, the participants disagree with each other on a number of issues related to what the United States should do in the Iraqi case. For example, IE1 advocates the view that for the advantage for the United States it should make an extra effort to have an agreement with allies like France, Germany, China and Russia to try more diplomacy by giving Saddam Hussein a longer deadline for disarmament, and if he fails to meet this deadline, the United States would be in strong to position to begin a war in a collective action that has international political support and legitimacy. On the other hand, IE2 thinks that the United States has made its efforts to avoid war if Saddam accepted disarmament, and war seems to be inevitable even without more authorization from the United Nations.

Despite the different positions that the IEs took concerning the topic of discussion, this did not result in having high instances of interruption. In fact, the IEs, in most cases, did not interrupt each other even to show disagreement. Rather, they waited till the co-IE finished his turn. Further, the IR did not interrupt to challenge the IEs about their perspectives, as he expected to do so to encourage disagreement. As Table 15 demonstrates, the participants' use of interruptions was very rare, even by the IR, who would be expected to use them the most, based on the various tasks of his role, despite the many opportunities available throughout the interview. Also, the IR's interruptions were very rare to the extent that they are fewer than the IEs' interruptions. This does not mean that the IR did not ask follow-up questions that involved some challenge to the IEs. But, he did not interrupt the IEs to do so, trying in most instances to give them the time to

complete presenting their views. Note that the overall number of turns by English participants is fewer than that of Arabic speakers.

Table 15: The frequency of using interruptions in War or Diplomacy

Speaker	Number of Turns	Interruptions used	Percentage of turns
IR	20	1	5%
IE1	8	1	12.5%
IE2	15	3	20%
Total	43	5	11.6%

By looking at Table 16, it is evident that the IR did not employ interruption even to carry out the fundamental tasks of his role in news interviews, such as changing a turn, challenging, and closing. The single use of interruption by the IR was to limit the topic of discussion by slightly changing the intended meaning of the question being asked.

Table 16: The function of using interruptions in War or Diplomacy

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To change a turn	--	--	--
To show disagreement	--	--	1
To challenge	--	--	--
To limit topic	--	--	--
To correct	--	--	--
To take the floor	--	1	2
To ask a follow-up question	--	--	--
To clarify	--	--	--
To limit time of discussion	1	--	--
To manage disagreement	--	--	--
To announce the results of a poll	--	--	--
To comment	--	--	--
To close	--	--	--
Total	1	1	3

For the IEs, they use interruption mostly for one function: taking the floor after the other co-IE finished his turn to add a comment, in response to the other co-IE's point, but not necessarily involving disagreement. In one instance, however, IE2 interrupts the IR to show disagreement. Let us examine this example (excerpt 11) to better understand the use of such a practice.

Excerpt (11):

(US PBS *NewsHour*: 06 March 2003: War or Diplomacy
IR: Jim Lehrer: IE1: Samuel Berger: IE2: James Schlesinger)

1. IE1: But I think we also have an interest here in the broadest possible
2. coalition the risks of this enterprise are significantly greater if it is
3. basically seen in the region and the world as the U.S.-British operation
4. than if it has an international face so I think we also have an interest here
5. in trying to achieve a final measure of convergence and unity
6. IR: Mr. Berger [the]
- 7. IE2: [Militarily] it is going to be an American and British
8. operation those in the region have already decided that war is inevitable

Here, as soon as IE1 finishes his turn, IE2 interrupts the IR before he directs the turn to him to discuss a different topic. By looking at the content of IE2's turn, it seems that he wants to disagree with the point stated by IE1 that war is not inevitable yet. Instead of disagreeing in a direct way, as seen in Arab interviews, IE2 inserts his disagreement within the content of his response in a mitigated and indirect way.

Let us look at two instances of interruption (excerpt 12) used by the IEs at the end of the program. Like the first example, the IEs rush to take the floor before the IR could take it so that they can add a comment or point that they think should be mentioned to clarify their positions towards what was going on in Iraq.

Excerpt (12):

(US PBS *NewsHour*: 06 March 2003: War or Diplomacy
IR: Jim Lehrer: IE1: Samuel Berger: IE2: James Schlesinger)

1. IE2: But we should recognize that much of what we see was inevitable
2. in that historically powers joined together to cut down the leading
3. nation that is the French objective [and it's]=
4. IR: [all right]
5. IE2: been joined in this case by China and Russia I think for the
6. moment
7. IR: [and]
- 8. IE1: [We have] we have Jim created a coalition in the past in
9. Gulf War one in Kosovo it's a painstaking job I think there's
10. nothing inHERENT in the notion that we can't put together
11. IR: [er]=
12. IE1: a coalition that to fight a [war]
13. IR: [what's]=
14. IE1: I still believe in the days remaining that we should make every
15. effort to do so
16. IR: [we will see]
- 17. IE2: [We will put] together a coalition under [1441]
18. IR: [all right]=
19. IE2: and it's been vitiated
20. IR: We'll see what happens tomorrow and the...(the IR continued)

IE1, here, does not wait to be asked by the IR to respond to IE2's point (arrowed line 8). Rather, he starts simultaneously with the IR to hold the floor before the IR could start his question, which possibly would not be about what the IE1 has just said. Thus, IE1 seems to use interruption to get the floor first, so he would be able to add whatever he thinks should be added. As we will discuss in Chapter V, note that IE1 uses an address term, Jim, to focus his attention to what he is about to add, suggesting that his interruption is to add an important point that needs more attention, since it represents the main theme that IE1 would like to say, which apparently is the position of the Democratic Party to which he belongs. Despite all the indications used by the IR that he wants to close (lines 11, 13), IE2 interrupts the IR at the last moment of the interview (arrowed line 17) in a

similar way to IE1's interruption, by taking the floor first to add a comment that seems to be an assertion about the point that he presented throughout the interview. Further, IE2's interruption seems to be a reaction to a point that IE1 has just stated. Although the IR's attempts to close in lines 7 & 13 could be attempts to interrupt, we did not consider them as so since the IR did not take the floor.

Above, we have observed that despite the different positions that the IEs took concerning the topic of discussion, this did not result in having high instances of interruption, as we have seen in Arab interviews, suggesting that cultural variation could influence this difference. In addition, the IEs interrupt more than the IR, who also did not interrupt the IEs to challenge them in contrast to what we have observed in Arab interviews. Instead of interruption, the IEs waited till the co-IE finished his turn to come with a response to the other interviewee's view, or to clarify a point that they mentioned in prior turns.

2. After the War: The U.N.'s Role

The topic of discussion in this edition, as its title indicates, is to debate whether the United States and Britain should give the United Nations a leading role in the reconstruction of Iraq after the war has ended, or should they keep that role to themselves only. The participants in this edition are William Luers, a retired American diplomat and now president of the privately-run United Nations Association; and Randy Scheunemann, a former foreign policy adviser to Senators Dole and McCain, now president of the Committee for the Liberation of Iraq. He also recently served as a consultant to the secretary of defense on Iraq policy.

Each one of the participating IEs presented the view of one side of this controversial issue. Randy Scheunemann (henceforth IE1) believes that the United States and Britain should take control of the rebuilding of Iraq since they are the only countries which shed blood to liberate Iraq, and also because of the bad history of the U.N.'s record in the political administration in other countries, such as in Kosovo. William Luers (henceforth IE2), on the other hand, thinks that the United States should draw on the expertise of the U.N. in building countries, as in countries like East Timor, Afghanistan, etc. By doing so, Luers thinks that this would back the new emerging government in Iraq to be backed by the whole world community, instead of the United States alone.

This edition discussed another controversial issue, which was debated strongly after the war on Iraq, concerning whether the United States should let the U.N. take control of the rebuilding of Iraq, or should it limit this role to itself. The participating interviewees represented the two options available for the United States to deal with this problem. The IEs showed complete disagreement with each other, using mainly historical examples to support their views. Nevertheless, their frequency of using interruption is relatively low, as shown in Table 17. For example, one employed interruption only once, and the other not at all during the entire interview, despite their clearly different views on the topic of discussion. However, the IR used more interruptions compared with his use in the first interview, 4 times, on 20 percent of all turns taken. As Table 17 also demonstrates, the overall percentage of using interruptions remained close to that seen in the first interview, accounting for just 12.1 percent of the total number of turns.

Table 17: The relative frequency of using interruption in After the War: The U.N.'s Role

Speaker	Number of Turns	interruptions used	Percentage of turns
IR	20	4	20%
IE1	8	0	0.0%
IE2	13	1	7.6%
Total	41	5	12.1%

In this interview, as Table 18 shows the IR used interruption for new functions that are more related to his role in news interviews. Further, these functions are more related to each other in that they are all about information mentioned by one of the IEs in prior turns and need further clarification or elaboration. The following example (excerpt 12) illustrates the use of such a function of interruption.

Excerpt (13):

(US PBS *NewsHour*: 12 April 2003: After the War: The U.N.'s Role
 IR: Jim Lehrer: IE1: Randy Scheunemann: IE2: William Luers)

1. IR: Let me ask each of you quickly before we go Mr. Ambassador you said
2. something a while ago, you think this can be worked out. I don't see
3. any evidence of it here in the last few minutes but do you think there
4. can be a solution here that can please both the U. N. and the I mean
5. the U. N. Security Council members like France and the United States
6. IE2: As the U.S. begins to see how extremely complicated this has been in
7. beginning to create stab[ility]
8. IR: [aha]=
- 9. they're going to see that they're going to need help [it's going to be]
10. IR: [So you think it]
11. IE2: I think it can be worked out

As the interview comes to its end, the IR asks a general question (lines 1-5) that summarizes the IEs' points of view. IE1's answer (line 6-9) is long and does not directly answer the question, forcing the IR to cut him off with a clarifying question that would demonstrate the main point of his view.

Table 18: The functions of using interruptions in After the War: The U.N.'s Role *

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To ask a follow-up question	2	--	--
To clarify	2		
To comment	--	--	1
Total	4	0	1

In this interview, we have shown the frequency of interruption is relatively low as found in the previous interview, particularly by the IEs. In addition, we have observed that the IR's interruptions were limited to functions that are associated with his role, and more related to each other, such as asking a follow-up question or to clarify.

3. Shields & Brooks # 1

This edition of *NewsHour* is arranged to discuss the latest developments in the war on Iraq after two weeks of its beginning, particularly the capturing of Baghdad's main airport by the coalition troops, and the media coverage of the conflict. The participants in this edition are: Mark Shields, syndicated columnist, and David Brooks, journalist in the *Weekly Standard*. Unlike other participants in this program, these two journalists are regularly invited to reflect on the main news stories of the week from their two different views. In this edition, however, they agreed with each other on the success that was made by capturing Baghdad's airport, and how effective it was in raising the self-confidence of both the American soldiers and their people. The participants showed some disagreement in their views of the criticism being made by retired military officers to the plan applied in the first week of war, and the reaction to that by Secretary Rumsfeld. To Mark Shields (hereafter IE1), the officers were right in their criticism and

* only used functions are shown in this table

their comments did not undermine the American troops. On the other hand, David Brooks (hereafter IE2), the military officers' talk to the press and to the media was a reaction to the transformation made by Rumsfeld in the military before 9/11, and the "leaking" in the war offered them an opportunity to criticize the Pentagon. IE2 asserted that this was not about the war, and they should not do that in the middle of the war.

As shown in Table 19, the total number of turns in this edition is still small compared with Arab interviews, and is similar to what we observed in previous English interviews. Having a small number of turns might explain in part the relatively low use of interruptions by English participants. However, when we look at the total percentage of interruptions per turn, it would be clear the small number of interruptions by English participants cannot be explained by the low number of turns. Rather, the contextual and cultural variables probably influence their use of interruptions.

Table 19: The relative frequency of using interruption in Shields and Brooks # 1

Speaker	Number of Turns	Interruptions used	Percentage of turns
IR	10	3	30%
IE1	7	0	0.0%
IE2	8	0	0.0%
Total	25	3	12%

In this edition, the IR used interruption in three instances, in 30 percent of total turns, which is the highest thus far. As Table 20 indicates, the IR used interruption for three different functions: changing a turn, asking a follow-up question, and closing. Let us examine the example of closing (excerpt 14), which would reveal further insights of how the function of closing is practiced.

Table 20: The function of using interruptions in Shields & Brooks # 1

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To change a turn	1	--	--
To show disagreement	--	--	--
To challenge	--	--	--
To limit topic of discussion	--	--	--
To take the floor	--	--	--
To ask a follow-up question	1	--	--
To clarify	--		
To limit time of discussion	--	--	--
To manage disagreement	--	--	--
To comment	--	--	--
To close	1	--	--
Total	3	0	0

Excerpt (14):

(US PBS *NewsHour*: 4 April 2003 : Shields & Brooks
 IR: Jim Lehrer: IE1: Mark Shields: IE2: David Brooks)

1. IE1: ... No I mean I think Jim, probably the most disturbing report I got all
2. week is that the Pentagon now is working on a contingency plan for the
3. invasion of Syria and that the argument is that the weapons of mass
4. destruction one of the rationalizations is that the weapons of mass
5. destruction aah have been transported to ah across the border aah
6. and aah
- 7. IR: Have you heard that David

Once IE1 introduces the idea of the Pentagon's plan to invade Syria, the IR immediately cuts him off to turn to IE2, David, to check whether he has the same information and attitude that IE1 has. The IR's use of interruption in this instance is similar to the way the Arab IR employs interruption in part for the purpose of generating disagreement. However, since the IR does not explicitly ask IE2 to agree or disagree with what IE1 said, his interruption might not be entirely to encourage disagreement, and it might be an

attempt to change the turn since the IR interrupts him in the slight pause in this turn (called silent interruption). After hearing the last part of IE1's turn again, it seems to me that the IR was more likely to change a turn rather than to encourage disagreement, as evidenced by his turn-yielding cues in his tone and intonation. Thus, I categorized this interruption as a change of speaker attempt, as shown in Table 20.

To summarize, we have observed that because the participating interviewees in this interview are journalists who are regularly invited to participate in this program, this might result in their failure to interrupt during the entire interview. Moreover, the cultural and contextual variation would explain the failure to interrupt compared with participants in Arab interviews.

4. Shields & Brooks #2

This is another edition of the debate between Shields and Brooks, who are normally invited in this program to discuss the latest development in the news from two different views. The topics discussed in this edition include the meaning of the fall of Saddam Hussein's statue in a square in Baghdad, and the looting that happened afterwards. Throughout this edition, and in many editions discussing the war in Iraq, the IEs had different views about the war. For example, when they were asked to reflect about the meaning of the fall of Saddam Hussein, David Brooks (hereafter IE2) was very emotional about that, considering it as the most emotional public day since Sep. 11th for America, particularly that America gained its victory with clean hands, and with the least number of casualties. Mark Shields (hereafter IE1), on the other hand, looked at it with conflicting emotions, asserting that what happens afterwards defines victory. His mixed emotions were the result of a number of suspicious issues, such as the contract for \$ 400

million awarded to Halliburton to put out oil fires for two years with no bid, as well as the looting and destruction that occurred after the victory.

This interview looks similar to other previous interviews at all levels, including the use of interruption, the level of disagreement, and the flow of discussion. As the numbers in Table 21 show, the use of interruption manifested by the numbers of times the participants used interruption as well as the percentage of use per turn, look alike in the way interruption is used in most interviews, indicating that this could be the common pattern of using interruption in this program.

Table 21: The frequency of using interruption in Shields and Brooks # 2

Speaker	Number of Turns	Interruptions used	Percentage of turns
IR	17	5	29.4%
IE1	10	0	0.0%
IE2	9	1	11.1%
Total	36	6	16.6%

The functions of using interruption by the IR, shown in Table 22, indicate that the IR limited his use of interruption to certain functions that usually do not result in additional use of interruption nor do they raise the level of argument and discussion to be more intense and hot. With the exception of one single use of interruption to show disagreement, the IEs projected their opposing views without relying on interruption. Also, it is interesting to note that the use of interruption by IE2 to show disagreement is the second use of interruption for such a function (excerpt 15) in all the five interviews, indicating the very low use of interruption for showing disagreement by English speaking participants compared with Arab ones.

Table 22: The function of using interruptions in Shields and Brooks # 2*

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To change a turn	--	--	--
To show disagreement	--	--	1
To challenge	--	--	--
To limit topic of discussion	1	--	--
To clarify	3		
To comment	1	--	--
Total	5	0	1

Excerpt (15):

(US PBS *NewsHour*: 11 April 2003 : Shields & Brooks #2
 IR: Jim Lehrer: IE1: Mark Shields: IE2: David Brooks)

1. IE1: City council meetings Jim admirable and important but when the
2. hospitals in the city of Baghdad are closed because of looters I mean
- 3. who is in charge : we're in charge that's ours : we broke it : we pay
4. for it : this is the antique [shop]
- 5. IE2: [We] didn't break Iraq Saddam Hussein
6. broke Iraq

Here, once IE1 asserts (arrowed line 3) that the United States is the one who broke Iraq by launching a war against it, IE2 cuts him off to deny such an assertion, even before IE1 completes his example in line 4. Note that both speakers use the plural pronoun, we, which depicts their identity as Americans.

In summary, this interview looks similar to other English editions in terms of interruption frequency and functions of use. Like previous interviews, the IEs' interruptions were very rare, and the IR limited his interruption to functions that are not associated with disagreement and dispute. Also, we have found the use of interruption to show disagreement is the second case in the entire five interviews, indicating the very

* We have deleted most unused functions of interruption in this table.

low use of such a function by English participants compared with their equivalent in Arab interviews.

5. Talk of War

This edition was broadcast at an earlier time compared with the other ones, when the U.S. Senate was discussing the debate about whether to approve the U.S. action against Iraq unilaterally, or doing so through the U.N. The participants were experts discussing what opinion polls reveal about public opinion on the possible war against Saddam Hussein. The participants were: Andrew Kohut (henceforth IE1), an expert at the Pew Center for the People, and Steven Kull (henceforth IE2), a faculty member in the program on International Policy Attitudes at the University of Maryland. Throughout the interview, the IEs agreed with each other on most of their readings of American public opinion, particularly the Americans' opposition for going into war alone. On other specific details about the way America should invade Iraq, the participants disagreed with each other a number of times, at a similar level of disagreement seen in previous interviews. In other words, this edition featured the lowest level of disagreement between the IEs so far, which would possibly influence the frequency and usage of address terms.

In brief, unlike other editions, this one goes back to the time when the U.S. Senate was debating a resolution to approve the use of force against Iraq. The IEs were expected to present two different readings about the public opinion polls at that time. However, they agreed with each other on most of their readings of the polls, with the exception of one instance. It is clear from Table 23 that the IEs did not use interruption at all, either with each other or with the IR. Throughout the interview, the IEs limited their

participation to only answering questions posed by the IR, and did not try to debate their views with the other participant. In addition, as seen in previous interviews, the IR did not challenge the IEs about their views, limiting his role to only asking clarification questions or attempts to encourage disagreement, possibly resulting in low use of interruption.

Table 23: The relative frequency of using interruption in Talk of War

Speaker	Number of Turns	Interruptions used	Percentage of turns
IR	22	5	22.7%
IE1	8	0	0.0%
IE2	13	0	0.0%
Total	43	5	11.6%

As Table 24 shows, the functions of interruption by the IR in this edition appear to be similar to those found in prior interviews. However, there is one instance in which the IR used interruption to limit the topic of discussion that might seem different not only from other examples found in previous editions but also from the other two instances of limiting discussion found in the current edition.

Table 24: The function of using interruptions in Talk of War*

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To show disagreement	--	--	--
To limit topic of discussion	3	--	--
To ask a follow-up question	1	--	--
To clarify	1		
Total	5	0	0

* This table shows used functions only

Whereas all other examples of limiting the topic of discussion involved cutting off the speaker as the result of his moving away from the main topic or line of argument, or avoiding answering the question, the IR in this example (excerpt 16) interrupts IE1 (arrowed line 17) once he begins talking about the topic on focus, unilateralism. The initial consideration of this use of interruption might be that the IR should not cut IE1 here since he has already started talking about the topic. However, by examining the question posed before (line 5) and the beginning of IE1's answer (lines 6-7), it is clear that the IR interruption is due to IE1's digression away from the point that the IR is trying to make concerning the idea that most Americans do not support invading Iraq unilaterally. Thus, the IR's motive could be seen as a way of refocusing his initial question about unilateralism, with an additional purpose of encouraging disagreement between the IEs in their reading of the polls. From this example, we would add that the IR uses interruption in some cases to carry out more than one function, suggesting that there is an overlap between the functions of an interruption, but with higher consideration of one over the other.

Excerpt (16):

(US PBS *NewsHour*: 07 October 2002: Talk of War
 IR: Jim Lehrer: IE1: Andy Kohut: IE2: Steven Kull)

1. IR: Unilateral action involving maybe air strikes or [something]
2. IE2: [that's]=
3. IR: that's one thing
4. IE2: Then you get a divided response
5. IR: I see Andy you're reading the same
6. IE1: Absolutely not the Gallup Poll finds 57 percent favoring the using
7. ground sending ground troops into Iraq. We found 48 percent, almost a
8. majority, saying we back using force even if there are thousands of
9. casualties or many casualties. And the casualties test is a very, very
10. strong test, because most of these questions only talk about the terrible

11. sacrifice we would make there, but not what the benefit would be
12. And I think that there are so many polls suggesting that the public is
13. inclined to use military force here, that there really is, the president
14. really does have the capacity to convert this general level of support into
15. actual support should he put a plan out to the public. But there are these
16. great qualifications mostly dealing with unilateralism [or how]
- 17. IR: [That's] what I
18. was asking about did you agree with Steven on the issue of unilateralism
19. that in your reading of the polls that is a concern of most Americans

In this interview, we have observed that because the IEs limited their participation to only answering questions posed by the IR, and did not try to debate their views with the other participant, this might lower their number of interruptions. An additional reason for the very low use of interruption was the IR's failure to challenge or encourage disagreement between the IEs. From our analysis of one example, we have concluded that the IR interrupts in some cases to carry out more than one function, but with higher consideration of one over the other, implying the multifunctionality of interruptions in this context.

Summary and Discussion

The close analysis of the use of interruption by English speakers in the five news interviews studied yields a number of important observations that could be considered as a baseline for exploring the general patterns of the use of such a practice. In what follows, a summary of the general findings will be presented and then discussed briefly.

To explain the relatively low level of interruption by English speakers, we have come up with possible reasons, which also would expand our exploration for the variables involved in generating interruption. One of the main reasons suggested is the rare incidents in which the IEs direct their talk to each other. Rather, they mostly direct their answers to the IR only. And, if they have to respond to an opposing point presented

by the co-IE, they usually attempt to do so once the co-IE has already finished his turn, and before the IR can take the floor to raise another point of discussion. We have seen the use of this strategy in most interviews, specifically in the two interviews by Shields and Brooks. As stated earlier, the use of this strategy as well as the way the IEs direct their responses because of their framing expectations of how they should talk and to whom they should direct their responses in this specific context of PBS *NewsHour*. Further, I would speculate that the IEs avoid interruption because of realization that interruption would generate a series of additional interruptions, which would not help them present their positions and views in the right way, and also would disturb the flow of discussion and possibly the whole interview, taking into consideration the limited time offered for the IEs to present their views.

Another important variable that we think contributed in part to lowering the number of interruptions was the relatively few cases in which the IR challenged the IEs about their views. Despite the fact that the IR frequently encouraged disagreement between the IEs, he rarely practiced the task of challenging his interviewees by interrupting them. To challenge the interviewees, the IRs usually interrupt their interviewees to confront them with an opposing point before they move on to talk about different topic. The possible reason for the American IR's not using such a practice may be his careful attempt to maintain neutrality in conducting his interviews since this program is broadcast in a Public TV network, PBS, which is very famous for taking a neutral stance towards most political and social issues. My evidence for this is my observation of the way other IRs lead the discussion in other TV networks, such as

FOXNEWS and MSNBC, etc, in which they frequently interrupt their IEs as a means of challenging them, which always results in violation of neutrality.

Having analyzed and discussed the practice of interruption by Arabic and English speakers in the preceding sections, our next step is to compare the findings and observations in order to uncover the common and different uses of interruption by Arabic and English speakers. Our methodology in performing this task will include examining the average use of frequency as well as the functions which will be presented first, followed by a discussion of the general findings that could be implemented in reporting the similarities and differences in using interruption.

Comparison between Arabic and English Speakers' Usage of Interruption

As shown clearly in Table 25, Arabic speakers (hereafter ASs) utilize the practice of interruption more frequently than English speakers (hereafter ESs), with an average (IR & IEs) of 30.6 times, accounting for 24.7 percent of all turns taken, which is almost double the English speakers' percentage of interruption per turn. By breaking down the overall frequency in terms of the IR and the IEs' use, the ASs have also higher use of interruption than ES. For the IR's use, the English IR's percentage of using interruption is half its equivalent by the Arab IR. The same thing can be said at the level of the IEs in which the Arabic speaking IEs' percentage of use per turn is more than double that of English IEs. The only point on which we can say Arabic and English speakers are alike is the finding that the IR always uses interruption more frequently than the IEs, as a natural consequence of the various tasks that the IR is responsible for in directing the interview as a result of their different framing expectations in this context. All of these

numbers stated above indicate undoubtedly that ASs' use of interruption is much higher than ES' use, at least at the level of the overall frequency of use.

Table 25 The average relative frequency of using interruption by Arabic and English speaking participants

Speaker	Average Number of Turns	Average Interruptions used	Percentage of turns
Arab IR	51.4	20.8	40.4%
American IR	17.8	3.6	20.2%
<i>Arab IEs</i>	<i>72.2</i>	<i>9.8</i>	<i>13.5%</i>
<i>American IEs</i>	<i>19.8</i>	<i>1.2</i>	<i>6%</i>
Arab IR & IEs	123.6	30.6	24.7%
American IR & IEs	37.6	4.8	12.7%

At the level of the function of use, there are a number of differences between Arabic and English speakers' use of interruption. The most obvious difference is that while ASs use interruption for 13 functions, ESs use it for only 9 functions. Although some of the functions that are not used by ESs are more specifically related to the design of the program, such as the announcing the results of a poll, the rest of the functions are commonly used in news interviews, including challenging, correcting, and managing disagreement. The failure to use interruption for such functions would imply that ESs did not reach the same level of disagreement, which would require the use of interruption for these functions, specifically managing disagreement and challenging. Further, as we will see in Chapter V about the moderator's role, as well as the finding here that the American IR did not use interruption for challenging the IEs, this would strongly indicate that the practice of this task was not one of the fundamental duties of his role in leading the interview, resulting in lowering the number of interruptions employed. This, however, does not mean that the American IR did not challenge the IEs; rather, he did so in a

number of cases, but not to the extent that would require the use of interruption. Similarly, the absence of interruption used for managing disagreement by the American IR indicates clearly that ESs did not have the type of disagreement and dispute seen in Arab interview, which demands the interference of the IR to manage it. This is not only based on the absence of interruption for such a function, but based on our observation of entire interviews. Another strong indicator of the low level of disagreement in the English interviews was the rare employment of interruption to show disagreement, as shown in Table 26, occurring only twice in the all English interviews, which we explained in a number of interviews as possibly because the English IEs had never had disputes with each other, involving direct counter attacks. Consequently, the absence of disputes and attacks between the English interviewees resulted naturally in a decrease in the use of interruption. This also would suggest that English and Arab interviews used in this study were not comparable in terms of the level of disagreement and argument to confirm the conclusion that ASs interrupts more frequently than ESs. In order to do so, this would require similar data from a variety of Arab and American TV channels.

However, the non-comparability between the two sets of data in terms of disagreement and dispute does not necessarily diminish the validity of the results of the current study entirely because there are other functions of interruptions that are not directly influenced by disagreement and argumentation, such as changing the turn, limiting the time and topic of discussion, commenting, etc. For example, despite the great difference between the English and Arab programs in terms of the time of the program, the Arab IR utilized interruption for limiting time of discussion more frequently than the English IR. Likewise, the Arab IR interrupted more to change the turn than the

English one, with an average of 2.8, accounting for 9.1 percent of the total number of interruptions by ASs.

Table 26: The average use of each function of interruption by Arabic (A.) and English (E.) speakers

Speaker	A. IR	E. IR	A. IEs	E. IEs	A. IR & IEs	E. IR & IEs	Total percentage by AS	Total percentage by ES
To change a turn	2.8	0.2	0	0	2.8	0.2	9.1%	4.1%
To show disagreement	1	0	8	0.4	9	0.4	29.4%	8.3%
To challenge	6.6	0	0.4	0	7	0	22.8%	0.0%
To limit topic of discussion	2.2	0.8	0	0	2.2	0.8	7.1%	16.6%
To correct	1	0	0.2	0	1.2	0	3.9%	0.0%
To take the floor	0	0	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.8	1.3%	16.6%
To ask a follow- up question	2.6	0.8	0.6	0	3.2	0.8	10.4%	16.6%
To clarify	2	1.2	0	0	2	1.2	6.5%	25%
To limit time of discussion	0.6	0.2	0	0	0.6	0.2	1.9%	4.1%
To manage disagreement	0.2	0	0	0	0.2	0	0.6%	0.0%
To announce the results of a poll	0.4	0	0	0	0.4	0	1.3%	0.0%
To comment	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.4	1.3%	8.3%
To close	1.2	0.2	0	0	1.2	0.2	3.9%	4.1%
Total	20.8	3.6	9.8	1.2	30.6	4.8	100%	100%

By looking at the total percentages of the use of interruption shown in Table 26, the most common functions of interruption used by ASs are showing disagreement and challenging, respectively, used by both the IR and the IEs. For the ESs, however, the highest functions employed are clarifying, with 25 percent, followed by the functions of limiting the topic, taking the floor, and asking a follow-up question, with 16.6 percent for each. Although these results show a discrepancy between ASs and ESs in using

interruption, it is difficult to confirm this without taking into consideration the difference between Arab and American interviews concerning the level of disagreement and dispute, which we have just described and analyzed above. Nevertheless, the difficulty in drawing conclusions in comparing Arabic and English speakers' use of interruption does not stop us from confirming the high use of interruption for certain functions by ASs or ESs, at least. For example, the results of the study undoubtedly illustrate that showing disagreement and challenging are the most used frequently functions of interruption used by ASs, at least in the same environment of discussion seen in Al-Jazeera TV Channel's program-*'The Opposing Views'*.

In addition, the results of the current study demonstrated a number of common uses of interruption between ASs and ESs, specifically by the IEs. For example, both Arabic and English speakers IEs restricted their use of interruption to tasks that are part of their role within the context of news interviews, such as showing disagreement, and taking the floor. The same can be said about the Arab and American IRs who limited their use of interruption to particular functions, such as changing the turn, asking a follow-up question, and closing. In other words, we have seen the IEs using interruption for functions that are part of the duties of the IR, which all suggest that both Arabic and English speakers participants adhered in the use of interruption to a similar turn-taking system by which the IR and the IEs have specific part within the context of news interviews. As stated in the beginning of this chapter, these results suggest that both Arabic and English speaking participants had common framing expectations in general regarding rules of turn-taking in this context.

Our close analysis of some examples from the data has uncovered additional findings. The first finding concerns the use of interruption for more than one function, but with more emphasis of one over the other. This multiple use of interruption is found to be more frequently used by both Arab and American IRs, adding another common use of interruption by ASs and ESs. The IRs sometimes use this multifunction interruption to put more pressure on the IEs as a means of challenging them or encouraging disagreement between them. For example, the IRs interrupt to ask a follow-up question, which involves some kind of challenge or encouragement to disagree. This would suggest that there is a great overlap between the functions of interruption to the extent that it is very difficult to determine the purpose of its use without having closely examined the content of turn in which the interruption has occurred as well as the preceding and following ones.

Another observation found in the analysis concerns the relationship between interruption and neutrality. As we have seen in some Arab interviews, particularly the one about the Kurds, the IR's excessive use of interruption resulted in a perceived bias in favor of one interviewee, especially when it is used more extensively with one interviewee rather than using it equally with both of them. Furthermore, our analysis reveals that the bias resulting from the excessive use of interruption does not necessarily occur due to using interruption for functions that are potential sources for bias, such as challenging, but also were found to result from using other functions that might be considered the least likely to cause bias, such as clarifying or changing the turn. This would also explain the low level of interruption used by the English IR as a means of maintaining neutrality. This observation leads us to another important variable, which

has some influence of the use of interruption pertaining to the different policies of the TV channels, PBS and Al-Jazeera, in terms of the level of neutrality that the IR should maintain towards the IEs. Whereas the PBS network might have strict rules regarding maintaining neutrality in their programs, Al-Jazeera channel, however, seems to not have the same level of rules, which would give the IR more freedom to use interruption, particularly with those who support the American invasion of Iraq. Further, based on our daily observation of how interruption is used in similar programs in other American TV networks, such as MSNBC *Hardball*, and FOXNEWS *O'Reilly Factor*, we observed higher use of interruption, as well as hot and intense debates than what was seen in PBS. Therefore, we would say that the PBS *NewsHour* might not be representative of other American programs in terms of interruption use and disagreement level, and that would not help us the best to make a comparison between Arabic and English speakers' use of interruption. In short, the different rules of neutrality imposed on the IRs in the two channels could be additional variables that should be taken into consideration in explaining the results of the current study.

Above, we have compared the use of interruption by Arabic and English speakers based on two levels: frequency and function of use. Further, we have analyzed at least one example from each interview to give further insight of how interruption is used, and what the possible variables are that could influence its use. Examples of these variables include neutrality and multifunctionality of interruption. Having finished this chapter, it is time to move to analyze the moderator's role.

CHAPTER V

THE MODERATOR'S ROLE

Introduction

This chapter examines the moderator's role within the context of panel political interviews in both Arab and American TV networks. As stated in Chapter III, my examination of the moderator's role will be limited to three tasks: encouraging disagreement between interviewees, challenging them, and managing escalating disagreement. For each one of these tasks, we will provide examples to show how the moderators perform these tasks, followed by detailed analysis of each example. In addition, we will compare and contrast the performance of the moderators in the Arab and American programs to illustrate the similarities and differences in the moderators' behavior in the programs. Furthermore, throughout my analyses, we will compare my findings with other studies' results concerning the moderator's role, particularly in British and American news interviews. Finally, a summary of the general findings of the current study will be presented.

First Task: Encouraging Disagreement between Interviewees

One of the important tasks that the moderator of panel news interviews is expected to perform in relation to the participants is to encourage disagreement between them. Performing such a task, of course, may vary from one moderator to another based

on a number of variables. To fulfill this task, the Arab moderator in this study employs certain strategies, such as asking an interviewee to respond to an opposing point previously mentioned by the interviewee after paraphrasing it in most cases, or by mentioning an opposing point that was not necessarily stated by the other speaker, while distancing himself from it. In this section, we will describe the moderator's encouragement of disagreement as a result of the contextual as well as the cultural backgrounds of the two programs. We will first describe the use of this task by the moderator in the Arab interviews, followed by the English one, with an attempt to highlight the common and different aspects in performing such a task.

Arab Interviews

Moderators of panel news interviews normally formulate their questions in a way to encourage disagreement or confrontation in some cases between the interviewees mostly when they are changing turns from one interviewee to another. In this study, the Arab moderator, Faisal al-Gassim, on many occasions tries to encourage disagreement between interviewees via a number of means that vary in the degree of promoting disagreement among interviewees. Before moving on to describe these strategies by which the Arab moderator fulfills this task, let us first take a look at the overall frequency of using this task in each interview. As Table (1) shows, the Arab moderator attempts to encourage disagreement between the interviewees 44 times, with an average of 8.8. His use of such a task varies from one edition to another due to probably the influence of the context, including the participants, topic of discussion, and how he frames his role accordingly in these editions. Another point to note is that the attempts by the moderator to encourage disagreement between the interviewees decrease

dramatically in cases where disagreement is escalating between interviewees. For example, the edition titled ‘the Iraqi Opposition’ included many instances of high and intense disagreement and dispute between the interviewees, forcing the moderator to manage such disagreement instead of encouraging it. With the exception of two attempts in the beginning and two at the end of this edition, the moderator spent the rest of the program trying to manage the increasing disagreement between the interviewees. In contrast, the moderator made twelve attempts to encourage disagreement in another relatively quiet interview, ‘Arab Countries’. However, whenever the moderator has successfully held the floor and managed the escalating disagreement, he normally turns back to his expected role by trying to encourage disagreement. In the edition mentioned above about the Iraqi opposition, the moderator was successful only once in turning the interview to its normal flow so that he could perform his expected role. Much detailed description of that edition will be presented in the section on managing disagreement.

Table 1: Number of attempts by the Arab moderator to encourage disagreement between the interviewees

Interview	Number of attempts
‘Increasing Alliance against America’	8
‘Iraqi Opposition’	4
‘Kurds and the Expected Changes in Iraq’	12
‘Arab Peoples’	8
‘Arab Countries’	12
Total	44

One such method that is frequently employed by the Arab moderator to accomplish such a task is asking one of the interviewees to reply to the other

interviewee's opposing view, which has been previously stated in prior turn. To illustrate, the moderator, in the following example (excerpt 1), asks one of the interviewees to respond to the other interviewee's claims:

Excerpt (1):

(Al-Jazeera TV 'The Opposing Views': 18 March 2003: 'The Increasing International Alliance Against America': IR: Faisal al-Gassim IE1: Hassan Sati IE2: Tala't Rumaih

- 1 IE1: ...if we have a wise super power it wouldn't use this power excessively in
2. the absence of other powers
- 3 IR: [good OK]=
- 4 IE2: [great :great]
- 5 IR: OK Tala'at Rumaih You heard this view you can respond
6. IE 2: Ah but I want to take my time
7. IR: Go ahead go: take your time go ahead

قناة الجزيرة: 18 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: التحالف الدولي المتصاعد ضد امريكا
مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.) الضيف الأول: حسن ساتي (ض 1) الضيف الثاني: طلعت رميح (ض 2)

1. ض 1: ...لو ربنا ابتلانا بدولة عظمى عاقلة لما كانت استخدمت هذه القوة هذا الاستخدام المفرط في غياب قوى
2. اخرى
3. م.ق.: (طيب كويس جداً)=
4. ض 2: (عظيم :عظيم)
5. م.ق.: كويس جداً طلعت رميح سمعت هذا الكلام لك أن ترد
6. ض 2: أه بس لو سمحت بقي أخذ وقتي
7. م.ق.: اتفضل خذ خذ وقتك اتفضل

Here, the moderator encourages the disagreement between the interviewees by asking one interviewee to respond to what the other has just said. The moderator usually precedes his question by indicating that they have heard the other interviewee's point, and asking them to respond without repeating the opposing view. However, in most cases, the interviewer paraphrases the opposing view of the other interviewee, followed by a question asking for a response. The following example (excerpt 2) illustrates this usage:

Excerpt (2)

(Al-Jazeera TV 'The Opposing Views':11 Mar, 2003: 'Kurds and the Expected Changes in Iraq': IR: Faisal al-Gassim. IE1: Kamal Majeed)

- 1 IE1: The mistake is that now the Kurdish leadership is in a cage or a
2 jail, they are prisoners they are under the American under the
3 Turkish threats and under the *Bai'th* threats So they cannot
4 move and they have to obey the orders imposed on them from an
5 illiterate person named Khaleel Zada Zalmai This is humiliation
6 to the Kurdish people and the Iraqi people to put a person from
7 Afghanistan where illiteracy is 90% as a representative or a
8 Crown prince: or: or an agent for the American leader
9 On: on:our country Arabs and Kurds so this is an intended
10 humiliation by the American government to make the Kurdish
11 people obey the orders of the Americans
→ 12 IR: Ok Mr. Berfikani, you heard this view and I want, you
13 know Mr. Kamal Majeed talked about mistakes: about horrible
14 mistakes done by the Kurdish leadership throughout its history
15 And unfortunately it did not learn from the history it is still
16 determined if the expression is correct to make extra mistakes
17 be especially now because they after all, you know, did not want
18 under: what has been said by Mr. Kamal Al-Majeed short time
19 to ago: under the leadership *Zalmai* or [*Zalmah*]
20 IE1: [Khaleel Zada]=
21 IR: who is appointed by the Americans Khaleel Zada to lead the
22 Kurds and their leadership

قناة الجزيرة: 11 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: الأكراد والتغيرات المرتقبة في العراق
المقدم: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.). الضيف الأول: كمال مجيد (ض1) الضيف الثاني: عبد القادر البيرفكاني (ض2)

1. ض1: الخطأ أنهم الآن القيادة الكردية في قفص أو في سجن هم أسرى هم الآن واقعين تحت النفوذ الأميركي
2. وتحت التهديد التركي وتحت التهديد البيئي فطبيعة الحال إنهم لا يستطيعون الحركة وهم خاضعين
3. للأوامر التي تفرض عليهم من قبل أمي اسمه خليل زاده: زلماي خليل زاده وهو تحقير للشعب الكردي
4. والشعب العراقي أن يضعوا شخصاً من أفغانستان حيث الأمية 90% يضعوه كمثل وحلقة الوصل أو
5. ولي العهد أو: أو: أو وكيل أو الحاكم الأميركي على: على: على بلدنا عربياً وأكراداً بطبيعة هذا: هنا
6. تحقير عمدي من قبل الحكومة الأميركية لكي: لإخضاع الشعب الكردي لأوامر الأميركيين
7. م.ق: كويس جداً سيد بيرفكاني سمعت هذا الكلام، وأنا أريد يعني السيد كمال مجيد تحدث عن أخطاء.. عن
8. أخطاء فظيعة قامت بها القيادات الكردية على مدى تاريخها وللأسف الشديد هي لم تتعلم من التاريخ
9. مازالت ممعنة إذا صح التعبير في ارتكاب المزيد من الأخطاء خاصة الآن فهم بعد كل ذلك يعني لا
10. بأس أن ينضوا تحت ما: يعني ما قال عنه السيد كمال المجيد قبل قليل: تحت إمرة يعني زلماي أو
11. (الزلمة) الذي الذي يعني عيَّنه الأميركان =
12. ض1: (خليل زاده) =
13. م.ق: خليل زاده ليشرف على الأكراد وقياداتهم

In this example, the moderator (in line 12, English excerpt) attempts to encourage disagreement between the two interviewees by paraphrasing briefly the point that has been already stated by the first interviewee, who is against the Kurdish leaders' decision to fight with the Americans to change the regime in Iraq. The moderator in this attempt not only plays his expected role by allocating turns to interviewees, but also makes the interview more interesting, particularly when he repeats some of the points mentioned by the first interviewee, which appear opposing and challenging to the second interviewee. As stated earlier, the moderator precedes his paraphrasing of the opposing points by reminding the second interviewee that he heard the point of the first interviewee. Although the moderator's reminder would mean initially that he does not want to repeat the first interviewee's points, he, however, does that but only with some points that seem challenging and opposing to the second interviewee, particularly if the first interviewee stated many points. Also, the moderator's repetition of IE1's (Kamal Majeed) points can be realized as a way of displaying his understanding of the points already stated, and transferring them to IE2 (AbdulGader al-Berfikani), who is expected to disagree with them.

In some few cases, the moderator encourages disagreement between interviewees not by stating one of the interviewees' points to the other, but by mentioning an opposing point while distancing himself from it (footing) by emphasizing that he is not the author of this statement; rather, someone else has said that. As stated in Chapter II, the concept of footing refers to the way speakers distance themselves from their speech as well as others' sayings by using particular forms to achieve neutrality and to encourage disagreement at the same time. Examples of these forms are: *ahadunma yagul* 'someone

is saying’, *Hunak min yagul* ‘there is one who says...’ etc. Another point to note is that the positioning of these phrases is usually either at the beginning or the end of the question. To illustrate the use of these forms, let us examine the following example:

Excerpt (3):

(Al-Jazeera TV ‘*The Opposing Views*’: 21 Jan 2003: ‘Arab Countries and the Expected American Attack on Iraq’: IR: Faisal al-Gassim IE1: Mansour Saifudeen Murad: IE2: Nassif Hitti)

1. IR: Demonstrations [you know]=
2. IE1: [sidi the]demonstrations
- 3. IR: there is someone who asks now where is the only Arabian regime
4. who threatened the Americans with [the public view]=
5. IE1: [yes: yes]
6. IR: you know there is no Arab leader who said to the Americans
7. I fear the public view: all of them say the public view is under the
8. shoe
9. IE1: Yes :yes :no no this is what they tell us...(IE1 continued).

{قناة الجزيرة: 11 يناير 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس الدول العربية والهجوم الأمريكي المحتمل على العراق
مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.) الضيف الأول: منصور سيف الدين مراد (ض1): الضيف الثاني: د.
ناصر حتى (ض2)}

1. م.ق.: المظاهرات (يعني) =
2. ض1: (يا سيدي) المظاهرات
3. م.ق.: هناك من يسأل الآن أين هو النظام العربي الوحيد الذي هدّد الأميركيان (بالشارع) =
4. ض1: (نعم : نعم)
5. م.ق.: يعني ولا زعيم عربي قال للأميركان أنا أخشى من الشارع الكل يقول له الشارع تحت
الحذاء
- 6.
7. ض1: نعم : نعم : لا : لا هذه بيحكوها إلنا... (ض1 اكمل حديثه).

In this example, the moderator uses the phrase, *hunak min yasail* ‘someone who asks (line 3), to encourage the interviewee being asked to disagree with the cited opposing point, while at the same time, the IR distances himself from the point. It is interesting to note that the IR uses the metaphor: “the public view is under the shoe” to mean that Arab leaders do not care that much about their people and what they want, and they repress them by not allowing them to present their real views and what they want.

The use of footing by the moderator in news interview is not new; it has been studied in earlier research on the American and British news interviews (e.g., Clayman, 1992). However, the interesting thing in the use of this strategy by the moderator in the Arab program is using it in the beginning of the program as part of a list of questions to present the two opposing views about the edition's topic. As you may recall from Chapter III, the moderator begins each edition of the program with a list of approximately 7-12 questions presenting each view of the edition's topic. Instead of statements, the moderator uses questions while at the same time. He uses distancing footing with some questions that may appear strong or biased. In addition, he uses these questions with distance footing throughout the program to challenge and encourage the interviewees to disagree and clarify their positions toward the cited point in the question. In only one example, the moderator used one of these questions to begin the program.

English Interviews

Similarly, the American moderator, Jim Lehrer, encourages disagreement between the interviewees via similar strategies used by the Arab moderator, such as asking an interviewee to respond to an opposing or challenging point that was previously mentioned by the other interviewee in prior turn, or presenting a challenging point and distancing his footing toward it. With regard to frequency, as Table 2 demonstrates, the overall number of the American moderator's attempts to encourage disagreement between the interviewees is 22 times, with an average of 4.4, which is less than the overall use by the Arab moderator. However, it is important to note the English interviews are shorter in time than English ones. Therefore, the overall American

moderator's attempts to encourage disagreement seem to be close to the Arab moderator's attempts if difference in length of time is taken into consideration.

Table 2: Number of attempts by the American moderator to encourage disagreement between the interviewees

Interview	Number of attempts
War or Diplomacy	8
After the war: The U.N.'s Role	3
Shields & Brooks #1	1
Talk of War	7
Shields & Brooks #2	3
Total	22

However, the only difference in the performance of this task between the two moderators was that the American moderator asked questions like: "Do you agree with what has been said by ...", while the Arab moderator made it more confrontational by using questions that may be interpreted by the interviewees as an attempt to engage in direct dispute with each other like: *Kifa tarudu ala thalik?* 'How do you respond to that?' The following example (excerpt 4) demonstrates the performance of such a task by the American moderator:

Excerpt (4):

(US PBS *NewsHour*: 12 April 2003: After the War: The U.N.'s Role
 IR: Jim Lehrer: IE1: Randy Scheunemann: IE2: William Luers)

1. IE1: ...And Mr. Blix , I think, presented a mixed picture of some compliance
2. but mostly kind of a sense that he wanted to continue. And that is the
3. message that I think went out to the delegates who, if you noticed, actually
4. applauded when the French foreign minister spoke and did not give that
5. same reaction to Sec. Powell.
- 6. IR: Do you agree, Mr. Luers at first that that was kind of the message

7. from Blix, that he and ElBaradei are ready to proceed and would prefer to
8. proceed further?
9. IE2: I think that was clearly...(IE2 continued).

The moderator in this example and many other examples in the data begins his question by referring to an earlier comment stated by the other interviewee to see whether he agrees or disagrees with it. To this end, he also paraphrased the main point stated, a technique also used frequently by the moderator in the Arab program.

In another way of encouraging disagreement similar to that used by the Arab moderator, the American moderator presented an opposing view or point to one of the interviewees to debate. Unlike the Arab moderator, however, the American moderator used this strategy in very few instances: only two occasions in the five editions of the program. In addition, instead of making the sources of his opposing points unknown as usually done by the Arab moderator, using phrases like *ahaduhum yasa'al* 'someone asked', *hunak mun yasaial* 'there is some people who ask', etc, the American moderator stated the sources of his points by citing a quote by a politician, or a known figure followed by a question to debate about it.

Overall, the two moderators displayed similar performances of encouraging disagreement in their shows. However, the American moderator, in one instance shown in excerpt 5 below, directly asked one of his interviewees to challenge the other interviewee's point (line 1). Furthermore, when the second interviewee tried to avoid his question, he repeated his question (in line 14) asking for a response to the first interviewee's point. This insistence by the moderator to answer his question occurred once in the American program, and it was used in several instances by the Arab moderator.

Excerpt (5):

(US PBS *NewsHour*: 06 March 2003: War or Diplomacy
IR: Jim Lehrer: IE1: James Schlesinger: IE2: Samuel Berger)

1. IR: Mr. Secretary, do you challenge Mr. Berger's points that it would be to
2. our advantage, to the United States' advantage to have a united front
3. against Saddam Hussein -- in other words, to come out of the U.N.
4. Security Council with some kind of resolution?
5. IE1: Certainly not. The president was asked last summer to go to the Congress
6. and to go to the U.N. It was said that he was acting unilaterally. He went
7. to the Congress. He got support from the Congress, a strong resolution of
8. support. He went to the United Nations. He painfully negotiated
9. Resolution 1441 with the
10. : French. The French are now dismissive of the resolution that they
11. negotiated. We would like to have others aboard but I think that the die is
12. cast. Unless Saddam Hussein disarms or abdicates which is very
13. doubtful, he will be removed from power.
14. IR: But I'm asking you to react to what Mr. Berger said, which is he listed
15. the advantages that there would be for the United States and Britain, if, in
16. fact, we had ... we had broader support in the world for what we're
17. doing. You don't think that's important?

Above, we first examined the performance of the Arab moderator to encourage disagreement as part of his expected role in the program, finding that he carried out this task frequently throughout each edition by either confronting an interviewee with an opposing view that has been previously stated by the other interviewee, or presenting a challenging point to debate about it from usually unknown sources to achieve neutrality. A comparison of the Arab and American moderators encouragement of disagreement in their programs showed that overall both of them carried out this task similarly in terms of the frequency with which they used this task as well as the strategies of performing it. The only noticeable difference between the moderators was in the Arab moderator's use of direct questions to ask for a response to the stated opposing points, compared to the

American moderator's frequent use of relatively indirect questions asking his interviewees to agree or disagree with a particular point.

Second Task: Challenging the Interviewees

Before moving on to analyze how the moderators carried out this task, let us first identify the definition of *challenge* that will be used in this section in detail. Challenging the interviewees involves any attempt by the moderator to confront the interviewee with a challenging point that calls the interviewee to any inconsistency or contradiction in the view that he is trying to present. The moderator's challenge usually occurs immediately after the interviewee finishes his turn, and sometimes the moderator may interrupt the interviewee to fulfill this task, as we have seen in Chapter IV. Moreover, some of the moderator's challenging points are based on his own information and expertise that usually are widely known by the public. Challenging also occurs in indirect attempts when the moderator points to information or views that the interviewee seems not to take into consideration, using forms, such as "what about". Further, when the moderator encourages disagreement between the interviewees, his attempt also involves in part some kind of challenge because he has to challenge them to encourage disagreement, resulting in an overlap between the two tasks: encouraging disagreement and challenging the interviewees. However, my discussion of this task in this section will not investigate the use of challenge that overlaps with encouraging disagreement since it has been illustrated earlier; rather, we will examine the examples when the moderator challenges his interviewees by raising an opposing point or comment related to what the interviewee has already stated. In addition, we will compare how the Arab and American moderators carried out this task.

Arab Interviews

In the Arab program, the moderator's challenge to the interviewees is very common in almost every edition. In fact, the practice of this task is one of the peculiar features of the panel political interviews that most of the audiences are expecting the moderator to perform. As Table 3 shows, practice of this task by the Arab moderator is frequent in every edition, with some variation from one interview to another, possibly based on the moderator's framing of each edition. The overall practice of this task occurs 48 times, with an average of 9.5 per interview, which is slightly higher than his practice of encouraging disagreement,

Table 3: Number of attempts by the Arab moderator to challenge the interviewees

Interview	Number of attempts
'Increasing Alliance against America'	14
'Iraqi Opposition'	8
'Kurds and the Expected Changes in Iraq'	13
'Arab Peoples'	10
'Arab Countries'	3
Total	48

Excerpt (6):

(Al-Jazeera *'The Opposing Views'*, 'The increasing international alliance against America', 18 Mar 2003). IR: Faisal al-Gassim, IE1: Hassan Sati, IE2: Tala'at Rumaih)

1. IE1: You noticed in the address of Bush after Sep.11th Bush jr who in my point
2. of view is the worst president who will drag the world into a catastrophe
3. and American [itself]=
4. IE2 [great :great great]
- 5. IR: [That contradicts] with your earlier statement
6. IE2: It does not contradict it doesn't He he is practicing the superiority
7. which is done by [super country it is now a super power]=

8. IE2: [what are its vitals doctor:::my dear brother]
 9. IE1: and this is your question this is your question but there is: I answered
 10. [your question or not]=
 11. IE2: [Tell us what are its vitals]
 12. IE1: He was looking for coverage and this coverage is
 13. [not not important]=
 14. IE2: [Allah is great:: Allah: Allah]
 15. IE1: because
 → 16. IR: To be [frank with you]=
 17. IE1: [yes]
 → 18. IR: You did not answer

(قناة الجزيرة: 18 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: التحالف الدولي المتصاعد ضد أمريكا)
 مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.) الضيف الأول: طلعت رميح (ض1) الضيف الثاني: حسن ساتي (ض2)

1. ض2: أنت لاحظت خطاب بوش بعد 11 سبتمبر -بوش الابن- وأنا في رأيي هذا أسوأ الرؤساء الذين سيجرون
 2. الكارثة بالعالم وبأميركا (نفسها)=
 3. ض1: (عظيم : عظيم :عظيم)
 4. م.ق: (هذا يناقض) كلامك الأول
 5. ض2: لا يناقض لا يناقض: هو هو يمارس السوبارية التي تمارس (الدولة العظمى هي الآن دولة عظمى)=
 6. ض1: (مقوماتها أليه يا دكتور:: يا أخي العزيز)
 7. ض2: وهذا سؤالك هذا سؤالك لكن فيه أجبت (على سؤالك أم لا)=
 8. ض1: (قل لنا مقوماتها)
 9. ض2: كان يبحث عن غطاء وهذا الغطاء (ليس ليس مهماً)=
 10. ض1: (الله أكبر:: الله : الله)
 11. ض2: لأنه الفكر أليه
 12. م.ق: والله أكون (صريحاً معك)=
 13. ض2: (أبوه)
 14. م.ق: لم تجب

In this example, the moderator (line 5) exercises his expected role by challenging the first interviewee when he describes the current American president, George W. Bush, as the worst, which contradicts with his earlier comments in which he supported the American attack on Iraq. Unexpectedly, this change in the first interviewee's point of view led the second interviewee to show his agreement with it, as shown in line 2. Consequently, the moderator interfered and pointed to this contradiction. Furthermore, the moderator challenges IE1 again, as shown in lines 16 and 18, when IE1 tried to avoid his question

about the contradiction and change in his view of the war in Iraq. From this example, we can note that up to this point the moderator has challenged the interviewees in two different cases: when there was contradiction in his statement, and when he avoided answering his question.

Right after these two attempts to challenge IE1, the moderator, however, explicitly states that he is not trying to challenge or interrupt him despite the fact that challenge is one of the expected tasks to be performed by the moderator. As shown in excerpt (7), the moderator (in line 10) tries to confirm to IE1 that he is not in a position to challenge or interrupt him; rather he is trying to find an answer to his question. Although the moderator's attempts look strange when we consider his role, it can be explained as a way to soften his language with IE1 due to his complaint (lines 4-5) about the repeated challenges by the moderator.

Excerpt (7):

(Al-Jazeera TV *'The Opposing Views'*: 18 March 2003: 'The increasing international alliance against America': IR: Faisal al-Gassim: IE1: Hassan Sati)

1. IE1: brother in: in: in the eighties they refused to give Arafat a visa for
2. entrance to an agency (U.N.) that they do not own it
3. IR: But Mr. Sati but ok if the agency in this [this]
4. IE1: [You're] making me
5. responsible for the mistakes of America.
6. IR: No brother if the international agency
7. IE1: You are telling me: I: I'm talking about
8. a great country and its [practices]
9. IR: [But I:I] excuse me
- 10. Mr. Sati I don't try to interrupt or challenge you: but I want an answer
10. IE1: [Yes: yes]=
11. IR: [You're] saying: America from one side you tell me that the United
12. Nations...(The IR continued)

قناة الجزيرة: 18 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: التحالف الدولي المتصاعد ضد امريكا
مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.) الضيف الأول: حسن ساتي (ض1) الضيف الثاني: طلعت رميح (ض2)

1. ض1: يا أخي في في: في التمانينات رفضوا عرفات تأشيرة دخول لمنظمة لا يملكون حقه
2. م.ق.: بس يا سيد ساتي بس طيب إذا كانت المنظمة بهذا: (بهذا)
3. ض1: (أنت) تحملني أخطاء أميركا
4. م.ق.: لأ يا أخي إذا كانت المنظمة الدولية
5. ض1: أنت تقول لي: أنا: أنا أتحدث عن دولة عظمى (وممارستها)
6. م.ق.: (بس أنا..) أنا عفواً يا سيد ساتي أنا لا
7. أحاول أن أقطعك أو أتحدك، بس أريد جواباً
8. ض1: = (نعم: نعم)
9. م.ق.: (أنت) تتحدث: أميركا من ناحية تقول لي إنه الأمم المتحدة... (اكمل م.ق حديثه)

In addition to the types of challenging mentioned above, the Arab moderator practices this task using another strategy- making the interviewee as if he is accusing the other interviewee of being part in the group described in previous turns. To illustrate such a practice, observe the following example (excerpt 8) in the edition about the Kurds' expected role in the changes in Iraq after the American attack on it.

Excerpt (8):

(Al-Jazeera TV 'The Opposing Views': 11 March 2003: 'Kurds and the expected changes in Iraq') IR: Faisal al-Gassim: IE1: AbdulGader al-Berfikani: IE2: Kamal Majeed

1. IE1: ...What has been addressed by you sir and by the professor is
2. specialized sentences by the media which the intelligence agencies
3. that fight Kurds are spreading out in the media and books
- 4. IR: Do you want to say that professor Kamal Majeed is an agent or
5. [repeating]=
6. IE1: [no sentences sentences]
- 7. IR: Is he connected with the intelligence to this extent
8. IE1: Sentences sentences sentences aired by the media who take their
9. orders from agencies of intelligence...(IE2 continued).

قناة الجزيرة: 11 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: الأكراد والتغيرات المرتقبة في العراق (المقدم: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.) الضيف الأول: كمال مجيد (ض1) الضيف الثاني: عبد القادر البيرفكاني (ض2)

1. ض1: ... ما طرحته سيادتكم وما طرحه الدكتور هي جُمْل متخصصة إعلامية كانت أجهزة

2. المخابرات التي تحارب الأكراد تسجلها في الصحافة وفي الكتب
 ← 3. م.ق: يعني هل تريد أن تقول أن البروفيسور كمال مجيد عميل يعني أو = (يردد (لا جملًا جملًا)
 4. ض:1 مرتبط بالاستخبارات يعني إلى هذا الحد
 ← 5. م.ق: جملًا جملًا بئتها وسائل الإعلام التي تأخذ أوامرها من أجهزة المخابرات
 6. ض:1

Here, we can observe (lines 4 & 7, English translation) that the moderator challenges the first interviewee in another type of challenge in addition to the two mentioned above. In this case, the moderator attempts to protect the face and credibility of the second interviewee by making the first interviewee as if he is accusing the second interviewee of being part of the group described in his earlier comments. In that edition of the program, the issue being discussed was the decision made by the leaders of the Kurdish opposition to cooperate with the American government in their attack on Iraq. The first interviewee was supporting that decision, while the second interviewee was against it. To show his disagreement with those against those opposing the Kurdish leaders' decision, he employed a common strategy used widely by politicians in the Middle East, in which any one rising against the local leaders is considered to be of helping the foreign governments with their intelligence agencies, and spreading their ideas. The close examination of the moderator's defense of the second interviewee, however, reveals that it was not only the result of the first interviewee's accusation of the second interviewee's view, but also of his own view, as shown in line # 1. Nevertheless, the moderator's challenge in this case was not common; it occurred only once throughout the five editions of the program.

However, in another example from the same edition of the program, the moderator repeated his defense of the second interviewee about whether he was an agent for intelligence or not. Let us look at the example to see how he did it again:

Excerpt (9):

(Al-Jazeera 'The Opposing Views', 'Kurds and the expected changes in Iraq', 11 Mar 2003). IR: Faisal al-Gassim, IE1: Kamal Majeed., IE2: AbdulGader al-Berfikani

1. IE 1: Reports of the security agencies that are against the Kurdish case
- 2. IR: These are documents he has documents
3. IE1: These aren't documents, these are records gathered by the intelligence agencies
- 4.
- 5. IR: You mean he is an agent
6. IE1: No he is reporting the and the reporter the writer and the presenter are
7. all in the Kurdish fire if God is willing...(IE2 continued)

(قناة الجزيرة: 11 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: الأكراد والتغيرات المرتقبة في العراق)
المقدم: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.): الضيف الأول: كمال مجيد (ض1): الضيف الثاني: عبد القادر البييرفكاني (ض2)

1. ض2: تقارير الأجهزة الأمنية المعادية للقضية الكردية
- ← 2. م.ق: هذه وثائق ووثائق لديه
3. ض2: هذه ليست وثائق هذه سجلات قد جمعتها أجهزة المخابرات
- ← 4. م.ق: يعني هو عميل
5. ض2: لا ينقلها والناقل والكاتب والمقدم هم كلهم في النار الكردية إن شاء الله...(ض2 اكمل حديثه)

Another situation in which the moderator challenges the interviewee is by presenting an opposing point that is assumed to be agreed on by the majority of the audience. Let us look at the following example from the same edition about the Kurds, in order to clearly understand the situation in which this challenge is used.

Excerpt (10):

(Al-Jazeera 'The Opposing Views', 'Kurds and the expected changes in Iraq', 11 Mar 2003). IR: Faisal Al-Gassim IE1: AbdulGader al-Berfikani

1. IE1: ...dear brother in every house of a Kurd there is a picture either of
2. Skaikh Ridha al-Dersimi, or Shaikh Mahmood al-Hafeed, or of the
3. leader of Kurds Umm Mustafa al-Brasani [those are] holding holding..
- 4. IR: [but but]one minute in
5. every house in every house of an Arab there is a picture of an Arab
5. leader and the Arab people hate them and don't want to be ruled by them
6. IE1: Well these pictures are hung for their love of what they did to serve

7. Kurds to the contrary to what your leaders have done, but I know that
8. Jamaal AbdulNassir is the heart of [many Arabs not]
→ 9. IR: [but having having]
10. having pictures of Kurds does not mean.: and it is possible that it is
11. forced on them as it is on the Arab people.
12.IE1: because every Kurd listening to this...(the interviewee continued).

(قناة الجزيرة: 11 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: الأكراد والتغيرات المرتقبة في العراق)
المقدم: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.): الضيف الأول: كمال مجيد (ض1): الضيف الثاني: عبد القادر البيرفكاني (ض2)

- 1.ض2: أخي العزيز في كل بيت كردي هناك صورة إما للشيخ رضا الدرسيماي إما للشيخ محمود
2. الحفيد أو لقائد الكرد أم مصطفى البرزاني (هؤلاء) يحملون هذه يحملون
← 3.م.ق: (بس بس) دقيقة واحدة في كل بيت في كل
4. بيت عربي في كل بيت عربي صورة للزعيم العربي والإنسان العربي ما يطبق ما يطبق
5. أرضه للزعيم
6.ض2: والله هذه الصور ترفع لمحبتهم وانسجامهم مع ما قاموه لخدمة الأكراد ليس كما قامت به
7. حكامكم ولكنني أعلم أن جمال عبد الناصر في قلوب (الكثيرين) من العرب ليس تزلفاً
← 8.م.ق: (بس) يعني
9. وجود وجود وجود الصور الأكراد لا تعني أنهم : وممكن أن تكون مفروضة عليهم
10. كما هي مفروضة على الشعب العربي
11.ض2: لأصل لأصل لأصل أن كل كردي يسمع هذا اللقاء (ض2 اكمل حديثه)

As we can note in this example, the moderator challenges the interviewee (lines 4 & 11, English translation)) by confronting him with an opposing point that is widely accepted in the Middle East, particularly since the main target audience of the program are those from such areas. To support his position in favor of the current political Kurdish leaders, the first interviewee gives an example about hanging pictures of the Kurdish leaders, which is immediately challenged by the moderator. To accomplish this kind of a task, the IR interrupts the interviewee; to the contrary of the way he encouraged disagreement which he mostly does by rephrasing the other interviewee's point without the need for interruption. However, the interviewer, in some cases, does not need to interrupt to present his challenge to the interviewee, especially in the beginning of the interview, where the discussion has not been intensified yet.

English Interviews

In the English program, on the other hand, the moderator never challenges his interviewees in the same way the Arab moderator does. Rather, he accomplishes this task in a mitigated and indirect way that can largely be understood from the examination of the semantic content of his turn. Instead of confronting the interviewee with any inconsistency or contradiction in his prior turns in a direct way, as usually done by the Arab moderator, the American moderator, however, attempts to challenge his interviewees by pointing to views that the interviewee seems not to consider in his view. In other situations, the moderator challenges using another strategy by associating the interviewee's point of view with a negative evaluation of the topic being discussed.

Before moving on to examine the strategies by which the American moderator fulfills this task, let us first take a general overview of the use of such a task by looking at the overall frequency in each interview. As illustrated in Table 4, the American moderator's use of this task is less frequent compared with the Arab moderator's use, and appears to be limited to only two editions: War or Diplomacy and After the War: The U.N.'s Role.

Table 4: Number of attempts by the American moderator to challenge the interviewees

Interview	Number of attempts
War or Diplomacy	3
After the War: The U.N.'s Role	3
Shields & Brooks #1	0
Shields & Brooks #2	0
Talk of War	0
Total	6

My explanation of the apparent variation in using this task across editions could be the result of the moderator's variation in framing his role in each edition according to the topic discussed, participants, and the views presented. Additional reason for this variation could be due to the frequent participation of the two professional guests: Shields and Brooks, who both are invited in this program to discuss a specific topic from two different views, and accordingly the moderator frames his role not to challenge the interviewees about their views. Similarly, in the third interview about talk of war, the participants were experts in polls, and the moderator attempts throughout the interview to make sure that the two guests read the results of the polls in the same way.

As mentioned above, in the relatively few instances in which the moderator practices challenging the interviewees, he uses different strategies. One of these strategies is to point to the interviewee to another view or position that he probably does not consider in his view, usually in an indirect attempt to challenge the interviewee with other possible ways to look at the topic being discussed from different points of view. To better understand the use of this strategy, examine the following example (in excerpt 11):

Excerpt (11):

(US PBS *NewsHour*: 06 March 2003: War or Diplomacy
IR: Jim Lehrer: IE1: James Schlesinger: IE2: Samuel Berger)

1. IE1: I certainly do not I think within Europe it is plain that the Germans, the
2. French and the Belgians are the ones that are isolated I think that it is
3. clear from even debates in the chamber of deputies in which members of
4. Chirac's own party say we should not be breaking up Europe, we should
5. not be breaking up nato in order to protect a tyrant That shows at
6. least in the political class in France that there is recognition of the cost
7. that France may play

- 8.IR: What about the basic point here that we can't get nine votes in the U.N.
- 9. Security Council as we're sitting here tonight, we don't have them the
- 10. United States doesn't have them

Here, the American moderator attempts to point to the potential difficulty facing the United States to get nine votes in the United States, in an attempt that can be interpreted as an indirect challenge to IE1 that even if we look at the current situation in the same view that you are presenting, we still need to solve this difficulty anyway, and our view should take this difficulty into consideration.

Another strategy employed by the American moderator to challenge the interviewees is to relate the point presented by the interviewee in prior turn with a negative evaluation of the situation being described in a way that would make the interviewee's point appear to be inconclusive or wrong. Examine the following example (excerpt 12) to better understand the use of such a strategy.

Excerpt (12):

(US PBS *NewsHour*: 06 March 2003: War or Diplomacy
 IR: Jim Lehrer: IE1: James Schlesinger: IE2: Samuel Berger)

- 1. IE1: The Europeans are not just France and Germany and Belgium : The
- 2. nations of the Vilnius 12 or 10 or whatever it is have supported U.S.
- 3. policy: Britain, France : Britain Italy Spain. Europe is divided :As
- 4. that parliamentarian in France indicated France should not cast a veto
- 5. that would break up Europe
- 6. IR: But your position is the United States has no fault for this slackening of
- 7. support in the last thirty to forty-five days

In this example, the moderator (arrowed line 6) infers from IE1's points stated in the previous turn that the United States does cause the divide in the United Nations. The moderator's inference, however, is not like other attempts usually employed by

moderators to clarify what has been presented; rather, it challenges the interviewee by relating his point with the current situation. To make his challenge look stronger, the moderator also tries to insert negative terms of evaluation, such as slackening, and no fault, to put more pressure on the interviewee, and make his earlier comments to have no meaning or validity in the actual situation or reality.

Above, we have examined the moderators' role in challenging their interviewees in both the Arab and American programs. We have demonstrated that the Arab moderator practiced his challenge of the interviewees by either pointing to any inconsistencies in their statement, making an inference from one interviewee's view as an accusation of the other interviewee, or attempting to repeat the question posed if the interviewee avoided answering them. Unlike the Arab moderator, the American moderator's challenge of the interviewees was less frequent and indirect by using mitigated strategies that soften the directness of his challenges, such as pointing to any other views that the interviewees seem not to consider, or by making an inference from the interviewee's point and associating it with the actual situation in a negative way.

Third Task: Managing an Escalating Disagreement

In examining this task, we will consider the strategies the moderator employs to end disputes in the Arab interviews only since the English interviews do not have any occurrence of an escalating disagreement between the interviewees. Before I started this study, I decided to limit my discussion of the moderator's role to two tasks: encouraging disagreement and challenging the interviewees. However, when I initially examined the data, particularly the Arab interviews, I noticed, on some occasions, the moderator adds to his role the management of a dispute that may arise without prior notice. Therefore, I

decided to include the examination of this task to my list, particularly since it has not been studied in detail within the context of English panel news interviews other than Clayman and Heritage's (2002) study, and not at all within the Arab interviews.

As indicated by Clayman & Heritage (2002: 320), the responsibility for ending dispute escalation in panel news interviews does not lie only with the interviewees. The moderator has to manage this dispute by employing certain strategies. One of these methods found in the data, which also has been observed by Clayman and Heritage (2002) is asking questions in order to restore the turn-taking system of the interview. Examine the following example (excerpt 13) that illustrates the use of this strategy from the edition about the Iraqi opposition.

Excerpt (13):

(Al-Jazeera TV *'The Opposing Views'*: 27 May 2003: 'The Iraqi opposition')

IR: Faisal al-Gassim: IE1: Mammed al-Tamimi: IE2: Sadiq al-Musawi

1. IE1: ...This accuses any one who aligns with his nation and aligns with Iraq as
2. a soldier of fortune: because those soldiers of fortune do not talk and do
3. not understand and do not treat but with this logic...
4. ((6 lines omitted))
5. IE1: The greatest civilization in the history is made by this nation=
6. IE2: Let me ::let me tell you something::let me tell you something:let me::let
7. me: let me to you::I don not excuse you to call with the word burglars::
8. speak with respect:speak with respect:otherwise I can excavate documents
9. and confirm your funding from to:to this regime=
10. IE1: This man;this: this: not me::not me who says that::not me who says::there
11. is a ruling: a ruling: there are rights::o' man I challenge you in front of
12. millions to excavate documents: man I am challenging ::in front of
13. millions to reveal
14. IE2: I don't permit: I call:call::call the moderator: I call who moderates this
15. session: I call who moderates this session to=
- 16. IR: Ok but one minute: one minute guys:one minute=
17. IE1: O'man: respect yourself: the Iraqi opposition the political powers are
18. respected: they have roots: they have history=
18. IE1: O 'man: this is your reason and you mention to me and you mention to me
19. Kurdish-opposition parties

- 20. IR: Ok guys guys : only one minute only one minute only one minute
 21 IE1: al-Barzani has an old history with Mossad al-Talbani has an old history
 22. with Mossad man those are Mossad's men
 → 23. IR: Guys we cannot listen
 24. ((9 lines omitted))
 → 25. IR: Ok only minute:one minute:only one minute in one minute one minute I
 26. want to ask a question but guys I wish we be quiet a little bit
 27. ((98 lines omitted))
 → 28. IR: Only one minute : by God one minute guys by God one minute::Ok let me
 29. ask a question
 30. IE1: Dr.Faisal I want to complete: complete:complete this point complete this
 31. point
 31. IR Only one minute brother one minute::but please without interruption please
 32. please please
 33. IE1: Get his permission to respond: to respond
 34. IR: Go ahead
 35. IE1: Why do the Americans now after they completed their mission what is
 36. called the Iraqi opposition, they...(IE1 continued)

(قناة الجزيرة: 27 مايو 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: المعارضة العراقية)
 مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.). الضيف الأول: محمد التميمي (ض1): الضيف الثاني: صادق الموسوي
 (ض2)

1. ض1: هذا يتهم كل من ينحاز إلى أمته وينحاز إلى العراق فهو مرتزق لأنهم هؤلاء المرتزقة لا يتكلمون
 2. ولا يفهمون ولا يتعاملون إلا بهذا المنطق...
 ((6 أسطر محذوفة))
 3. ض1: أعظم الحضارات في التاريخ صنعها هذا الشعب=
 4. ض2: =اسمح لي أقول لك شيئاً: اسمح لي أقول لك شيئاً : اسمح لي: اسمح لي: لا اسمح
 5. لك.. لا اسمح لك أن تتعت مرة ثانية بكلمة لصوص تكلم بأدب: تكلم بأدب وإلا أنا: أنا أتمكن: أنا
 6. أتمكن أن أكشف أوراق وأثبت وأثبت ارتزاقكم: ارتزاقكم لهذه : لهذا النظام=
 7. ض1: هذا رجل هذا: مش أنا: مش الذي أقولها مش أنا الذي أقول هناك حكماً: حكماً صادر هناك
 8. حقوق يا رجل: أنا أتحداك أمام الملايين أن تكشف أوراق يا رجل أنا أنا متحدي أمام الملايين أن
 9. تكشف=
 10. ض2: =لا أسمع لك، أنا أذعو أذعو مدير أذعو من يدير هذه الجلسة أذعو من يدير هذه الجلسة أن=
 11. ← م.ق.: =طيب بس دقيقة: بس دقيقة يا جماعة: بس دقيقة=
 12. ض2: =يا رجل الزم أدبك المعارضة العراقية القوى السياسية قوى محترمة قوى لها جذور قوى لها
 13. تاريخ=
 14. ض1: =يا رجل هذه حجتكم، وتذكر لي، وتذكر لي.. تذكر لي أحزاب المعارضة الكردية=
 15. ← م.ق.: =طيب يا جماعة يا جماعة، بس دقيقة.. بس دقيقة.. بس دقيقة=
 16. ض1: =البرزاني تاريخه مع الموساد عريق الطلبناني تاريخه مع الموساد عريق يا رجل هؤلاء رجال
 17. الموساد=
 18. ← م.ق.: =يا جماعة مش راح نسمع=
 ((98 سطر محذوفة))
 19. ← م.ق.: = بس دقيقة بالله بس دقيقة يا جماعة بالله دقيقة طيب خليني أسأل سؤال =

20. ض:1 = دكتور فيصل بدي أكمل بأكمل أستكمل هاي النقطة بأستكمل هاي النقطة =
 ← 21. م.ق: = بس دقيقة يا أخي بس دقيقة: بس رجاء بدون مقاطعة رجاء رجاء رجاء
 22. ض:1 استأذنه يرد علي يرد علي
 23. م.ق: تفضل
 24. ض:1 لماذا الأميركان الآن بعد أن استكملت مهمتها ما يسمى بالمعارضة العراقية (اكمل ض 1 حديثه)

This extended dispute between IE1, who is against the Iraqi opposition, and IE2, who is in favor of it, starts when IE1 (in lines 1-3) attacks people who support the Iraqi opposition, and accuses them of being soldiers of fortune, thereby forcing IE2 to interrupt him and express his complaints (in lines 6-10) about such an accusation. As the dispute intensifies between the interviewees in subsequent turns, the moderator attempts to end this dispute by calling them as a group with an offer that his turn will not exceed one minute (in arrowed lines 16 & 21). Unfortunately, the moderator's attempt fails, and the interviewees continued their confrontational dispute by accusing and challenging each other. Consequently, the moderator tries another method to end the dispute by calling them and telling them their clash cannot be heard (in arrowed line 24), referring to himself as well as the audience. Again, the interviewees do not end their clash potentially because their dispute reaches a degree of escalation (Greatbatch, 1992, Clayman & Heritage, 2002) in which their dispute becomes very confrontational, immediate, and direct with frequent interruptions. Instead of following the turn-taking rules of interviews, the interviewees begin to direct their talk to each other rather than to the moderator. As a result of that, the moderator's responsibility to end the escalating dispute becomes very difficult, particularly when the interviewees' turns become overlapped with no chance for the moderator to hold the floor even using all of his methods to end the dispute. Thus, despite the moderator's interruptions of the interviewees to ask a question (in arrowed line 26), he fails to end the dispute. The

moderator then decides to wait until the degree of the dispute becomes less confrontational, and the interviewees become more willing to listen to the moderator. Thus, after the moderator waits for the dispute to de-escalate, he successfully ends it by interrupting the interviewees to ask a question (in arrowed lines 29-30). It is also interesting to note the moderator ends the dispute without articulating a question. Thus, it is possible that the dispute in part comes to an end as the interviewees realize that they have to bring it to a close. This observation confirms the comments mentioned earlier by Clayman and Heritage (2002) that the management of dispute does not lie solely with the interviewees, but with the help of the moderator. Another point to note is that the moderator is not able to end the dispute despite the fact IE2's calls for the moderator to interfere and end the exchange of accusations, as well as his direct expression of an objection about that (in lines 14-15), as a result of IE1's continued assaults and direct accusations.

In a similar way, the dispute escalates again when IE1 repeats his accusations about the Iraqi opposition, particularly Kurdish-opposition leaders as having a relationship with the Israeli government (excerpt 14, lines 1-3), raising the degree of the dispute and producing another circle of heated dispute. The moderator also fails to end the new escalating dispute despite his use of a new tactic to end the dispute: reminding the interviewees that the time is over (line 7). The moderator then is rescued from the endless dispute of the interviewees with beginning of a news update, which is prepared and presented in a different part of the channel's studio. Consider the following excerpt (14), which begins from where the previous one stopped.

Excerpt (14):

(Al-Jazeera TV 'The Opposing Views': 27 May 2003: 'The Iraqi opposition')
IR: Faisal al-Gassim: IE1: Mummmed al-Tamimi: IE2: Sadiq al-Musawi

1. IE1: ...The Kurdish people who is ruled by the band of al-Talabani and
2. al-Barazani: the school boys of Sharoon, who are paid by Mossad: This
3. people [the grandsons of]
4. IE2: [Who are you]Who are you: I don't permit I
5. don't permit I don't permit you=
6. ((4 lines omitted))
7. IR: Only one minute only one minute guys: guys: guys only one minute:
8. Time is over time is over time is over
9. IE2 I don't permit you:: don't talk: don't talk in the name of the Kurdish
10. [people: and I don't permit you]=
11. IR: [Guys guys guys one minute]=
12. IE1: [I speak in the name of every Muslin in all of earth]=
13. IR: [Guys:: guys one minute: one minute guys:]we return to you=
14. IE1: [I represent all the righteous Muslims]in [earth and speak in their names]=
15. IR: [One minute: brother one minute]

(قناة الجزيرة: 27 مايو 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: المعارضة العراقية)
مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.). الضيف الأول: محمد التميمي (ض1): الضيف الثاني: صادق الموسوي
(ض2)

1. ض1: الشعب الكردستاني الذي يتحكم برقابه عصابة الطالباني والبرزاني تلاميذ شارون والذي
2. يصرف عليهم الموساد هذا الشعب (أحفاد)
3. ض2: (من أنت) من أنت ما أسمح ما أسمح ما أسمح هنا
4. لا أسمح لك.. ما أسمح لك
(4 اسطر محذوفة))
5. م.ق: (طيب بس اسمح لي يا جماعة يا جماعة بس دقيقة انتهى الوقت انتهى الوقت انتهى
6. الوقت)=
7. ض2: (لا أسمح لك لا تتكلم لا تتكلم باسم الشعب كردستان ولن أسمح لك)
8. م.ق: (يا جماعة يا جماعة يا جماعة بس دقيقة =)
9. ض1: (أنكلم باسم كل مسلم في الأرض كلها)
10. م.ق: (يا جماعة يا جماعة بس دقيقة دقيقة يا جماعة نعود إليكم)
11. ض1: (أنا أنوب عن المسلمين الصالحين) في (الأرض وأنطق باسمهم)
12. م.ق: (دقيقة يا أخي بس دقيقة)

An additional note to observe in the data is the moderator's continuous call for the attention of the interviewees using an address term, which includes both of them, to end the dispute. As we will see in our examination of address terms in the following chapter,

the moderator uses address terms primarily to hold the floor so that he can then carry out his tasks, including asking questions, changing the topic, ending a dispute, etc.

A final note from the close examination of the moderator's role in managing the dispute concerns the way the moderator calls the interviewees to end the dispute. As shown in the two excerpts presented above, the moderator continues in calling the interviewees during the heated moments of the dispute using an address term, "guys", which normally is used for more than one addressee, instead of calling each one with the same address terms that he repeatedly used throughout the interviews, such as 'brother', 'sir', etc. Moreover, the fact that not all the interviewees are present in the studio does not influence the moderator's use of the collective address term, "guys". We can logically assume that the moderator will try to call IE1, who is present in the studio, especially because he continues attacking and accusing IE2. Rather, the moderator calls the interviewees collectively to maintain neutrality, particularly in heated disputes like the ones being discussed. Also, if the moderator calls one of the interviewees to end the dispute, it is highly possible that the addressed interviewee would express a complaint about that, and would ask him to direct the request to end the dispute to the other interviewee instead.

In summary, we have examined in this section the ways by which the moderator tries to manage a heated dispute between the interviewees. One of these ways is to interrupt the interviewees to ask a question. We have seen in this section that the moderator does not necessarily need to articulate a question to do so, but he just needs to hold the floor first and try to make the interviewees direct their talk to him instead of the other interviewee. We have also noticed that the use of this method, interruption to ask a

question, is not successful at all times, particularly at the most heated and intense moments of the dispute. Another way by which the moderator attempts to manage a dispute is by calling the two interviewees collectively and asking them to let him talk for a short time.

Conclusions

In this chapter, we have examined three tasks as part of the moderator's role in panel news interviews: encouraging disagreement, challenging interviewees, and managing disputes. To promote disagreement, the moderator uses a variety of means, including paraphrasing one interviewee's point and asking the other interviewee to respond to it, or by asking an interviewee about a challenging point with distancing footing. Overall, the English and Arab moderators have been shown to use these two means similarly in terms of frequency as well as the ways of performance, but with some difference in the degree of directness in asking the question. With regard to challenging the interviewees, the Arab moderator practices this task via a number of ways, including pointing to any inconsistency in the interviewee's view, repeating questions, which the interviewees have avoided answering, and making an inference from an interviewee's statement suggesting he is accusing the other interviewee. None of these means have been seen to be used by the American moderator. For the final task, managing disputes, we have examined a number of ways by which the Arab moderator has carried out such a task. Examples of these means include the interruption of interviewees to ask a question, calling the interviewees using a collective address term, expressing complaint that the audience may not hear or understand the discussion, and reminding the interviewees that

time is over. Finally, we have demonstrated that the moderator's use of collective address terms does not only serve to end the dispute, but also to achieve neutrality.

Having examined the moderator's role in this chapter, the following chapter will be devoted to examine the usage of address terms, with special focus on finding the similarities and differences between the Arab and American participants' usage of them.

CHAPTER VI

ADDRESS TERMS

Introduction

When I was working on my pilot study (2002), which was primarily about interruption in panel news interviews, I noticed differences in the use of address terms between Arabic and English speakers, not only in terms of frequency but also in the functions of their usage. Although the results of my pilot study confirmed my initial guess that there were differences between the speakers of the two languages in using address terms, it was, however, based only on a small amount of data: one interview for each language, limiting its results. Therefore, in this chapter, we will try to examine the usage of address terms in more detail, using a relatively larger set of data, with much emphasis paid to examining the environments in which they are used. In addition, throughout my examination of the results, we will compare my findings with previous studies' results on the usage of address terms to uncover discrepancies, if any.

As stated in Chapter III, my investigation of address terms usage will involve examining the frequencies, types, and the environments and functions by which they are used. Due to the fact that address terms, particularly Arabic ones are used very frequently and in a variety of environments in each edition, my description of address terms usage will be detailed for each edition of the Arab and American programs. Before proceeding on to analyze each edition, we will present an overview of the general

findings and common uses of address terms by each group, beginning with Arabic-speaking participants, followed by a summary of the general characteristics of using address terms by Arab participants.

Arab interviews

Overview of the findings

The close examination and analysis of address terms usage by Arabic speakers in the five panel news interviews reveal a number of important and interesting findings. To summarize the Arabic speakers' usage of address terms in the five interviews in a precise way, this would require figures that show the average use in terms of frequency, types of address, and functions. Therefore, we will present in this section tables to show the total averages and percentages of use at the levels of frequency, type, and function of address term use, followed by brief discussion.

Table 1 illustrates the averages and percentages of the overall frequency of the number of turns and address terms used in the five interviews by all Arab participants. As shown in Table 1, the average number of turns and address terms used for the IR is 51.4 and 35.6, consecutively, with an average percentage of 69.2% of use per turn. The average number of address terms use by all participants is 87.2, with a percentage of 70.5%. In simple language, we can say that the average usage of address terms by Arab participants (IR & IES) is 87.2 times in an interview, with a total percentage of 70.5% per turn. These two figures will be the main values that will be employed in comparing the Arabic and English speakers' usage of address terms, particularly the total percentage per turn since there is a big difference between Arab and American interviews in terms of

time. As we have stated in Chapter III, whereas Arab interviews are usually conducted for an hour and eight minutes, the English ones take an average of 12.5 minutes of time.

Table 1: The total average of frequency and percentage of using address terms in all the five Arab interviews

Speaker	Average number of turns	Average of address terms used	Percentage of turns
IR	51.4	35.6	69.2%
IEs only	72.2	51.6	71.4%
IR & IEs	123.6	87.2	70.5%

Detailed description of the general results is provided in Table 2. In specific, it shows the average use of each type by the IR, the IEs, and all the participants, with the total average percentages for each type. As expected, the highest type of address terms used by all participants (IR & IES) is *title*, with a total average of 40.4, which accounts for 46.3 percent of all terms used. In addition, as Table 2 shows, most of the usage of this type is by the IEs, with an average of 33.4, whereas the average of using this type by the IR is only 7. The most frequent type of address used by the IR is *title & last name*, averaging 10.6. The type *collective* comes in the second place with relatively a small difference than the type *title & last name*, with an average of 8, followed by the type *title*, in an average of 7. The remaining types of address have small averages compared with the three high types mentioned above. Thus, we can conclude that the most frequent types used by the Arab interviews' IR in addressing the IEs are *title and last name*, *collective*, and *title*, consecutively. It is important to note that the majority of using the type *collective* (in 35 times out of 40) was in the third interview, 'Iraqi Opposition', which witnessed frequent hot debates between the IEs, forcing the IR to use this type of address to manage their escalating dispute. Therefore, it would be more accurate to

conclude that the types *title & last name*, and *title* are the most frequent ones used by the IR.

Table 2: The average frequency and percentage of each type of address terms used in all the five Arab interviews

Type	Average by IR	Average by IEs	Total use by IR & IEs	Average by IR & IEs	Total Percentage by IR & IEs
First name	2	1.4	17	3.4	3.9%
Title	7	33.4	202	40.4	46.3%
Title +first name	2.2	11.8	70	14	16%
Title + last name	10.6	0.4	55	11	12.7%
Adj. + title	0.2	2.6	14	2.8	3.2%
Title + Full	1.4	0.4	9	1.8	2%
Full name	3.6	0.0	18	3.6	4.1%
Collective	8	0.8	44	8.8	10.2%
Sarcastic	0.0	0.2	1	0.2	0.2%
Adj.	0.2	0.4	3	0.6	0.6%
pronoun	0.4	0.2	3	0.6	0.6%
Total	35.6	51.6	436	87.2	100%

Among the various types of titles used, *sidi* ‘sir’, *akhi* ‘brother’ appear to be the highest ones in use, consecutively. Furthermore, as we mentioned in our analysis above, there has been a variation in using titles from one edition to another, which is possibly the result of the participants’ shift, particularly the IEs to their dialects, specifically in using address terms, which usually occurs at the heated moments of the debate. For example, there has been a high usage of the title *rajul* ‘man’ in the interview about the Iraqi opposition compared with other interviews. Another important point to note is that although the participants in the Arab interviews speak a variety of Arabic dialects, including Egyptian, Lebanese, Jordanian, Sudanese, Iraqi, Palestinian, and Syrian Arabic dialects, we can not generalize the use of titles used in the data to all Arabic speakers,

since there are other Arabic dialects that are not utilized in the data, such as Gulf, Saudi, Yemeni, and Moroccan Arabic dialects. For example, in the Saudi Arabic dialect, which I speak, the title *sidi* ‘sir’ is rarely used in mundane conversation as well as news interviews according to my experience in observing how the speakers of this dialect use address terms. However, the data used in the present study still provide important and interesting insights into the address terms usage by Arabic speakers, which also can be used as a starting point to examine the address terms usage in detail, covering more dialects.

The second highest type of address term used by all participants is *title & first name*, with an average of 14, occurring in 16 percent of the total number of usage. Compared with the use of the type *title*, there is a big difference in using the two types in terms of both average and percentage of usage. While the average of using the type *title* is 40.4, the type *title & first name* has the average of only 14. Another point to note about this type is that most of its usage is by the IEs in their address of the IR, occurring in almost 30 times out of 70. Following the type *title & first name*, the type *title & last name* comes in the third place with a small difference, having the average of 11. In contrast to the other types used more frequently that have been just mentioned, this type is mostly used by the IR rather than the IEs, with an average of 10.6 compared with 0.4 by the IEs. The following type in frequency of usage is *collective*, which as stated above, most of its usage is the result of the hot debate in the third interview, ‘Iraqi Opposition’, therefore, we would not consider it as one of the most frequent types of address. The rest of types have been used very rarely therefore, they may not require further analysis and

discussion. Finally, we conclude that the most frequent types of address terms by all Arab participants are: *title*, *title & first name*, and *title & last name*, consecutively.

Table 3 demonstrates the average and total percentage of the functions of address terms by the IR, the IEs, and all participants. In general, the current study confirms Clayman's (1998: 4) observations that address terms are employed in particular "interactional environments", specifically in the context of news interviews, including disagreement, challenges, floor fights, and agenda shifting. In addition to the environments mentioned by Clayman, the results of the current study indicate that address terms are also utilized in other functions, such as directing or changing a turn, managing disagreement, introducing an argument, referring to the interviewee, and sarcasm.

Table 3: The average and percentage of the functions of using address terms by all participants in the entire five Arab interviews

Function	Average by IR	Average by IEs	Overall average by IR & IEs	Total percentage by IR & IEs
To direct or change a turn	11	0.0	11	12.6%
To show disagreement	0.6	16.2	16.8	19.2%
To challenge	4.2	5	9.2	10.5%
To manage a disagreement	10	0.0	10	11.4%
To introduce an argument	0.0	9.4	9.4	10.7%
To hold the floor	0.0	3.6	3.6	4.1%
To take the floor	4.6	5.8	10.6	12.1%
Sarcastic	0.0	0.8	0.8	0.9%
To show agreement	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.6%
To refer	5.2	10	15.2	17.4%
Total	35.6	51.6	87.2	100%

Among the various functions by which address terms are used, showing disagreement appears to be the most frequent function used by Arab participants. However, as Table 3 shows, using address terms in association with performing such function is used in most cases by the IEs, in an average of 16.2 compared with an average of 0.6 by the IR. Such difference is due to the fact that performing this function is one of the basic and constant tasks for the IEs, whereas for the IR it is not.

The use of address terms for the function of referring to one of the other participants comes in the second place in frequent use, having the average of 15.2, which is close to the one in the first place, occurring in 17.4 percentage of the total usage by all the participants. In contrast to the use of the first function, showing disagreement, using address terms for the function of referring by the IR equals the usage by one interviewee, which indicates high usage of such function by the IR, taking into account the difference in number between them. This result would suggest that referring to other participants by the use of address terms is one the most frequent and fundamental tasks for Arab participants in news interviews for both the IR and the IEs.

Following the function of referring, changing the turn by the use of address terms falls in the third place in terms of frequency, accounting for 12.6 percent of address terms used by all participants. This function is used only by the IR as part of his role in the interview. The function of taking the floor comes next in 12.1 percent. The IR & the IEs appear similar in their use of address terms for this function. As we see in our analysis of the interviews next, taking the floor via the use of address terms appears to be an effective practice used by all participants in most interviews as a polite means for interruption with less harshness than using just interruption, specifically the IR.

The fourth and fifth places in the frequency of use are for the functions of directing or changing turns, and managing disagreement between IEs, constituting 12.6 and 11.4 percent, successively of address terms used by all participants. However, as Table 3 shows, using address terms in fulfilling these two functions appears to be exclusively used by the IR. Likewise, the use of address terms to introduce an argument seems to be restricted to the IEs only. Thus, we would not consider using address terms to perform these three functions as one of the most frequent types used by all participants in news interviews since they are employed only either by the IR or the IEs.

The final function by which address terms are used in high frequency is challenging, with an average of 9.2, in 10.5 percent of the total usage by all participants. Unlike the three functions that we have just described, the usage of address terms for this function is by the IR as well as the IEs, with higher usage by the IR. The last functions by which address terms are employed, sarcasm and showing agreement, are the least frequently used functions, accounting for less than one percent for each of them of the total usage by all participants. Moreover, the usage of these two functions is limited to the IEs only.

Examining the types of address terms used by all Arab participants and the functions for which they employ them reveals some common patterns and uses. For example, the IR used the type *title & last name* in most editions to direct the turn to one interviewee to respond to the co-IE's point of view. This use would suggest that this type appears to be the most appropriate one in terms of formality and neutrality to achieve this task, which would require these qualities to maintain neutrality. Another common pattern use of address terms by the IR is his use of the type *collective*, e.g., *jama'ah* 'group',

exclusively to manage escalating disagreement between the IEs. The use of this type for this function by the IR would also be for the purpose of maintaining neutrality because it allows the IR to call the two IEs at the same time rather than calling one, which could involve bias, particularly at heated moments of dispute because if the IR asks one interviewee to stop the disagreement, the interviewee might consider this use biased on the assumption that IR should direct both interviewees to stop disagreeing since both of them are participating in the dispute. The IR also frequently used the type *title*, particularly the types *akhi* ‘brother’ and *sidi* ‘sir’ for functions associated with argumentation, such as encouraging disagreement, challenge, and introducing argument whenever he employed these functions, particularly in the editions , which witnessed high level of disagreement and dispute.

Similarly, the Arab IEs have common patterns in their use of certain types of address terms for certain functions. Similar to the IR’s use, they used the type *title* most frequently for functions associated with argumentation, such as showing disagreement, challenge, and introducing argument, particularly the types *sidi* ‘sir’ and *akhi* ‘brother’, which would indicate that these titles are the most appropriate ones to achieve this function in this specific context. The IEs as well as the IR usually pronounce these terms in a certain way, involving high intonation and prolonged vowels to clarify the use of them for this function. An additional common pattern in most editions is the use of the type *title & first name* (mostly using *doktor Faisal* ‘doctor Faisal’) by the IEs to take the floor from the IR and the use of the type *title*, particularly the titles *sidi* ‘sir’, *akhi* ‘brother’, and *azizi* ‘dear’ to achieve the same function with each other, suggesting that the IEs change the address term according to whom it is directed, and what his roles.

Above, we have summarized and discussed the general usage of address terms in terms of frequency, types, and functions of usage. With regard to frequency, the average use of address in an interview by all participants is 87.2, on 70.5 percent of the total number of turns. Our second conclusion about the usage of address terms indicates that the most frequent types of address terms employed by all Arab participants are: *title*, *title & first name*, and *title & last name*, respectively. The concluding findings concerning the functions by which address terms are used indicate that the most frequent functions used by all participants are in the following order: (1) showing disagreement, (2) referring, (3) holding the floor, (4) challenging. In addition, our discussion of both types of address terms and functions by which address terms are used shows that there are other types and functions, which are limited in their usage to either the IR or the IEs. These types and functions have not been cited as part of the most frequent ones since the scope of the current study is to have a general description of the usage of address terms by all participants, rather than by some of them. The following section presents an in depth analysis of the use of address terms in each edition.

1. ‘The Increasing International Alliance against America’

As you may recall from Chapter IV, the participating IEs in this edition were Tala’at Rumaih (hereafter IE1), and Hassan Sati (hereafter IE2). This edition witnessed a number of fierce discussions between the IEs about particular points on the edition’s topic, influencing the participants’ use of address terms. Table 4 illustrates the relative frequency of using address terms by each speaker. The total usage was 100 times, occurring in 59.8 percent of turns taken.

Table 4: The frequency of using address terms in ‘The increasing international alliance against America’

Speaker	Number of Turns	Address term used	Percentage of turns
IR	63	17	26.9%
IE1	44	39	88.6%
IE2	60	44	73.3%
Total	167	100	59.8%

As Table 1 shows, the IR has the highest number of turns but he uses address terms the least. The high number of turns by the IR is probably due to his expectations of his role in this interview, involving more tasks to perform than the IEs, and these tasks require greater use of turns. The relatively low use of address terms by the IR compared with the IEs seems to suggest that the IR does not rely on address terms in fulfilling particular functions associated with his expected tasks as the IEs do. Note that the address terms used by the IR are all directed to the IEs, whereas the IEs direct address terms to each other as well as the IR, suggesting that this would in part cause the difference between the IR and the IEs in their overall frequency of using address terms.

The two IEs are similar in their use of address terms even though the number of their turns is different. My initial explanation for the difference between the IEs is probably because IE1 takes longer turns to express his view compared with IE2, who has relatively short turns as a result of his attempts to show disagreement to IE1 as well as the IR. This reason would also explain the higher use of address terms by the IEs compared with the IR in that they use address terms frequently for functions associated with their roles, such as showing disagreement and introducing arguments that are not employed by the IR, as we will see below on the functions of address terms.

Moreover, different types of address terms are used in this interview, including first name, e.g. *Tala'at*; full name, e.g. *Hassan Sati*; title, e.g. *doktor* 'doctor', *akhi* 'brother', *sidi* 'sir'; title and first name, e.g. *doctor Faisal*; title & adjective, e.g. *akhuna al-Azizi* 'dear brother'. As Table 5 shows, the type *title* is the most frequently used by all participants (IR & IEs), accounting for 57 percent of all address terms used. Among the various titles used, the most frequent ones used are *akhi* 'brother' and *sidi* 'master', respectively.

In general use, the term *akhi* 'brother' was originally employed among brothers in one family. Then, its use was extended as a preferred way of address among Muslims. For example, a Pakistani Muslim can use *akhi* 'brother' to address an Egyptian Muslim even when they are not brothers in blood. In general, this term has become more associated with further pragmatic functions, such as closeness and intimacy. Adding an adjective after the term *akhi* 'brother' increases the level of closeness, largely based on the adjective chosen. As we will see in the functions below, this term is sometimes used to function the opposite meaning of it, sarcasm. Similarly, the term *sidi* 'sir' was originally used when a low-status person addresses a higher status one. However, throughout time, it has become a formal way of addressing to carry the pragmatic functions of respect and formality. The use of these two terms, *akhi* 'brother', and *sidi* 'sir' vary across contexts and speakers. For example, IE2 shifts his use from *akhi* 'brother' to use the collective version of it, *akhwan* 'brothers' on one occasion to show his disagreement with the view of the IR and IE1. Other types of address terms have complete different use than their literal meaning. For example, the address term *ei'ni* literally means 'my eye'. However, it is used in various environments to convey

sometimes an opposite meaning based on the intended function of it. For example, if it is used to refer to a sick person, it normally carries the pragmatic function of sympathy and empathy. In other contexts, however, it can be used to show sarcasm. For instance, IE1 in this edition used this address term, *e'eini* 'my eye' sarcastically to show his dissatisfaction with IE2's view. This type of address term is usually used in colloquial Egyptian Arabic for this purpose. Collective types of address terms, such as *jama'ah* 'group' and *akhwan* 'brothers' are employed for uses associated with their literal meanings. The term *jama'ah* 'group' refers to more than two people, and when it is used as an address term, it is usually used to address more than two speakers. Similarly, the term *akhwan* 'brothers' is used to address more than one speaker, but with more closeness and intimacy than the term *jama'ah* 'group'. In short, most of the address terms used in this edition fulfill pragmatic functions that are different than what their literal meaning would convey.

The IR uses the types *full name* and *title and last name* most frequently in addressing the IEs, usually to change turns from one interviewee to another, particularly in the beginning of the interview. As we have mentioned in Chapter V, the IR also uses the collective types of address terms like *jama'ah* 'group' or *akhwan* 'brothers' as a means to manage escalating disagreements and disputes between the IEs, not only in this edition but also in all other ones.

For the IEs, they generally use similar types of address terms, with the type *title*, , and the type *title & first name* as their most frequent ones. However, the two IEs are using other types of address terms. Whereas IE2 used the type *first name* in 7 instances,

mostly directed to IE1, IE1 used the type *adj. & title* in 5 cases. IE2's use of first name in addressing the other participants is possibly due to his familiarity with them.

Table 5: The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used

Type	IR	IE1	IE2	Total use by all speakers	Percentage of all address terms
First name	--	-	7	7	7%
Title	4	25	28	57	57%
Title + first name	1	8	8	17	17%
Title + last name	5	--	--	5	5%
Adj. + title	--	5	--	5	5%
Full name	5			5	5%
Collective	2	--	1	3	3%
Sarcastic	--	1	--	1	1%
Total	17	39	39	100	100%

To better understand the use of address terms in this edition, we have examined the functions of the address terms used. Table 6 shows the functions of using address terms by all speakers. As Table 6 illustrates, address terms are used for a variety of functions that vary from one speaker to another according to the tasks the speaker is expected to perform. For example, if we look carefully at the numbers shown in Table 6, we will note that the IEs employ address terms most frequently in environments that are close to their expected role, such as showing disagreement, holding & taking the floor, and challenging, respectively. Further, after examining to whom the IEs direct the address terms used, I found that they use them with each other more than with the IR. For example, IE1 used address terms 14 times with the IR compared with 25 times with IE2. Similarly but with slight difference, IE2 used address terms 20 times with the IR compared with 24 times with IE1. IE2's greater use of address terms with the IR than what IE1 did is probably due to the greater challenges initiated by the IR to IE2 than to

IE1. In addition, the IEs do not use them in environments that are not part of their expected role. For example, the IEs do not use address terms to change a turn or manage an escalating dispute since these tasks are the IR's responsibility.

Table 6: The function of using address terms by each speaker

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To change turn	7	--	--
To show disagreement	2	13	21
To challenge	4	7	2
To manage a disagreement	2	--	--
To introduce an argument	1	2	5
To hold the floor	--	6	3
To take the floor	--	8	7
Sarcastic	--	2	--
To show agreement	--	1	1
To refer	1	--	5
Total	17	39	44

Examining the types of address terms used by the IEs and the functions for which they employ them reveals some common patterns and uses. For example, the type *title & first name* is most frequently used by the IEs to take the floor from the IR, suggesting that this type is the most appropriate one to achieve this function, which may require showing respect with persistence. In contrast, the IEs used the type *title*, particularly *aziz* 'dear' and *sidi* 'sir', most frequently to take the floor from each other. To show disagreement with the IR's opposing points, the IEs used the type *title* in most cases. However, the IEs in this interview used different titles with the IR. Whereas IE2 frequently used the titles *azizi* 'dear' and *akhi* 'brother' most frequently, IE1 used the title *doktor* 'doctor'

most frequently. Similarly, the IEs used the type *title* most frequently to show disagreement to each other, particularly the title *akhi* ‘brother’.

As we have stated in Chapter V, the IR employed address terms on a number of occasions throughout the interview to help him in performing his role according to his frame of the context. The most frequent use of address terms by the IR is to indicate to whom the question is directed. As indicated by Clayman (1998), using address terms appears most frequently when the IR is either asking the first question, the first question following a commercial break or a news update, or redirecting a question from one interviewee to another. Consider the following example (excerpt 1) in which the IR redirects (in line 1) a question from IE1 (Tala’at Rumaih) to IE2 (Hassan Sati) to respond to the IE1’s perspectives. Note that the IR used the type *title & last name* to fulfill this function not only in this example, but also in all the three cases where this type is used, suggesting that there is a link between this type and the function it fulfills. That however does not mean that the IR uses only this type for this particular function because the type *full name* was also used for this function in three cases. Both of these two types, *full name*, and *title & last name* are formal ways of address, indicating that they are the most appropriate ones in terms of their formality and neutrality to achieve this function.

Excerpt (1)

(Al-Jazeera TV *The Opposing Views*: 18 March 2003: ‘The Increasing International Alliance against America’: IR: Faisal al-Gassim IE1: Tala’at Rumaih: IE2: Hassan Sati)

1. IR: Ok ok: **Sayyd Sati** (IE2): You heard this view: you know a lot of information: America you know has been crushed: big view you know: how do you respond
2. IE2: Yes yes it is a beginning: let me ensure that my methodology in addressing things...(IE2 continued)

مقتطف (1):

{قناة الجزيرة: 18 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: التحالف الدولي المتصاعد ضد امريكا
مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.) الضيف الأول: طلعت رميح (ض1) الضيف الثاني: حسن ساتي (ض2)}

← 1. م.ق: كويس جدا: طيب سيد ساتي: سمعت هذا الكلام: يعني الكثير من المعطيات: يعني سمعت أميركا يعني
2. سُحقت : كلام كبير جداً: يعني كيف ترد
3. ض 2: نعم.. نعم هو بداية: دعني أو من على منهج هو طريقتي في تناول الأشياء (اكمل حديثه) .

In addition, the IR uses address terms to challenge his IEs in the same way they do with each other. To illustrate, consider the following excerpt (excerpt 2) in which IE1 is trying to give an example to show how the United States is weak for starting a war without the help of other countries, particularly countries from the European Union (line 1-2). The IR then interrupts (line 6,8) him to show his disagreement about that, and challenges (line 12) him with what has been stated by the former French president Chirac, starting with an address term, *rajul* 'man'. Note that both IE1 (line 11) and the IR (12 & 13) use the type *title* to achieve the function of challenging, but using two different titles. Another important point to note is that the IR repeats the address term *rajul* 'man' in lines (12-13) as a strategy to take the floor from IE1. In this edition, the IR used address terms repeatedly in the same turn to take the floor from the IEs, mostly to encourage disagreement, challenge, or to manage escalating disagreement between the IEs. This could contribute to some extent in increasing the overall use of address terms in this edition, particularly at the IR level.

Excerpt (2):

(Al-Jazeera TV 'The Opposing Views': 18 March 2003: 'The Increasing International Alliance against America': IR: Faisal al-Gassim IE1: Hassan Sati IE2: Tala'at Rumaih)

1. IE1: ...and all what has been said about that the United States has broke

2. through [the European Union]=
3. IR: [in the countries]
4. IE1: to show us those where is the strength of the United States within the
5. European countries: [they didn't]
6. IR: [in the countries:] in the countries
7. which will join like Bulgaria:[Romania: Hungaria]=
8. IE1 [nothing: it is only Bulgaria::it is Bulgaria
9. and possibly]
10. IR: [You know] what
11. IE1: [It has no more than five soldiers: **doctor**]=
→ 12. IR: [Ya rajul::you know what has been said by]
13. IE2: [ya rajul::ya rajul] =
14. IR: You know what Chirac has said::[you know :he described them with
15. impoliteness]=
16. IE1 [no::forget that: you know::this is not
17. an issue]

مقتطف (2):

1. ض:1 ... وكل ما قيل عن أن الولايات المتحدة اخترقت هذا (الاتحاد الأوروبي)=
2. م ق: (في الدول)
3. ض:1 لئيرينا هؤلاء أين قوة الولايات المتحدة داخل الاتحاد الأوروبي لم يقرءوا
4. م ق: (في الدول : في الدول)
5. التي يعني ستتضم مثل بلغاريا ورومانيا وهنغاريا)=
6. ض:1 (ما فيش: هي بلغاريا:: هي بلغاريا، ويمكن ما)
7. م ق: يعني أنت تعلم ما قاله
8. ض:1 (ما لهاش 5 عساكر يا دكتور)=
9. م ق: (يا رجل أنت تعلم ما قاله)
10. ض:2 (يا راجل::يا راجل)=
11. م ق: أنت تعلم ما قاله شيراك:: (يعني: وصفهم بقلة الأدب)=
12. ض:1 (لا::سيب: يعني ليست مسألة)

Now, let us examine some of the uses of address terms by the IEs in addition to showing disagreement and challenging each other. Although the context of panel news interviews is formal, address terms are used sarcastically in very few cases, when an interviewee refers to the other interviewee's perspectives. IE1 employs an address term as a means to redirect his criticism to the other interviewee in addition to using other behavioral resources, such as tone, eye contact, etc, even without the need to use a negative address term. Let us observe the following example (excerpt 3) to demonstrate

such a usage of an address term. During IE1's presentation of his view that the United States has lost its shine at the time of war on Iraq, he ridiculed the other interviewee for his support of the United States, referring to him with the address term, *akhuna al-aziz* 'our dear brother' (lines 4-5). Although this term is normally used to show a higher level of closeness and intimacy than most address terms associated with this function, such as *akhi* 'brother' and *azizi* 'dear', IE1 used this term sarcastically in contrast to its usual meaning. To fulfill the function of sarcasm using this specific term, IE1 attempts to associate IE2 with a culturally negative behavior, fascination with America, based on the assumption that such a behavior is not acceptable in Arab culture, particularly in this context. An indication of the use of this term for this specific function is IE2's reaction (in line 5) by interrupting IE1 to show his anger and dissatisfaction, as discussed in Chapter IV. Note also that IE2 ends his turn with the religious phrase, "May Allah protect you", which its literal meaning might contradict with the commend used in the beginning of the turn to show anger. However, this phrase is used in this particular context to carry the pragmatic function of emphasizing the speaker's anger, in contrast to the literal meaning of the phrase.

Excerpt (3):

(Al-Jazeera TV *The Opposing Views*: 18 March 2003: 'The Increasing International Alliance against America': IR: Faisal al-Gassim IE1: Hassan Sati IE2: Tala'at Rumaih)

1. IE1: The shine of the United States has ended:its local shine has ended as a
2. result of what's going on within the United States:racial and religious
3. ::the repression of freedom:rules against freedom and the control of the
- 4. Zionist lobby::the American project has become
5. isolated:which::*akhuna al-azizi*: you know: is fascinated by the
6. Americans [from inside (....)]=
7. IE2: [don't mistake: say just your opinions: may Allah protect you]

مقتطف (3):

1. ض: انتهى بريق الولايات المتحدة: بريقها الداخلي انتهى بما هو حاصل داخل الولايات المتحدة:
2. عنصر ديني :: وقمع الحريات: وقوانين ضد الحريات وسيطرة اللوبي الصهيوني: انعزل
3. المشروع الأمريكي: اللبي :: اخونا العزيز: يعني مفتون بالأمريكان (من جوه. =..)
4. ض: (بلاش تغالط: قول ارأك بس
5. الله يخليك).

Another frequent and important usage of address terms found in the data is to introduce an argument or a strong personal opinion. In some cases, the IEs use address terms in particular environments as a way of introducing the addressees to their perspectives and arguments, which are usually opposing to what the addressees prefer to hear. Although the use of address terms for this function may appear similar at first glance to how address terms are used to show disagreements to others' views, this use, however, usually occurs within long turns when the speaker attempts to generate his argument, and it is not a disagreement reaction to a point mentioned previously; rather, the speaker utilizes it to heighten the addressees' attention to an opposing argument. To show the difference between the types of environments, consider the following example (excerpt 4) in which IE1 uses an address term, *ahki al-azizi* 'dear brother' (line 17) in the middle of his first turn (the beginning of the interview). The first turn in this interview is long and does not have frequent interruptions by either the IR or the other interviewee so that the IEs can have enough time to express their positions about the edition's topic. His use of this address term is to help in showing disagreement per se because he does not only disagree with the opposing point raised by the IR in that part of his turn; but he also makes the addressee ready to listen to a convincing part of his argument.

Excerpt (4):

(Al-Jazeera TV 'The Opposing Views': 18 March 2003: 'The Increasing International Alliance against America': IR: Faisal al-Gassim IE1: Hassan Sati IE2: Tala'at Rumaih)

1. IR: Tala'at Rumaih: in the beginning: you know: a simple question: don't you
2. think that there is a lot of exaggeration in the saying that America's nose
3. rolled in dust after its defeat in the United Nations: and the United Nations
4. has won: and the world's will has won over America: to the end of this
5. big view: you know: some people say that this view is exaggeration
6. IE1: Respected brother may I have your attention first: when I came to here I
7. thought that you will cancel the title of this edition after the final
8. diplomatic battle that occurred in the Security Council which did not only
9. result its result was not only that the US escaped from powers
10. secondary powers before it escaped from super powers but its results that
11. the US was smashed within the UN not only in the Security Council: We
12. should conceptualize this issue that this defeat is within the Security
13. Council only because if the US has the ability to bring the UN and make
14. resolutions it wouldn't hesitate: The US now is like a devil chased in all
15. world's countries: it becomes in a strategic position for any fair person to
16. see it clearly except if we have to show that person the sun and tell him
- 17. this the sun :: **Sidi al-aziz** : may I have your permission first: at this
18. historical and difficult moment in which our Muslim and Arab people are
19. under aggression from ... (IE1 continued)

مقتطف (4)

1. م ق: طلعت رميح: في البداية: يعني سؤال بسيط: ألا تعتقد أن هناك الكثير من المبالغة في القول أن يعني أنف أميركا تمرغ في التراب بعد هزيمتها في الأمم المتحدة: وأن الأمم المتحدة انتصرت: وإرادة العالم
2. انتصرت على أميركا: وإلى ما هنالك من هذا الكلام الكبير: يعني: البعض يقول: كلام مبالغ فيه
3. ض 1: أخي الفاضل، أستاذك أولاً: حينما حضرت إلى هنا تصورت أنك ستلغي عنوان هذا البرنامج، بعد المعركة
4. الدبلوماسية الحاسمة التي جرت في مجلس الأمن، والتي لم تنتج فقط.. لم تكن نتيجتها فقط أن الولايات المتحدة هربت.. هربت من القوى.. من الدول الصغرى قبل أن تهرب من القوى العظمى، وإنما كانت
5. نتائجها أن الولايات المتحدة سحقت داخل منظمة الأمم المتحدة، وليس مجلس الأمن فقط.
6. لا يجب أن نصور الأمر على أن الهزيمة هي في داخل مجلس الأمن فقط، لأن الولايات المتحدة لو كان
7. لديها أي درجة من القدرة على جمع الجمعية العامة، واتخاذ مواقف لما ترددت في هذا، الولايات المتحدة
8. الآن أصبحت شيطان يطارد من كل دول العالم، أصبحت الآن في وضع استراتيجي لا يمكن لأي منصف
9. ألا يراه بأعين واضحة إلا إذا كان مطلوباً أن نذهب لثري إنسان الشمس، ونقول له: هذه هي الشمس.
10. ض 1: سيدي العزيز: أستاذك أولاً: في هذه اللحظة التاريخية العصبية التي يتعرض فيها شعب إسلامي عربي
6. إلى عدوان من (اكمل ض 1 حديثه)

2. 'The Iraqi Opposition'

As indicated in Chapter IV, the frequent hot disputes between the IEs in this edition influenced the use of address terms by the participants, particularly, the IR, who uses address terms most often to stop the IEs from interrupting each other and to restore turn-taking rules of the interview. As shown in Table 7, the IR's most used type of address terms is the collective, which he always uses to manage the IEs' escalating disputes. Another consequence for the hot and intense atmosphere that this edition has in most of its parts is a rise in the overall percentage of using address terms, and a decrease in the total number of turns, compared with the first interview ('the increasing international alliance against America'). As shown in Table 7, IE1, for example, uses an address term in every turn he holds the floor, and in some cases, he uses different address terms in one turn, resulting in having more than 100 percent use of address terms per turn. The IR's total use of address terms in this edition is more than the IEs, unlike the first interview due probably to the IR's great use to manage the disagreement between the IEs.

Table 7: The frequency of using address terms in 'The Iraqi opposition'

Speaker	Number of Turns	Address form used	Percentage of turns
IR	43	61	141.8 %
IE1	29	31	106.8%
IE2	32	27	84.3%
Total	104	119	114.4%

In addition to showing a great use of the collective address term by the IR, Table 8 illustrates another important point: Using titles alone is the most frequent type of address terms used by Arab participants, which is similar to what has been observed in the first interview. However, unlike the first interview, the most frequent title used is *ya*

rajul ‘man’, 19 times by IE1 and 9 times by IE2. The term *rajul* ‘man’ can be used in general to refer to any male adult person. However, when used as an address term, it can also fulfill additional pragmatic functions, mostly associated with expressing an opposing point to a previously mentioned argument. Other titles were also employed in this interview for this function, such as *sidi* ‘sir’ and *akhi* ‘brother’, but with less strength and attraction of attention to the opposing point they present. As we see in this interview, the increased use of the title *rajul* ‘man’ is possibly related to the dialect of the IEs, who both speak the Iraqi Arabic dialect. Because of the hot disputes that occur more than once during the interview, the IEs shift from using Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) to their own dialect, Iraqi Arabic dialect, particularly at the most heated moments in the interview, while both IEs are trying to take the floor and persuade each other. Another reason that confirms my initial observation is that this type of title is rarely used by the IR, who speaks a different dialect, Syrian Arabic dialect, and who also participated directly and indirectly in the disputes.

Table 8: The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used

Type	IR	IE1	IE2	Total use by all speakers	Percentage of all address terms
First name	--	--	--	--	0.00%
Title	14	29	19	62	52.5 %
Title + first name	--	2	6	8	8.2%
Title + last name	11	--	1	12	10%
Adj. + title	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Full name	1	--	--	1	0.8%
Collective	35	--	1	36	30.5%
Sarcastic	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Total	61	31	27	119	100%

Now, let us examine some of the address terms used in this edition that were not discussed in the first interview. Before we do that, let us take a look at the functions of using address terms by each speaker, as shown in Table 9. Like the first interview, the IR's use of address terms derives from his principal tasks, such as directing turns, managing disagreement, and challenging the IEs. However, the most frequent use of address terms was in managing disagreement using the type *collective*, mostly the term *jama'ah* 'group', as we discussed earlier. The IR used the type *title & last name* most frequently to fulfill the function of changing the turn from one interview to another, similar to what we observed in the first interview. In all the cases where the IR used this type of address, he used the title *sayyd* 'Mr.', suggesting that this title is the most appropriate one by the IR in terms of formality and respect to address the IEs, particularly with interviewees who have no positions or ranks. To challenge the IEs, the IR tends to use the type *title*, particularly the titles *sidi* 'sir' and *akhi* 'brother', respectively. Similar to what we observed in the first interview, the IE1 frequently used the type *title & first name*, particularly *doktor Faisal* 'doctor Faisal' to take the floor from the IR, but he also used the type *title*, particularly *rajul* 'man' to do this function, suggesting that the IEs shift their address terms in fulfilling the same function according to whom the address term is directed, and what his role is in the interview.

Table 9: The functions of using address terms by each speaker

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To change turn	10	--	--
To show disagreement	--	16	8
To challenge	6	10	3
To manage a disagreement	43	--	--
To introduce an argument	--	1	3
To hold the floor	0	2	1
To take the floor	1	--	3
Sarcastic	--	1	1
To show agreement	--	--	--
To refer	2	1	8
Total	61	31	27

With regard to the IEs, their greatest use of address terms is to show disagreement or to challenge the others. To achieve these two tasks, the IEs in this interview use the type *title*, particularly the titles *rajul* ‘man’ and *sidi* ‘sir’, respectively. The IEs also used the type *title & first name* to both take and hold the floor in all cases where they used these two functions, in contrast to the first interview in which the IEs used different types for each function, suggesting that there is a personal variation in using address terms for these two functions since the participating interviewees in the two editions were different. Also, it is interesting to note that IE2 uses address terms relatively frequently, 8 times, to refer to IE1 in a way that can be in part considered as a means of showing disagreement indirectly to IE1. Similarly, using address terms to challenge others overlaps to some extent with other functions, specifically showing disagreement, but with different variation form one use to another. To illustrate, let us look at excerpt 5.

Excerpt (5)

(Al-Jazeera TV 'The Opposing Views': 27 May 2003: 'The Iraqi Opposition'
IR: Faisal al-Gassim IE1: Muhammed al-Tamimi IE2: Sadiq al-Musawi)

1. IE1: ...You are saying to me that whatever happened:: Saddam is criminal: no
3. matter how unjust he was: what happened in Iraq is not justified::does not
→ 4. justify what happened in Baghdad **rajul**: now an environmental
5. disaster: the IRAQI people are THREATEN: threaten to be...(IE1
6. continued).

مقتطف (5):

(قناة الجزيرة: 27 مايو 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: المعارضة العراقية)
مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.) الضيف الأول: محمد التميمي (ض1): الضيف الثاني: صادق الموسوي
(ض2)

1. ض1: ...تقول لي مهما كان صدام مجرماً كان:: صدام مجرماً: مهما كان ظالماً: لا يبرر ما حصل في العراق: لا
2. يبرر ما حصل في بغداد: يا رجل الان كارثة بيئية: العب العراقي مهدد: مهدد... (ض1 اكمل حديثه).

As shown in line 3, as soon IE1 shows his disagreement with IE2's point about how the cooperation of the Iraqi opposition with America to launch a war against Saddam's regime is justified because of Saddam's previous crimes, he immediately remembers a point by which he can challenge IE1's perspective (the environmental disaster in Iraqi at that time). He introduces his challenge with an address term, 'man', which can be viewed as an introductory and helping way to present a challenge since it is used in this specific context to show disagreement with the Iraqi opposition's views.

Let us now examine another example (excerpt 6), which shows how IE2 shifts in his use of address terms to perform more than one function in the same turn.

Excerpt (6):

- 1. IE2: ...what's going on in Iraq now which is wanted to be in Iraq: **ustaaz Faisal**
2. is a new example in the region: similar to Al-Jazeera channel when it first
→ 3. introduced all people showed enmity to it:: and **al-ustaz** is talking to me
4. like the Libyan channel:: that means I'm Al-Jazeera channel and he is the

- 5. Libyan Satellite channel: I want to tell the democratic truth *akhwan* the
 6. Americans came because we lost hope in the Arabian system: and we lost
 7. hope even in the Arab public...(IE2 continued).

مقتطف (6):

(قناة الجزيرة: 27 مايو 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: المعارضة العراقية)
 مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.). الضيف الأول: محمد التميمي (ض1): الضيف الثاني: صادق الموسوي (ض2)

1. ض2: ...الذي يجري في العراق والذي يراد له أن يصبح في العراق: أستاذ فيصل نموذج جديد على
 2. المنطقة: شبيهه بقناة الجزيرة اول ما انطلقت كل الناس عادوها: والاستاذ بيكلمني زي القناة ←
 3. الليبية: يعني أنا قناة الجزيرة وهو قناة فضائية ليبية: أنا عايز أقول الحقيقة الديمقراطية يا
 4. اخوان جاءوا الأمريكان لأننا ايسنا من النظام العربي: و ايسنا حتى من الشارع العربي... (ض2) ←
 5. أكمل حديثه).

As shown in this example, IE2 first uses the address term, *ustaaz Faisal* (line 1) which literally means ‘master’, to function as a means of getting the IR’s attention to listen carefully to the argument that he is about to say. Then, he uses the same address term, *ustaaz*, but without first name and adding the Arabic definite article *al* to become *al-ustaz* (line 3) to refer to IE1’s perspective in a sarcastic way by associating IE1’s views with the Libyan TV channel in a negative way, based on the assumption that the Libyan TV channel does not say the truth. Note how cleverly IE2 associates his view with Al-Jazeera TV channel in that they both say the truth. IE2 then immediately uses the collective address term, ‘brothers’ (line 5) to introduce and try to persuade the audience, including the IR and IE1, about his perspective toward the crisis in Iraq.

3. ‘Kurds and the Expected Changes in Iraq’

As stated in chapter IV, the participating IEs in this edition were all Kurds, and were using Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) throughout the interview. The two IEs had different views concerning the decision made by the main Kurdish parties to join the U.S.’s plan to launch a war against Saddam Hussein’s regime.

As we have done with other previous interviews, the first thing to examine about this edition is to have an initial idea about the address terms usage by looking at the total usage by each speaker. As shown in Table 10, the total usage is 46, occurring in 27.2% of the total number of turns. Compared with other interviews discussed so far, this edition has the lowest usage of address terms although it has the highest number of turns of all previous interviews. The IR is in between in terms of his usage of address terms in comparison with his usage in the other two interviews. Also, his total usage of address terms is more than the usage by the IEs although this edition did not feature the same type of dispute and confrontation seen in the second interview about the Iraqi opposition, suggesting that the occurrence of frequent disputes by the IEs was not the only variable resulting in higher use of address terms by the IR than the IEs. Other variables could also have contributed in this difference, particularly the framing expectations of the IR, which require the use of address terms in achieving the various tasks of the IR in this particular context, such as directing and changing turns, encouraging disagreement, and referring, compared with the IEs who would use address terms in fewer tasks.

The total number of address terms used by both IEs in this interview is the least compared with previous studies. This would confirm our initial guess that the use of MSA by the IEs in this interview will result in less usage of address terms. As we have observed in previous editions, the IEs used great number of address terms that are associated with their Arabic dialects, particularly the Egyptian Arabic dialect, which probably has a higher number of address terms than not only the MSA but all Arabic dialects due to its development of address terms from different languages, particularly, Turkish, French, and English, as stated in Chapter II. In this edition, because the IEs are

Kurds, they speak the MSA, which has fewer address terms than most Arabic dialects. The low use of address terms by the IEs would be due to cultural differences since the IEs belong to the Kurdish culture, which may have different norms and expectations in using address terms, especially when we know that Kurds have their own languages, which is different from Arabic, and may have different rules in using address terms. Our examination of the types and functions of using address terms by the IEs would confirm this observation.

Table 10: The frequency of using address terms in ‘Kurds’

Speaker	Number of Turns	Address form used	Percentage of turns
IR	69	29	42%
IE1	61	7	11.4%
IE2	39	10	25.6%
Total	169	47	27.2%

For the types of address terms used in this interview, Table 11 illustrates a number of important points for discussion. First, the second highest type used by the IR is title and full name, which has not been used by the IR in previous editions, indicating that the IR usage of address terms varies from one edition to another. Similar to what we observed in previous editions, the IR and the IEs used the type *title* as the highest frequency way of addressing. An additional point is IE1’s usage of one type of titles- *al-akh* ‘brother’ in all instances where he used an address term, giving further support for our guess that this is the result of the use of MSA throughout the interview. However, IE2, who also used the MSA in this edition, used other types of address terms, but in very small numbers, suggesting IE1’s use of address terms was mainly influenced by personal variation. It is possible that looking at the functions of address terms used by IE2 would

give us more insights into explaining the difference in the usage between the two participants.

Table 11: The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used in ‘Kurds’

Type	IR	IE1	IE2	Total use by all speakers	Percentage of all address terms
First name	--	--	--	--	0.00%
Title	6	7	5	18	39 %
Title + first name	7	--	3	10	21.7%
Title + last name	6	--	--	6	13%
Adj. + title	1	--	1	2	4.2%
Title + Full	6	--	--	6	13%
Full name	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Collective	3	--	1	4	8.5%
Sarcastic	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Total	29	7	10	46	100%

Table 12: The functions of using address terms by each speaker in ‘Kurds’

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To change turn	11	--	--
To show disagreement	--	--	4
To challenge	4	--	--
To manage a disagreement	3	--	--
To introduce an argument	--	--	5
To hold the floor	--	--	--
To take the floor	2	--	--
To refer	9	7	1
Total	29	7	10

By combining our observations from Table 10, 11, and 12, as well as the examination of the sequence of disagreements and dispute, which occurred between the participants throughout the interview, we would suggest that both IE1 and IE2’s usage of

address terms appears similar to each other compared with other participants' usage in previous interviews, in contrast to what appeared to be the case in the our discussion above. How? Because the apparently frequent use of address terms to show disagreement and introduce an argument may be the result of IE2's need throughout the interview to deny the allegations made by IE1 against the leaders of the two main Kurdish parties, and his constant attempt to persuade the audience to unite with their leaders, especially at that time. In addition, the IR challenged IE2 about his views more than he did IE1, in a violation of the neutrality rules usually expected in this context. Thus, these factors appear to have forced IE2 to take a defensive stand in most of the interview, limiting his use of address term in general to two functions: showing disagreement and introducing arguments for persuasion. Apart from that, the two IEs appear similar in that they do not use address terms for functions that are common for participants in previous interviews, such as challenging, holding the floor, and sarcasm.

As we briefly described above, and discussed in detail in Chapters IV and V, the IR in this edition broke the rules of neutrality in his treatment of the two IEs on a number of occasions. Even though neutrality is beyond the scope of the current study, his violation of the neutrality rules influenced his use of address terms. In addition to the fewer attempts to challenge IE1 than to IE2, the IR addressed IE1 at some times with *professor*, which is a prestige term that can be substituted by *doctor* instead to achieve neutrality. In addition, the IR used the types *title & full name* or *title & last name* (e.g., Mr. Kamal Majeed, or Mr. Majeed) in addressing IE1 in some cases in the beginning of the interview, but he shifted to use the title *professor & last name*, particularly for achieving the purpose of referring to IE1's opposing points, suggesting that the IR was

trying to add further credibility to IE1's point. Therefore, the use of *professor* in addressing IE1 not only gives him prestige, but it also added a high level of credibility to the information he provided. Although IE2 could not be addressed in a comparable way as how IE1 was addressed since IE2 was not a professor, the IR did not address him with the exact type of address that he used with IE2. While the IR used the type *title & last name* in addressing IE1 in some cases in this edition, and as he usually did frequently in previous edition, he did not address IE2 similarly; rather, he used the type *title & first name* (mostly Mr. AbdulGader), which might have less a level of respect than using title & last name. Thus, the IR probably was able to maintain neutrality by addressing the IEs with a similar type of address, such as *title & last name*, or using the title *professor & last name* with IE1 and addressing IE2 with *title & last name*. Moreover, in one instance, the IR added an adjective (*sa'adat* 'esteemed') to the already prestigious address term, *professor*, making it an obvious violation of neutrality. Let us look at the following example (excerpt 7), where it was used.

Excerpt (7):

(Al-Jazeera TV *'The Opposing Views'*:11 March 2003:'Kurds and the Expected Changes in Iraq': IR: Faisal al-Gassim:IE1: Kamal Majeed :IE2: AbdulGader al-Berfikani)

1. IE1: ...So the two Kurdish parties: as they made their contact in the past with
2. the French government ::they can benefit from the conflict that's going to
3. defend themselves [()]
- 4. IR: [but] *sa'adat al-professor*:: there is one who says that
5. Kurds' interests at this tome...(The IR continued).

:(7) مقتطف

(قناة الجزيرة: 11 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: الأكراد والتغيرات المرتقبة في العراق
مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.) الضيف الأول: كمال مجيد (ض1) الضيف الثاني: عبد القادر
البيرفكاني (ض2))

1. ض1: ... فعلى الحزبين الكرديين كما اتصلوا في السابق بالحكومة الفرنسية يستطيعون أن يستفيدوا
2. من الخلاف الموجود ويافعوا عن انفسهم ()
3. ← (بس) يا سعادة البروفيسور: هناك من يقول أن
4. مصالح الأكراد هذه المرة (م.ق. أكمل حديثه)

As clearly shown in this example, although the IR interrupts IE1 (line 4), he uses the highest possible way of addressing his guest; *sa'adat al-professor* 'esteemed professor', to present an opposing point to his views, with a shift in distance footing. The use of such an address term not only violates neutrality since he never used this term, *sa'adat* 'esteemed' with IE2, it also helps in softening his interruption in an attempt that the IR never employed with IE2 in challenging him with opposing points. To maintain neutrality, the IR therefore should not add this adjective, *sa'adat*, since the address term before which it was used, professor, is a prestige term.

4. 'Arab Peoples and their Resistance to the American Plans'

Like other editions of this program, the participants in the episode disagreed with each other, with frequent interruptions on a number of occasions. However, this edition did not have the type of disputes that we have seen in the edition about the Iraqi opposition. With regard to the address terms, Table 13 presents the numbers and percentages of address terms used by each speaker. This edition has the highest overall number and percentage of address terms used of the editions discussed by the speakers, occurring 110 times in 114 turns. In addition, the IR's number of address terms is the highest so far, 34, with the highest percentage of total number of turns, 70.8%.

Concerning the IEs, their use of address terms is relatively high, compared with previous

editions. Also, the IEs' use of address terms is higher than the IR's use, and that is similar to their use in the first interview. It is interesting to note that both the two IEs in this edition used address terms in every turn that they held the floor. A possible reason for such a high usage of address terms is due to the frequent occurrence of overlapped talk between the IEs as well as with the IR, thereby reducing the number of held turns by the participants. As you may recall from Chapter III, overlaps in which two or more speakers talk simultaneously and do not interrupt the current speaker's discourse will not be counted as separate turns since no one held the floor. Thus, because overlaps occurred in many occasions in this edition, the speakers' turns in these occasions were not counted, thereby reducing the number of turns held by each participant.

Table 13: The frequency of using address terms in 'Arab resistance'

Speaker	Number of Turns	Address form used	Percentage of turns
IR	48	34	70.8%
IE1	35	41	117%
IE2	31	31	100%
Total	114	106	92.9%

To have a better understanding of address terms usage in this edition, let us look at Table 14, which illustrates the frequency and percentage of the types of address terms used in this edition. With regard to the IR, he used first names as the second most frequent way of addressing his IEs, although in previous editions he never addressed his IEs using first name. Most instances in which first names are used, they are directed to IE2: 8 times. Also, the IR used the type *first name* for several functions, suggesting that the IR did not limit this type for a specific function. However, the IR used the type *full name* more frequently for directing turns to the IEs, in a similar pattern to his use of this

type in previous editions. Another point to note from Table 14 is that using the type *title* in addressing is still the most frequent type of address term used by all the participants. Most of such usage is by IE1, occurring in 29 instances, mostly by using the term *sidi* ‘sir’. With regard to IE2, he uses *title & first name* most frequently, usually directed to the IR. Final observation that could be derived from Table 14 is the absence of using the collective type of addressing by the IR, which is usually employed to manage disagreement.

Table 14: The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used in ‘Arab resistance’

Type	IR	IE1	IE2	Total use by all speakers	Percentage of all address terms
First name	10	--	--	10	9%
Title	8	29	7	44	39.6 %
Title +first name	3	10	20	33	29.7%
Title + last name	1	--	--	1	0.9%
Adj. + title	--	--	1	1	0.9%
Title + Full	--	--	2	2	1.8%
Full name	12	--	--	12	10.8%
Collective	--	--	1	1	0.9%
Sarcastic	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Adj.	--	2	--	2	1.8
Total	34	41	31	106	100%

Now, let us look at the functions of using address terms illustrated in Table 15. If we pay more attention to the IR’s functions in using address terms, we would notice a decrease in the function of managing disagreement, confirming our initial observation that this edition does not have strong disagreement between the IEs that would require the involvement of the IR. In other functions, the IR seems consistent in his usage in this edition compared with previous interviews. However, there is one feature that needs

further explanation, concerning the relatively high number of usage of address terms for floor fights: holding and taking the floor. The IR used different types of address terms in 11 instances for floor fight, all of them were for the function of taking the floor, 11 times. When we compared the IR's use of address terms for this function with his use of it in previous editions, we observed that he was consistent for using address terms only to take the floor, not to hold the floor. This could be explained as a result of his frame expectations about his role in this context, which involves certain tasks that require taking the floor first and then achieving the tasks, such as challenging, encouraging disagreement, and closing. Further, holding the floor is more associated with presenting an argument or a long point, and both of these are not expected by the IR. As we will see in the next examples, the IR did not use address terms in most instances only to take the floor, but he uses it as a means for other functions, such as challenging the interviewee, changing the turn, and closing.

Table 15: The functions of using address terms by each speaker in 'Arab resistance'

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To direct or change a turn	13	--	--
To show disagreement	1	9	6
To challenge	6	2	1
To manage a disagreement	2	--	--
To introduce an argument	--	13	6
To hold the floor	--	3	3
To take the floor	11	4	8
To show agreement	--	--	1
To refer	1	10	6
Total	34	41	31

Examining the use of specific types of address terms by the IEs and their functions of using them reveals some common patterns. For example, both the two IEs used the type *title & first name* (mostly the title *ustaz* ‘master’) when they refer to each other, suggesting that this type was the most appropriate for them to address each other. Similarly, the IEs frequently used the type *title*, particularly the titles *sidi* ‘sir’ to challenge and show disagreement, and that is consistent with our observation in some previous editions. Similar to the IR’s usage of address terms in floor fights, the IEs, particularly IE2 frequently used the type *title & first name* to take the floor from the IR, but with each other, they, particularly IE1 used the type *title* to achieve this function. The IEs in this edition appeared consistent with the use of address terms for this function in previous editions.

Now, let us take a look at some examples from this edition for further analysis. Our first example is from IE1’s usage. One of the apparent observations about IE1’s usage of address terms is his systematic and frequent use of a particular address term, *sidi* ‘sir’, in most instances for a variety of functions. To illustrate, consider the following example (excerpt 8).

Excerpt (8):

(Al-Jazeera TV ‘*The Opposing Views*’: 04 March 2003: ‘Arab People and their Resistance to the American Palms’: IR: Faisal al-Gassim: IE1 Yassir al-Za’atra IE2: Fa’ag al-Shaikh Ali)

1. IE2: Do Arabs and the Arab public benefited from oil: do the oil money get in
 2. the pockets of Arabs if we now want [to detail...]=
 3. IE1: [This is description this is description]
 4. IR: [Ok sayyd sayyd sayyd Faig
 5. al-Shaikh Ali (IE2) a lot of points let’s respond to them one by one how do
 6. you respond to this view why the public get out *sayyad* Yassir alZaiatra
- (IE1)

7. IE1: *s:idi* [...]
 8 IR: [He is] asking ::a question you know: just to what they go out::to what
 9. they defend
 10. IE1: *S:idi*: the public the public [the Arab public: the Arab public::]=
 → 11. IE2: [I want to interrupt **doktor. Faisal** one question:
 12. one question: one question]
 → 13. one [moment *sidi*]
 14. IR: [One minute]::only one minute

مقتطف (8):

(قناة الجزيرة: 4 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: الشعوب العربية ومناهضة المخططات الأمريكية)
 مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.): الضيف الأول: ياسر الزعاترة(ض1): الضيف الثاني: فائق الشيخ
 على(ض2)

1. ض1: هل النفط استفاد منه العرب والشارع العربي؟ هل دخلت أموال النفط إلى جيوب الشارع العربي لو أردنا
 2. (الآن أن نفصل.)
 3. ض2: (هذه عملية توصيف.. هذه عملية توصيف)
 4. م.ق: (طيب سيد.. سيد.. سيد فائق) (الشيخ علي الكثير من النقاط دعنا نرد عليها واحدة واحدة
 5. كيف ترد على هذا الكلام لماذا يخرج الشارع سيد الزعاترة..
 6 ض1: (يا سيدي.) ←
 7. م.ق: (يعني يسأل):: سؤالاً سؤالاً يعني عم ماذا يخرج:: عن ماذا يدافع
 8 ض1: يا سيدي : الشارع :: الشارع:: (الشارع العربي
 9 ض2: (بأقاطع دكتور فيصل: بس سؤال سؤال واحد: سؤال واحد)
 10
 11 ض1: الشارع العربي:: (لحظة ياسيدي) ←
 12 م.ق: (بس دقيقة::) (بس دقيقة)

As shown in this example, after IE1 attempts to show his disagreement (line 3) to the points mentioned by IE2 in his prior long turn, the IR intervenes (line 4) to manage the apparent disagreement between the IEs, and asks IE1 to respond to these points one by one (lines 5-6). Then, once IE1 starts to introduce his opposition to these points using the address term *sidi* 'sir' (line 7), the IR interrupts him in lines 8-9 to specify to which point he wants IE1 to respond. The use of the address term, *sidi* 'sir' in this example is evidenced by his intonation and prolonged vowels, which all suggest that he is about to introduce an opposing point of view to what has been stated earlier. IE1's usage in this

example can also be in part a way of showing disagreement to IE2's points of view previously mentioned. IE1 resumes responding to IE2's opposing points by introducing his point of view using the address term *sidi* 'sir' for the same function used in the previous one (introducing an argument). Once IE1 starts presenting his argument, IE2 interrupts him (lines 11-12) to ask a question. Note that IE2 attempts to take the floor using the term *doctor Faisal* 'Dr. Faisal', which he frequently employs to take the floor. During this overlap, IE1 attempts to hold the floor (arrowed line 13) after the persistent attempts by IE2 to take the floor by repeating his words. To hold the floor, IE1 uses the same address term *sidi* 'sir', which he used earlier for a different function. IE1 also uses the same strategy that IE2 used to hold the floor by repeating his words. IE1's last usage of the address term *sidi* 'sir' can also be considered from another angle as a way of expressing complaint about IE2's interruption. In line 14, the IR intervenes again to manage the disagreement by trying first to take the floor, but with no use of address term.

Let us now take a look at another example that shows the multifunctionality of address terms (excerpt 9)..

Excerpt (9):

(Al-Jazeera TV *The Opposing Views*: 04 March 2003: 'Arab People and their Resistance to the American Palns': IR: Faisal al-Gassim: IE1 Yassir al-Za'atra IE2: Fa'ag al-Shaikh Ali)

1. IE2: I will say that after a while: but let me support your perspective with two
2. examples now:: did America go to Afghanistan to kill the Afghani people
3. or to run after Mulla Omar this one who is living in the unknown regions
4. of Africa or in the Middle ages this silly I don't know how he led people in
5. Afghanistan and that's strange by Great God: when I think about him for
6. a while and I look at our situations: this is a joke Mulla Umar is leading
7. the nation:: this the Islam that *al-ustaaz* is calling for it *al-ustaaz*
8. Yasser [*al-Za'atra* (IE1) :: Let me::]
9. IE1: [*sidi*: that's enough:: it's clear now]=
10. IR: [Ok: just one minute:]= [just one minute]=

11. IE2: [let me continue]The
 12. Afghani government has been hit: Talaban has been hit (IE2 continued).
 مقتطف (9):

(قناة الجزيرة: 4 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: الشعوب العربية ومناهضة المخططات الأمريكية)
 مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.): الضيف الأول: ياسر الزعاطرة (ض1) : الضيف الثاني: فائق الشيخ
 على (ض2)

1. ض2: سأقول هذا بعد قليل: ولكن دعني ادعم وجهة نظرك بمثلين اثنين:: هل امريكا ذهبت الى افغانستان
2. لقتل الشعب الأفغاني لقتل الشعب الأفغاني أم لمطاردة ملا عمر هذه الذي يعيش في مجاهل افريقيا
3. وفي القرون الوسطى: هذه التافه: ما اعرف كيف قاد شعباً في افغانستان:: وعجيب والله العظيم:
4. حينما اطرقة قليلا وانظر في اوضاعنا هذه المسخرة: ملا عمر يقود الأمة: هذا هو الاسلام الذي
5. يدعو اليه الأستاذ ياسر: الأستاذ ياسر (الزعاطرة):: دعني أكمل (
6. ض1: (يا سيدي كفا الوضع أصبح واضحاً الان)=
7. م.ق: (طيب بس دقيقة)=(بس دقيقة)
8. ض2: (دعني أكمل)=
9. ضربت الحكومة الأفغانية ضربت طالبان وحررت الشعب الأفغاني ... (أكمل ض2 حديثه).

IE2 in this example tries to employ a clever tactic to attack IE1 by harshly criticizing the leader of the Afghani Talaban leader, Mulla Omar, and then referring to IE1 as if he is supporting him, while he in fact is not. To do so, IE2 uses at first the term *al-ustaz Yassir* ‘Master Yassir’ and then he makes it more formal by using the type *title and full name*, *al-ustaaz Yassir al-Za’atra* ‘Master Yassir al-Za’atra., and both of these terms at first look like ways of reference with neutral connotation, but in fact they serve as a sarcastic means to undermine IE1’s views. How? IE2 attempts by the use of very formal ways of addressing to associate his earlier negative comments about Mulla Omar with IE1 as if he shares his ideas. IE1 immediately understands the meaning of such a usage, and interrupts IE2, asking him to stop talking. IE1’s usage of *sidi* ‘sir’ in this instance is similar to the examples that we just discussed above; it can be seen as a way of expressing complaint about IE2’s link between the type of Islam presented by Mulla Omar and his own views. At the same time, it can be considered as a means of showing disagreement with the ideas presented by IE2. However, his tone and the immediate

interruption to IE2, all indicate that his usage is mostly to show an objection to IE2's false association, and that IE2 has had enough time to address his views, and it is time for his turn.

IE1 then attempted to use the same strategy that IE2 employed by linking him to a negative symbol in the Middle East, this time, the present Israeli prime minister, Sharon, using an address term. Consider the following example to see such usage.

Excerpt (10):

(Al-Jazeera TV 'The Opposing Views': 04 March 2003: 'Arab People and their Resistance to the American Palms': IR: Faisal al-Gassim: IE1 Yassir al-Za'atra IE2: Fa'ag al-Shaikh Ali)

1. IE1: ...There is a consensus in the Israeli circles that this war will change
2. the region the blocks of dominoes will fall it will repeat it partition
3. again to benefit the Israeli view which asks for more dominance and
- 4. humiliation: This is what *al-ustaz Fa'ag* is propagate: that's what
- 5. Sharon is propagating: I want *ustaaz Fa'ag* to respond [to that..]=
4. IE2: [I will respond to
5. you I will respond to you]

مقتطف (10):

(قناة الجزيرة: 4 مارس 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: الشعوب العربية ومناهضة المخططات الأمريكية)
مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.): الضيف الأول: ياسر الزعاترة (ض1): الضيف الثاني: فائق الشيخ
على (ض2)

1. ض1: ...هناك اجماع في الأوساط الاسرائلية على أن هذه الحرب ستغير خريطة المنطقة ستسقط
2. حجارة الدمينو ستعيد تجزئتها من جديد ستعيد تشكيلها من جديد لصالح الرؤية الاسرائيلية
- ← 3. القائلة بالهيمنة عليها وبمزيد من اذلالها هذا الذي يبشرنا به الاستاذ فائق هو ذات ما يبشرنا به
4. شارون كيف يمكن أن يستوي انسان عربي مسلك لأن يقول مثل هذا الكلام انا اريد أن يجيبني
- ← 5. الاستاذ فائق على (هذا) =
6. ض2: (انا سأجيبك أنا سأجيبك)

Although the address term, *Ustaaz Fa'ag*, that IE1 uses to link Sharon, the Israeli Prime Minister, with IE2's point of view about the war in Iraq is the most frequent one used to refer to IE2 during the interview, its usage here has more than just reference: it has a sense of sarcasm and challenge to IE2's views at the same time. After explaining that the

war on Iraq is for the benefit of Israel in the first place, IE1 then relates IE2's point of view in supporting the war on Iraq with the Israeli plan so that IE2 appears as if he is in favor of the same view as Israel. From another side, IE1's usage can be recognized partly as an intended way by IE1 to make fun of the IE's ideas. Similar to what IE2 employed in the previous example, IE1 utilized the address term *al-ustaz Fa'ag* 'Master Fa'ag', which is generally used in this context as a formal and appropriate way for referring, to fulfill his function: association with a negative symbol. To make his association more negative, IE1 used the name of the Israeli Prime Minister, Sharon, on the assumption that the majority of the audience does not want to share any view with the leader of their enemy, Israel. IE1 then (line 5) uses the same address term, *al-ustaz Fa'ag* 'Master Fa'ag', but to challenge IE2 to respond to his argument. However, unlike the other example that we just discussed above, IE1's tone as well as other qualities, such as facial, body, and hand movements do not suggest that such usage is completely a way of sarcasm or challenge. Rather, it would be seen as a mixture of all the three possibilities, but it looks to me more as a resource of sarcasm.

5. 'Arab Countries and the Expected American Attack on Iraq'

This edition discusses the possible procedures that the Arab League can and has used in the Iraqi case. Because this edition was broadcast two months before the beginning of the war against Iraq, this edition was relatively quiet, compared with previous editions discussed, with very few occurrences of disputes and heated disagreement, which would influence the participants' use of address terms. Table 16 illustrates the frequency and percentage of usage for each speaker. Similar to most previous editions, the IR's use of address terms is higher than the IEs' use, in 108.8

percent per turn. The most noticeable feature of this edition is that it has the highest overall percentage of using address terms per turn, 102.5%, despite the relatively quiet discussions that this edition has. The reason behind that is possibly the result of the long turns that each speaker takes, reducing the total number of turns for each speaker, which in turn would raise the total percentage of using address terms. This is clearly shown in the small numbers of turns for each interviewee, which are also the lowest numbers of turns in comparison with other editions. In addition, IE2's number of turns as well as the use of address terms is the lowest among all speakers in the five editions.

Table 16: The frequency of using address terms in 'Arab countries'

Speaker	Number of Turns	Address form used	Percentage of turns
IR	34	37	108.8%
IE1	17	15	88.2%
IE2	13	13	100%
Total	64	65	101.5%

Unlike all other five editions in which the type *title* is the most frequent type of address terms used, *title & last name* is the most frequent type of address term in this edition, mostly used by the IR. This is possibly due to the reasons that we discussed above concerning the low level of intensity of debate during the interview, which might have lowered the use of address terms, specifically by the IEs.

Another important point to note is that this edition has a low use of address terms despite the IEs' use of their own dialects, Jordanian Arabic by IE1, and Lebanese Arabic by IE2, in some parts of the interview. This also may be because these two dialects have a lower number of address terms compared with the other dialects studied in previous editions. However, IE1 in the previous edition about Arab resistance, who speaks

Palestinian Arabic, which is very close to the Jordanian Arabic spoken by IE1 in this edition, employed address terms 41 times, suggesting that dialect alone does not explain the low use observed in address terms usage in this edition. Other variables, such as the level of disagreement and personal differences, as well as contextual factors, such as topic and participants, could all contribute in determining address term usage.

As Table 17 shows, the participants in this edition never use first name to address each other, suggesting that Arab participants rarely use first name in this context. This is possible due to the fact that the participants in this interview were not familiar with each other. An additional point to consider is IE2's high use of the type *adjective & title* (e.g., *al-zamil al-karim* 'the respected colleague') in addressing, which is usually used to denote mutual respect and closeness. This is due probably to his preservation of the formal way of speech of his job, as an official in the Arab League.

Table 17: The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used in 'Arab countries'

Type	IR	IE1	IE2	Total use by all speakers	Percentage of all address terms
First name	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Title	3	13	5	21	32.3 %
Title +first name	--	1	1	2	3%
Title + last name	30	--	1	31	47.6%
Adj. + title	--	1	5	6	9.2%
Title + Full	1	--	--	1	1.5%
Full name	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Collective	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Sarcastic	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Adj.	1	--	--	1	1.5%
pronoun	2	--	1	3	4.6%
Total	37	15	13	65	100%

Unlike other editions, the participants in this edition use the term, *hadritak* ‘your presence’, to address each other. Although this form is used in normal conversation to address speakers who have higher or equal relationship, it is used in this context to indicate respect, familiarity, and distance.

By looking at the functions of using address terms illustrated in Table 18, it is clearly apparent that this edition is different from other editions in terms of the level of intensity and argument. For example, the IR does not use address terms to manage disagreement in any instance. His use of address terms is either to direct or change a turn by referring to the other interviewee, or by taking the floor-usually through interruption-to confront the interviewee by referring to the other interviewee’s point. Similar to what we observed in most previous editions, the IR employed the type *title & last name* in most cases to change on direct the turn from one interviewee to another. This would suggest that this type is the most appropriate type for the IR in terms of showing formality and respect to address the IEs, most of whom seem unfamiliar to the IR. The IR also used the type *title & last name* with both interviewees to take the floor in all cases where this function is used in a similar way to what we observed in most previous editions.

With respect to the IEs, we can say that their usage of address terms is restricted to only three functions: showing disagreement, introducing an argument, and referring. The IEs also used the type *title*, particularly the titles *sidi* ‘sir’ and *akhi* ‘brother’, respectively to introduce arguments and show disagreement, mostly with the IR’s opposing points, in a similar way to what we observed in some previous studies. As stated earlier, IE1, who spoke the Jordanian Arabic dialect, used address terms most

frequently in introducing arguments in a similar way to IE1 in the previous edition about ‘Arab resistance’, who spoke the Palestinian Arabic dialect. Another similarity between the speakers’ usage of address terms includes the use of the type *title*, particularly the titles *sidi* ‘sir’ and *akhi* ‘brother’, respectively to introduce arguments and to show disagreement, suggesting that the two dialects have similar uses of address terms.

Table 18: The functions of using address terms by each speaker in ‘Arab countries’

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To direct or change a turn	14	--	--
To show disagreement	--	1	3
To challenge	1	--	--
To manage a disagreement	--	--	--
To introduce an argument	--	10	2
To hold the floor	--	--	--
To take the floor	9		
Sarcastic	--	--	--
To show agreement	--	--	--
To refer	13	4	8
Total	37	15	13

Now, let us look at some examples from this edition that would require further examination, and reveal interesting observations. In some cases, the IR may intervene during the interviewee’s turn to correct the address term that he is using to refer to the other interviewee. To illustrate, consider the following example (excerpt 11).

Excerpt (11):

(Al-Jazeera TV *The Opposing Views*: 21 January 2003: ‘Arab Countries and the Expected American Attack on Iraq’: IR: Faisal al-Gassim: IE1: Mansour Safidain Murad: IE2: Nassif Hitti)

1. IE1: At the military level now 11 Arab countries and that’s what have been said

2. American officials from the American administration that 11 Arab
3. countries each country is offering all it can do to serve the conquest of Iraq
4. This is the role that we are talking about it:: I'm talking now about reality:
- 5. 'al-akh'[()]=
5. IR: [doctor Hitti]
6. IE1: doctor you know: is saying let us talk about reality...(IE1 continued)

مقتطف (11):

قناة الجزيرة: 11 يناير 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس: الدول العربية والهجوم الأمريكي المحتمل على العراق
مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.) الضيف الأول: منصور سيف الدين مراد (ض1): الضيف الثاني:
د. ناصيف حتي (ض2)

1. ض1: على الصعيد العسكري الان 11 دولة عربية وهذا ما قاله مسؤولين امريكان من الادارة
2. الأمريكية أنه 11 دولة عربية تقدم كل دولة حسب ما تستطيع في خدمة غزو العراق هذا
- ← 3. الدور اللي بنحكي عنه:: انا بأحكي واقع: الاخ (...) (الدكتور حتي)
- ← 4. م.ق: (الدكتور حتي)
- ← 5. ض1: الدكتور يعني: عم بيقول انه خرينا نحكي في الواقع... (ض1 اكمل حديثه)

When IE1 makes a pause after addressing IE2 (line 5), using *al-akh* 'brother', which does not clearly specify to whom he is referring, the IR then intervenes to clarify referent rather than to correct IE1, since he makes a pause before continuing his turn. Also, note that IE1 then addresses IE2 using *doctor* only without the last name of IE2 (line 6), since it becomes apparent to whom he is referring even though the IR is also addressed using the same title.

As we discussed above IE2 was to some extent formal in his address of both the IR and IE1. The following example (excerpt 12), demonstrates to what extent he was formal in his address term usage.

Excerpt (12):

(Al-Jazeera TV *The Opposing Views*: 21 January 2003: 'Arab Countries and the Expected American Attack on Iraq': IR: Faisal al-Gassim: IE1: Mansour Safidain Murad: IE2: Nassif Hitti

1. IE2: ...and I address another question:: I address another question
2. which I think is a very important one: we are exposed since

3. September 11th to a furious attack on our Arab identity: **the**
4. **participating brother: the participating colleague:: the**
5. **participating Mr. said:** and I agree with him that there are various
6. ways...(IE1 continued)

مقتطف (12):

قناة الجزيرة: 11 يناير 2003: الاتجاه المعاكس الدول العربية والهجوم الأمريكي المحتمل على العراق
مقدم البرنامج: د. فيصل القاسم (م.ق.) الضيف الأول: منصور سيف الدين مراد (ض1): الضيف الثاني: د. ناصيف
حتي (ض2)

1. ض2: ... واطرح ايضاً تسأل:: اطرح ايضاً تسأل واعتقد انه مهم:نحن نتعرض منذ 11 ايلول
2. لهجمة شرسة على الهوية العربية الأخ المشارك الزميل المشارك السيد المشارك ذكر
3. وانا نتفق معه انه هنالك اتجاهات عديدة... (اكمل ض 2 حديثه)

As can be seen in this example, IE2 refers to IE1 by not only using one address term but rather by using three, which show to some extent an increasing level of respect and distance from one term to another. The close examination of the way these three successive address terms are used would suggest that IE2 uses them to reach the best one in terms of respect and distance to address IE1, particularly since they are not joined with each other by a conjunction, otherwise their usage would be different. Additionally, the three successive terms are all preceded by the same adjective, *musharik* 'participating', which does not add or change the level of respect and closeness of the terms. However, if different adjectives were used with each term, they would reveal more insights in regard to IE2's purpose of usage. In its current usage, the three successive terms appear relatively redundant because the difference in formality between them is slight, and possibly would not be noticed by the addressees.

Having analyzed all five Arab interviews in detail in the last sections of this chapter, the next step is to summarize the main observations being made in order to come up with a general idea about address terms usage by Arabic speakers, particularly

frequency, types of address, and functions of usage, which will be then used in comparison with English speakers' usage.

Summary and Conclusions

Since we have presented an overview of the general findings about Arabic-speaking participants' use of address terms in the beginning of this chapter, it would be repetitive to present them here again; instead, we attempt in this section to summarize the main findings that we have identified based on the close analysis of the use of address terms in each edition. Further, we will attempt to outline the general findings that will be used in comparing Arabic and English speaking use of address terms.

In general use, Arabic-speaking participants were found to use address terms in 70.5 percent of turns. The IR and the IEs had similar percentages of using address terms, the IR had 69.2% whereas the IEs had 71.5 per turn. Although the IR's use of address terms was the same in all the five interviews, his use varied from one interview to another, suggesting that his use was influenced by several contextual variables, such as participants, topic, level of disagreement, and time of discussion. The IR and the IEs were observed to limit their use of address terms according to their expectations of their role in this context. The IR used address terms most frequently to help him in fulfilling the tasks constituting his role in the interview, mostly associated with encouraging disagreement between the IEs, such as changing the turn, referring, taking the floor, and challenging. The IEs, on the other hand, were found to use address terms most frequently to perform their expected tasks, particularly showing disagreement, referring, and introducing arguments. The IR and the IEs were observed to use address terms

differently; while the IR frequently addressed the IEs using the type *title & last name*, the IEs addressed him using the type *title & first name*, indicating that the Arab participants selected the way they address each other in this context based on their expectations of their role in it. Another point observed in most Arab interviews was the high use of the type *title*, particularly the titles *sidi* ‘sir’, *akhi* ‘brother’, and *azizi* ‘dear’, by the IEs, and its use was frequently for functions associated with argumentation, such as showing disagreement, challenging, and introducing arguments. Our explanation of this phenomenon was that the Arab participants, particularly the IEs framed their expectations to involve a high level of showing disagreement and dispute with each other, resulting in a high use of address terms to fulfill these functions to add further strength and attention to their viewpoints. Similarly, the IR framed his expectations to encourage disagreement by engaging them in confrontation and dispute, resulting in great use of address terms, particularly to challenge one interviewee with the co-IE’s point of view. It is also important to note that the IR used address terms to fulfill other functions, such as taking the floor and referring, which in part were employed to encourage disagreement between the IEs. For example, the IR was observed to use an address term to take the floor so that he could then challenge the interviewee with an opposing point by referring to the other IE.

Having analyzed and discussed the usage of address terms by Arabic speakers, the next step is to make the same procedures but with English interviews, followed by a comparison between the usage of address terms between Arabic and English speakers.

English interviews

Overview of the results

Our detailed analysis of address terms usage by English speakers yields a number of important results, which would shed some light on English speakers' usage of such terms in the context of panel news interviews. First, let us take a look at Table 19 to examine the total average of number of turns, address terms used, and the percentages of address terms used per turn. By just looking at the averages of address terms used by the IR and the IEs, it is clear that the IR used such terms with high frequency, with a total average of 10, occurring in 56.1 percent of turns, compared with a total average of 3.6, in 18.1 percent of turns for all the IEs. The low frequency use of address terms by the IEs resulted in a lower the overall average of all participants at 13.6, with a total percentage of 36.1 per turn.

Table 19: The total average of frequency and percentage of using address terms in all five English interviews

Speaker	Average number of turns	Average of address terms used	Percentage of turns
IR	17.8	10	56.1%
IEs only	19.8	3.6	18.1%
IR & IEs	37.6	13.6	36.1%

With regard to the types of address terms used, the type *first name* appears, as Table 20 shows, to be the most frequently used type by all participants, with a total average of 7.6, accounting for 55.8 percent of all address terms used. It is important to note that the type *first name* is the only one used by the IEs to address the IR. For the IR, the type *first name* is the most frequent one, specifically in interviews in which the IEs do not hold positions, usually governmental ones, such as ambassador or secretary, as in the

interviews with Shields and Brooks. The second most frequent type is *title and last name*, with a total average of 4.6, occurring in 33.8 percent of the total address terms used by all participants. This type, however, is only used by the IR, in two interviews in particular, which would not make it one of the most frequent types used by all participants. The types *title* and *full name* follow the type *title and last name*, but with very low frequency, occurring in 5.8% and 4.4%, respectively. Moreover, these two types were used only in particular interviews, indicating that their usage is limited, and cannot be considered as a frequent pattern by English speakers.

Table 20: The average frequency and percentage of each type of address term used in all the five English interviews

Type	Average by IR	Average by IEs	Total use by IR & IEs	Average by IR & IEs	Total Percentage by IR & IEs
First name	4.2	3.4	38	7.6	55.8%
Title	0.6	0.2	4	0.8	5.8%
Title +first name	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
Title + last name	4.6	0.0	23	4.6	33.8%
Adj. + title	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
Title + Full	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
Full name	0.6	0.0	3	0.6	4.4%
Collective	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
Sarcastic	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
Adj.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
pronoun	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
Total	10	3.6	68	13.6	100%

As can be seen in Table 21, the functions for which address terms are used seem to be limited to specific ones, and their overall averages and percentages remain low in general. More than half of all address terms used are for the function of directing or changing a turn, employed only by the IR. Referring is the following function in terms of

frequency of use with a total average of 3, occurring in 22 percent of the total address terms used. Next, the function of introducing an argument comes in third place, used only by the IEs, in 17.6 percent of the total usage. Using address terms for the functions of challenging or showing agreement are in the last two places, occurring only once in one particular interview.

Table 21: The average and percentage of the functions of using address terms by each speaker in all five English interviews

Function	Average by IR	Average by IEs	Overall average by IR & IEs	Total percentage by IR & IEs
To direct or change a turn	7.8	0.0	7.8	57.3%
To show disagreement	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
To challenge	0.0	0.2	0.2	1.4%
To manage a disagreement	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
To introduce an argument	0.0	2.4	2.4	17.6%
To take the floor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
To hold the floor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
Sarcastic	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
To show agreement	0.0	0.2	0.2	1.4%
To refer	2.2	0.8	3	22%
Total	10	3.4	13.6	100%

In conclusion, we have presented above a summary for the usage of address terms by English speakers, covering the overall frequency, types, and functions of usage. The overall average of usage by all participants was 13.6, used in 36.1 percent of turns. In terms of the types of address terms used, the type *first name* is most frequent for all participants, accounting for 55.8 percent of the total usage. With regard to functions of usage, directing or changing a turn is the most frequent one, but used only by the IR,

followed by the function of referring, with 30 percent lower usage than the first-place function.

1. War or Diplomacy

This edition addressed the contentious topic of whether the United States should continue its diplomatic efforts to find a solution with the international community on the Iraqi's weapons of mass of destruction, or should go to war to change the regime there. The participating IEs were two former top U.S. officials, who represent the position of their political parties. IE1 was Samuel Berger, who advocates the position for giving Saddam Hussein more time to destroy his weapons. IE2 was James Schlesinger, the former Secretary of State, who supports the view that the United States is ready to go to war without further authorization from the U.N., especially with the dismissive position that France, Germany, and Belgium are taking, offering no sufficient compromise for this problem through the U.N.

With regard to the use of address terms, the IR has used them frequently, whereas the IEs have used them very seldom. Table 22 provides a detailed description of the use of address terms by each speaker.

Table 22: The frequency of using address terms in War or Diplomacy

Speaker	Number of Turns	Address form used	Percentage of turns
IR	20	12	60%
IE1	8	1	12.5%
IE2	15	--	0%
Total	43	13	30.2%

It is very clear from Table 23 that the use of address terms is mostly done by the IR, occurring 12 times, which accounts for 60 percent of turns. IE1 uses address terms only once, whereas IE2 does not use them at all. The overall use of address terms per

turn is 30 percent, indicating very clearly the overall low usage of address terms. The possible reasons behind that for the IEs specifically might be because the interview's atmosphere was not hot enough to generate a high use of address terms since it seems to be set up to discuss rather than to debate the controversial Iraqi issue. In addition, the disagreements between the IEs in this edition were not as strong as those of the Arab participants, despite the frequent attempts by the IR to generate them.

Table 23 illustrates the frequency and percentage of the types of address terms used in this edition by each speaker. With the exception of only one address term, which has *title and title* as its type ("Mr. Secretary"), all the address terms used by the IR have the type of *title & last name*. The one used by IE1 has the type of *first name* directed to the IR. The difference between IE1 and the IR in their use of such terms confirms the observations made by Clayman (1998) about this phenomenon in English panel news interviews. In addition, the types of titles used by the IR with the IEs are not always the same due to the different positions they have. For example, the IR used the title *secretary* with IE2 since it was his former position, while his addressing of IE1 involves the use of the title *Mr*. Since he does not have a specific term associated with a position that he held or is currently holding.

Table 23: The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used in War or Diplomacy

Type	IR	IE1	IE2	Total use by all speakers	Percentage of all address terms
First name	--	1	--	1	7.6%
Title	--	--	--	--	0.0 %
Title +first name	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Title + last name	12	--	--	12	92.3%
Tile & title					
Adj. + title	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Title + Full	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Full name	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Collective	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Sarcastic	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Total	12	1	--	13	100%

With regard to the functions of address terms used, there is also an apparent difference in their use by the IR and IE1. As Table 24 shows, the majority of address terms used by the IR are to direct or redirect a question to one of the IEs, or to refer to the other interviewee, while IE1's function in using an address term is to express his strong argument and view about the Iraqi case. To achieve this function, the IR used the type *title & last name* in all cases, in a similar way to how the Arab IR fulfills this function. This use by the IRs would be due to the qualities of formality and neutrality that are associated with this type, which would help them in maintaining neutrality with the IEs. To examine IE1's only use of address terms in more detail, let us look at the environment in which it was used in the following (excerpt 11):

Excerpt (11):

(US PBS *NewsHour*: 06 March 2003: War or Diplomacy
 IR: Jim Lehrer: IE1: Samuel Berger: IE2: James Schlesinger)

1. IE2: We have allowed time: for the opposition to organize: we have seen these
2. : demonstrations in cities:: SIMUltaneous demonstrations in cities all over
3. the world: they were carefully organized: auh but we should recognize
4. that much of what we see was inevitable in that historically: powers joined
5. together to cut down the leading nation: that is the French [objective]
6. IR: [all right]=
7. and it's been joined in this case by China and Russia: I think for the
8. moment
9. IE1: [We have]
10. IR: [well]=
- 11. IE1: we have **Jim** created coalitions in the past in Gulf War: in
11. Kosovo: it's a painstaking job: I think there's nothing inherent in the
12. notion that we can't put together a coalition to fight a war

Immediately after IE2 finishes his turn in line 8, the IR tries to take the turn to redirect the question to IE1, who does not wait to do so and talks first to respond indirectly to IE2 by giving the suggestion of building a coalition similar to what was done in the first Gulf War. The employment of an address term in this particular context seems to serve as an expression of a strong view by IE1, especially since it is immediate without even being asked. It is also possible; however, that IE1's usage is in part a way to hold the floor after his overlap with the IR for a very short time.

Table 24: The functions of using address terms by each speaker in War or Diplomacy

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To direct or change a turn	8	--	--
To challenge	--	--	--
To introduce an argument	--	1	--
To refer	4	--	--
Total	12	1	0

2. After the War: the U.N.'s Role

There was an increase in this edition's level of disagreement and debate, compared with the first edition, War or Diplomacy, possibly because the topic of discussion was so controversial at its time. The use of address terms, however, did not increase in parallel to the increase in disagreement witnessed in this interview. In addition, the types and functions of using address terms are almost the same as those used in the first interview. As Table 25 shows, the relative frequency of address terms usage by all participants is 17 times, occurring in 41.4 percent per turn, which is slightly higher than in the first interview. Similar to the first interview, most of address terms used are by the IR, in 14 instances out of 20. Although both IEs use at least one address term, the frequency of their usage is still very low compared with the Arabic speakers' usage.

Table 25: The frequency of using address terms in After the War: The U.N.'s Role

Speaker	Number of Turns	Address form used	Percentage of turns
IR	20	14	70%
IE1	8	1	12.5%
IE2	13	2	15.3%
Total	41	17	41.4%

In terms of the types of address terms used, as shown in Table 26, the participants' usage is very similar to those used in the first interview in which most terms used by the IR have the type *title & last name*, and the ones used by IE2 have the type *first name*, in his address of the IR. The new thing in this edition is IE1's usage of the type *title* (ambassador) in his reference to IE2. Also, the IR was consistent in the type of titles he used in addressing participants whose positions have titles, usually government positions, such as *ambassador*, and addressing those who do not have any with the title

Mr. IE1's use of first name in his address of the IR also confirms the observation previously mentioned by Clayman (1998) concerning the apparent different way of the IR and IEs in their address of each other.

Table 26: The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used in After the War: The U.N.'s Role *

Type	IR	IE1	IE2	IR & IEs	Percentage Of all terms
First name	--	--	2	2	11.7%
Title	3	1	--	4	23.5%
Title +first name	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Title + last name	11	--	--	11	64.7%
Total	14	1	2	17	100%

Table 27: The functions of using address terms by each speaker in After the War: The U.N.'s Role

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To direct or change a turn	12	--	--
To challenge	--	--	--
To introduce an argument	--	--	2
To hold the floor	--	--	--
To refer	2	1	--
Total	14	1	2

Likewise, the functions by which the participants used address terms in this edition are almost the same as those employed in the previous interview. As demonstrated in Table 27, the IR mostly used address terms to direct or change the turn from one interviewee to the other, occurring 12 times, with two additional instances of address terms used to refer to the other interviewee in order to encourage disagreement.

* Only used types of address terms are shown in this table

Consider the following example (excerpt 12) that shows the usage of address terms by the IR to encourage disagreement between the IEs.

The two address terms used by IE1 were to serve the function of expressing an argument or a strong view. Although both of them are used for the same function, the placement of their use within the sentence is different. Let us take a closer look at the two instances (Excerpt 12), where they are used to see whether that would result in any difference.

Excerpt (12):

(US PBS *NewsHour*: 12 April 2003: After the War: The U.N.'s Role
IR: Jim Lehrer: IE1: Randy Scheunemann: IE2: William Luers)

1. IR: **Ambassador Luers**: do you agree: or disagree
- 2. IE2: **Jim** I:I disagree with that to begin with: I don't think it's either or to begin
- 3 with I think the United States would be FOOLish not to draw on the:
- 4 expertise of the people who have worked on building nations for the last
- 5 20 years : we need all the help we can get; this is going to be a VERY
- 6 tough task. Nobody suggests that I it should be either all the U.N. or all
- 7 some other international group : the U. N record has not been that BAD in
- 8 fact what happened in Kosovo was better than : the alternative they did a
- 9 good job by and large they put East Timor together in Afghanistan the
- 10 U. N. role has been very supportive of the Karzi Karzai government and I
- 11 think mainly in U.S. interests this country does not want its soldiers
- 12 doing non- soldierly work does not want to have the full burden of a
- 13 disaster: in putting together this very complicated country:and it wants to
- 14 share the cost: the American people say over and over again **Jim**: that:
- 15 they want their government to share the burden: the cost: the
- 16 responsibility of such complicated international activities

As clearly shown in Excerpt 12 (line 1), the IR uses the term “ambassador Luer” (title & last name) to direct the turn to him, followed by an attempt to encourage disagreement between the IEs about what IE1 asserted in previous turn that the U.S. and Britain should not set aside and let the U.N. run the reconstruction in Iraq. In line 2, IE2 begins his turn with an address term “Jim”, preceding the presentation of his strong view to disagree

with the IE's perspective. This usage also can serve as an introduction to an argument that would need extra attention and focus. Another way to look at this use would suggest that IEs uses the IR's first name in part to introduce a non-compliance or non-preferred response to the IR's question and the way the question is formulated. An indication of this use is IE2's statement, "I don't think it's either or to begin with", suggesting that IE2 does not want to answer the question in the same format that the IR uses. The use of first name in this situation is similar to one use of 'well' in normal conversation as observed by Schiffrin (1993). Likewise, IE2's usage of first name (line 14) apparently serves the same function by heightening the addressees' attention to what the speaker, IE1, is about to say, even though the address term used is located in the middle of the sentence. Such usage of address terms in the current data confirms Clayman's (2002) observation that address terms used for this function usually precede the emphasized part of talk.

3. Shields and Brooks # 1

The participating interviewees in this edition are journalists, who regularly are invited to discuss the latest developments in national and international news, with different views at most times. This edition presents a sample of the type of discussion and argument usually used by the two guests. In discussing the latest development in the war on Iraq, the IEs presented their assessment, with very few instances of disagreement. However, when the IR raised the topic of the criticism being made by some retired military officers of the military plan employed in the beginning of war, the IEs had extremely different opinions.

Overall, the level of debate in this edition was to some extent high, specifically in the last part of it, offering chances for the participants to use address terms. However, the

use of address terms in this edition is to some extent different from the two interviews previously discussed. For example, as Table 28 shows, the IR's use of address terms is relatively low: 5, which is equal to the use by IE1. This is possibly because the IEs are regular in the program, and they get used to their expected roles unlike guests interviewed for the first time. An indication of that is the frequent attempts by the IEs to take the turn without being asked by the IR, which in turn decreases the number of times address terms are used by the IR to direct or change a turn. Another point to note is that IE1's use of such terms is the highest by a single interviewee so far. IE2 did not use address terms at all, indicating that their usage is not so high compared with Arabic speakers' usage, even in editions that have some disagreement. The overall usage of address terms per turn in this edition is still in the low range of 30-41 percent, indicating once again the low usage of such terms by English speakers.

Table 28: The frequency of using address terms in Shields and Brooks # 1

Speaker	Number of Turns	Address form used	Percentage of turns
IR	10	5	50%
IE1	7	5	71.4%
IE2	8	--	0.0%
Total	25	10	40%

As Table 29 clearly shows, the type of address terms used by the IR was different from all previously analyzed editions. For the first time, the IR addressed the two IEs using their first names, which is possibly the result of the fact mentioned earlier that these two IEs are regularly invited onto this program, and consequently the IR has established a relationship with them and they have become well known and familiar not only to him

but also to the audience, resulting in a change in the way he addressed them. IE1 was consistent with other IEs in previous editions in addressing the IR with his first name.

Table 29: The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used in Shields and Brooks # 1

Type	IR	IE1	IE2	Total use by all speakers	Percentage of all address terms
First name	5	5	--	10	100%
Title	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Title +first name	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Title + last name	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Total	5	5	--	10	100%

As we mentioned earlier, the frequent appearance of the two IEs on this program has influenced the functions by which address terms were used. As Table 29 demonstrates, instead of using address terms frequently to refer to the other interviewee in order to generate disagreement, the IR in this edition abandons this usage entirely. Again, this would indicate to what extent the IR as well as the IEs were used to their expected tasks, specifically the IEs who showed their disagreement without even the need of the IR to encourage them to do so.

The IEs maintained their consistency in using address terms for only introducing a strong feeling or an argument, or referring to the other interviewee. Also, in all the four instances where IE1 used an address term as a means to increase the addressees' attention to his argument, the positioning of such terms either precedes or follows it, as shown in excerpt 13.

Excerpt (13):

(US PBS *NewsHour*: 4 April 2003 : Shields & Brooks
 IR: Jim Lehrer: IE1: Mark Shields: IE2: David Brooks)

1. IE2: Well, what happened was that he and chairman of the joint chiefs
2. came out and said to these guys, the leakers in the military and some
3. of the retired generals on some of the TV channels, you are
4. undermining our troops. Now when the chairman of the joint chiefs
5. comes out and says that, that is the ace card; that shows real anger.
6. You began to see some of the retired generals in the TV studios
7. backtracking furiously
8. IR: Mark
- 9. IE1: I could not disagree more strenuously **Jim** :The first person who said
10. we encountered more resistance than expected was the official
11. briefer, Gen. Wallace... (IE1 continued).

As you can see in this example, IE1 uses the IR's first name to introduce his argument against what has been said by IE2 in the prior turn by providing further details to support his view. This example could also be in part a way of showing disagreement. Note that IEs' use of the address term precedes his argument.

Table 29: The functions of using address terms by each speaker in Shields and Brooks 1

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To direct or change a turn	5	--	--
To challenge	--	--	--
To introduce an argument	--	4	--
To refer	--	1	--
Total	5	5	--

4. Shields and Brooks # 2

In comparison with previous editions, this edition had the highest level of disagreement in discussing a number of controversial issues about the war, which

influenced the use of address term by the IEs in particular. As Table 30 shows, IE1's usage of address terms is the highest so far by a single interviewee, occurring 8 times in 80 percent of the total number of turns. In addition, note that the IE's total use of address terms is more than the IR's, which is the first time this has occurred in the American editions. IE2, however, was consistent with his performance in not using address terms at all, lowering the overall percentage of use per turn to be 41.6%.

Table 30: The frequency of using address terms in Shields and Brooks # 2

Speaker	Number of Turns	Address form used	Percentage of turns
IR	17	7	41.1%
IE1	10	8	80%
IE2	9	--	0.0%
Total	36	15	41.6%

As shown in Table 31, in the same pattern found in the first interview with Shields and Brooks, using the type *first name* appears to be the only way participants address each other. The IEs's consistency in using *first name* of the IR confirms our observation that this is the only type of address used by American IEs with the IR in the editions examined.

Table 31: The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used in Shields and Brooks # 2*

Type	IR	IE1	IE2	Total use by all speakers	Percentage of all address terms
First name	7	8	--	15	100%
Title	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Title + last name	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Total	7	8	--	13	100%

* Only used types are shown in this table

The most interesting findings about this edition are found in IE1's usage of address terms. As shown in Table 32, for the first time in the American editions, an address term is used for the functions of challenging, and for showing agreement. To examine the usage of address terms for such functions, let us take a close look at the examples where these two address terms are used. First, the function of showing agreement is presented in excerpt 14.

Excerpt (14):

(US PBS *NewsHour*: 11 April 2003 : Shields & Brooks #2
IR: Jim Lehrer: IE1: Mark Shields: IE2: David Brooks)

1. IR: Mark more images: this has been a week of images on this war has it not
- 2. IE1: It sure has **Jim**: aah and and the confusing images I guess from from
1. Iraq...(IE1 continued)

It is clear that IE1 wants to emphasize his agreement with the IR's comment stated in his question. Note, the term used, "Jim", follows the expression of agreement, "it sure has". This usage would not be for the purpose of introducing or expressing an argument about the images since such argument is delayed and it comes after a pause (line 2).

Excerpt 15 shows the use of an address term for the purpose of challenging IE2.

Excerpt (15):

(US PBS *NewsHour*: 11 April 2003 : Shields & Brooks #2
IR: Jim Lehrer: IE1: Mark Shields: IE2: David Brooks)

1. IE1: We broke the regime we broke the regime and there before the regime
2. while the regime was there and made the same point about the Soviet
- 3. Union **David** there is not looting because of fear: there isn't looting
2. because of authorization and repressive

IE1's comment in this excerpt was in response to IE2's assertion that America did not break Iraq; rather, Saddam Hussein did that. IE1 then disagreed with him very strongly, as can be seen in the beginning of his turn (line 1). He then remembered a challenging point that was previously mentioned by IE2 about the Soviet Union (line 3-4) that would support his disagreement that what was going in Iraq was the responsibility of America since it did not happen during the fall of the Soviet Union. In part, IE1's usage of an address term can be as a means to increase his attention to his point. Thus, we would say that this usage is considered as means to increase to a challenging point, which was remembered by IE1 in the flow of expression of disagreement.

Table 32: The functions of using address terms by each speaker in Shields and Brooks 2

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To direct or change a turn	4	--	--
To challenge	--	1	--
To introduce an argument	--	4	--
To refer	3	2	--
To show agreement	--	1	--
Total	7	8	--

5. Talk of War

As stated in Chapter IV, unlike other editions, this one goes back to the time when the U.S. Senate was debating a resolution to approve the use of force against Iraq. The IEs were expected to present two different readings about the public opinion polls at that time. However, they agreed with each other on most of their readings of the polls, with the exception of one instance.

By looking at the relative frequency of the use of address terms by each speaker, as shown in Table 33, it appears that such terms are used at a frequency similar to those found in previous interviews despite the apparent low level of disagreement. It is interesting to note that the total number of turns and address terms used in this edition are the same as of those used in the first interview (War or Diplomacy).

Table 33: The frequency of using address terms in Talk of War

Speaker	Number of Turns	Address form used	Percentage of turns
IR	22	12	54.5%
IE1	8	1	12.5%
IE2	13	--	0.0%
Total	43	13	30.2%

As shown in Table 34, the majority of address terms used by the IR are of the type *first name*, which is similar to the second interview in which Shields and Brooks were the participating IEs. Unlike the second interview, however, the IEs in this edition are not frequently invited to participate in the program, suggesting that the use of first name by the IR is not only due to the fact that the IEs are regular participants in the program, rather, it would be the result of the type of relationship established between them and the IR no matter how many times they appear in the program. In addition, the IR addressed IE1 with a short form of his first name, using “Andy”, whereas he used the full first name with IE2, using “Steven”. Even though this usage might indicate a difference in the relationship between the IR and his IEs, we would not be in a strong position to draw such conclusion from just the data set used in the current study. For the three instances by which the IR used the type *full name*, all of them were used in the beginning of the

edition, which would be a way for the IR to introduce the IEs to the audience. The type *first name* is again the only type used by the IEs to address the IR thus far.

Table 34: The frequency and percentage of types of address terms used in Talk of War

Type	IR	IE1	IE2	Total use by all speakers	Percentage of all address terms
First name	9	1	--	10	76.9%
Title	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Title +first name	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Title + last name	--	--	--	--	0.0%
Full name	3	--	--	3	25%
Total	12	1	--	13	100%

For the functions for which address terms are used, the participants, as shown in Table 35, were consistent in their usage in a similar way to previous editions, limiting their usage to certain functions, such as directing a turn, referring to the other interviewee, or introducing a strong opinion or argument. As stated earlier, this might be due to the fact that although this edition was set up to discuss a topic from two different views, it turned out to be a quiet discussion with a lot of agreement between the IEs.

Table 35: The functions of using address terms by each speaker in Talk of War

Speaker	IR	IE1	IE2
To direct or change a turn	10	--	--
To challenge	--	--	--
To introduce an argument	--	1	--
To refer	2	--	--
Total	12	1	--

Having described and analyzed all the English interviews, we will present next a summary of the findings and observations being noted in a similar way to what we have done with Arab interviews, focusing on frequency, types, and functions of usage.

Summary and Conclusions

As we did with Arab interviews, we attempt in this section to present the main findings observed in the close analysis of the use of address terms in all the five editions in terms of frequency, type, and function of use. Further, we present the common patterns of use observed in most editions.

Overall, English speakers appeared to use address terms in 36.1 % of turns in an interview. The IR had a higher use of address terms for 56.1 percent compared with only 18.1 percent per turn by the IEs. We explained the great difference between the IR and the IEs in their use of address terms to be probably due to the IR's reliance on address terms in achieving the various tasks constituting his role in the interview, particularly changing turns, and referring. The relatively low use of address terms observed by English-speaking participants compared with those seen in Arab interviews was explained due to the different expectations of the English participants, as stated in Chapter IV. Specifically, the American IR appeared to frame his expectations to include encouraging disagreement rather than confrontation and dispute, resulting in a lower level of disagreement and fewer uses of address terms accordingly. The IEs, on the other hand, appeared to limit their framing expectations to involve presenting their views without the need to debate them with other interviewees, resulting in lowering the level of disagreement, and that in turn influenced the use of address terms.

A number of common patterns in using address terms by English speakers were also identified. The IR was found to use the type *title & last name* frequently for the function of changing the turn from one interviewee to another, usually to respond to an opposing viewpoint. The IEs were also found to use the type *first name* most frequently to introduce an argument.

It is now time to shift gears to try to answer the second research question: What are the similarities and differences between Arabic and English speakers in their usage of address terms in panel news interviews? To answer this question, we will use all the findings and observations we have discussed and summarized above about both Arabic and English speakers in a comparative way, covering the three main issues: frequency, types, and functions of usage.

Comparison between Arabic and English Speakers' Usage of Address Terms

Before moving on to describe the similarities and differences between Arabic and English speakers in their usage of address terms, I would like first to assert that the current study serves as a baseline for exploring the usage of address terms by the speakers of the two languages based on a relatively limited set of data. Thus, it would be risky to make broad generalizations from this study since it is the first single one investigating the usage of such terms in panel news interviews by speakers of Arabic and English. To confirm the observations made in this study would require additional future studies with similar findings.

As Table 36 shows, there was a great difference between Arabic speakers (hereafter ASs) and English speakers (hereafter ESs) in the number of turns, which was due to the difference in time of broadcasting between the two programs, *NewsHour* and

al-Itjah al-Muakis ‘The Opposing Views’. Consequently, the averages can not be used to identify the differences between the two groups since the two programs are not comparable in terms of time. Instead, the percentage use of address term per turn will be employed. First, let us begin our comparison by examining the overall usage of address terms in terms of frequency.

Table 36: The total average of frequency and percentage of using address terms by both Arabic and English speakers

Speaker	Average number of turns by ASs	Average number of turns by ESs	Average address terms used by ASs	Average of address terms used by ESs	Percentage of address term use per turn by ASs	Percentage of address term use per turn by ESs
IR	51.4	17.8	35.6	10	69.2%	56.1%
IEs only	72.2	19.8	51.6	3.6	71.4%	18.1%
IR & IEs	123.6	37.6	87.2	13.6	70.5%	36.1%

The figures shown in Table 35 indicate clearly that ASs use address terms more frequently than English ones (hereafter ESs) at all levels, including the IR, IEs, and IR & IEs percentage of usage per turn, indicating that the difference is obvious, and it is not only the result of difference in time. For example, the overall use of address terms by Arab participants is 70.5 percent per turn, compared with 36.1 percent per turn by American participants. Similarly, the Arab IR’s overall use of address terms is 69.2 percent per turn, while the American IR’s overall use is 56.1 percent per turn. At the IEs level, whereas Arab IEs’ overall use is 71.4 percent per turn, the English IEs’ overall use is only 18.1 percent per turn. Note that the difference between Arab and American IEs is much higher (more than 50 percent difference) than the difference between Arab and American IRs. As we will see below, this difference is probably due to the great

difference between Arab and American IEs in the functions for which they employ address terms compared with the Arab and American IRs, who used address terms for similar functions in general.

Nevertheless, based on the results of this study, there are some variables, which we think might have influenced the size of the difference to be so great. Most of these variables are based on the assumption that address terms usage increases with the increase in the level of disagreement between interlocutors. One of these variables concerns the difference between the two programs in terms of the IEs' expectations about their role of participation. While the Arab IR seems to expect his role to include engaging the IEs in direct and confrontational talk by focusing on encouraging disagreement between them and challenge each one with the other's opposing points, on the other hand, the American IR seems to hold the expectations that his role involves attempting to encourage disagreement between the IEs and challenge them, but in a mitigated and indirect way.

Another indication of the difference between the two programs is shown in the very few instances in which the ESs direct their talk to each other rather than to the IR, in contrast to ASs, who regularly do so. This may contribute to the infrequency of disputes and confrontational talk between ESs, resulting in less usage of address terms accordingly. The Arab participants seem to hold the expectation that they are invited to the program to debate their views directly with other IEs, who have opposing perspectives. The ESs, however, seem to expect their role to include only the expression of their views without the need to debate them directly with others, with the exception of a few cases that occurred between Shields and Brooks. This is clearly evident in the rare

incidents in which the ESs had disputes with each other, which resulted in fewer attempts by the American IR to intervene, as well as the rare occurrence of overlapped talk and interruption. In other words, there were no extended disagreements in the English interviews, compared with Arab ones, which featured a lot of disputes and confrontational talk between the participants.

Another important variable, which might influence the performance of the IEs concerns the differences in the ways the IRs' fulfilled their role. For example, the Arab IR occasionally challenged the IEs about their views, and tried to take the floor to do so, which increased the frequency of address terms usage. In contrast, the American IR rarely challenged his IEs, and never fought to hold the floor with them. As discussed in Chapter V, the IR in the Arab program more frequently than the English one used a variety of strategies to perform certain tasks, such as encouraging disagreement and challenging the IEs, resulting in turn in an increase of address terms usage, specifically by ASs. For example, the Arab IR attempted in many instances to interrupt the interviewee, mostly using an address term to challenge him about views, and in turn the interviewee responded to this challenge, usually using an address term to show his disagreement or to introduce his opposing point of view.

Lastly, it is very important to note that the phenomenon of repetition, which is widely observed in Arabic discourse (e.g., Johnstone, 1991) could also contribute in increasing the difference in the frequency of using address terms by ASs and ESs. As we have stated in Chapter III, our method of examining address terms involved counting each usage of them, including repeated ones. This possibly doubled the usage of such terms in some instances, particularly by ASs, who used address terms repeatedly in the

same turn to add to the force of performing their functions of using such terms, specifically for taking the floor and managing disagreement, in contrast to ESs, who never did so. However, after reviewing the data, I noticed that repeated address terms were used almost in every edition but in a few instances that would not make the difference to be so great. For example, in the second Arab interview, 'Iraqi Opposition', which witnessed the highest number of disputes and disagreement by the participants, only 14 instances of repeated terms in the same turn were found out of 114 address terms used by all speakers in the entire interview.

Although the variables that have already been discussed above may appear to influence the IEs' usage of address terms to some extent, this does mean that the ESs' frequency of using address terms would be equal to ASs' usage if these variables have been fixed or controlled. Why? Because the ASs used address terms for a variety of purposes, as we have seen before. Also, this probably was not due only to the difference between the two programs in terms of disagreement and dispute. As we will discuss later, the Arab IR, for example, used address terms more frequently than the American IR for performing the same functions.

With regard to the types of address terms used, a number of differences and similarities have been observed between ASs and ESs. For ASs, titles, such as *sidi* 'sir', *akhi* 'brother', *ustaz* 'master', are the most frequent ones, particularly by the IEs, accounting for almost half of the total percentage of all address terms used by ASs, as shown in Table 37. On the other hand, the ESs used the type *first name* most frequently, with a total percentage of 55.8. The type *title & first name* came in the second place for ASs, used primarily by the IEs to address the IR, using *doktor Faisal* 'Dr. Faisal'. The

second most frequent type of address used by ESs is *title & last name*, which was exclusively used by the IR.

The type *title & last name* is the most frequently one by the Arab IR, and it is the most frequent type used by the American IR, indicating that it is probably the most appropriate way in terms of formality to address the IEs.

Table 37: The total average and percentage of each type of address terms used by Arabic (A) and English (E.) speakers

Type	A IR	E. IR	A. IEs	E. IEs	Total percentage by ASs	Total percentage by ESs
First name	2	4.2	1.4	3.4	3.9%	55.8%
Title	7	0.6	33.4	0.2	46.6%	5.8%
Title +first name	2.2	0.0	11.8	0.0	16%	0.0%
Title + last name	10.6	4.6	0.4	0.0	12.7%	33.8%
Adj. + title	0.2	0.0	2.6	0.0	3.2%	0.0%
Title + Full	1.4	0.0	0.4	0.0	2%	0.0%
Full name	3.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	4.1%	4.4%
Collective	8	0.0	0.8	0.0	10.2%	0.0%
Sarcastic	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2%	0.0%
Adj.	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.6%	0.0%
pronoun	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.6%	0.0%
Total	35.6	10	51.6	3.6	100%	100%

In addition to the differences between ASs and ESs in terms of the frequency of use of particular types of address, there are types that are only used by ASs. For example ASs used types, such as *title & first name*, *adj. & title*, *title & full*, and *collective*, which are not used by ESs at all. With the exception of the type *title & first name*, these types are largely utilized in disputes and escalating disagreements by ASs. For instance, the type *collective* is mostly used by the Arab IR to manage disputes between the IEs. This would provide further support for our point mentioned above in which the rare

occurrence of confrontations and disputes in the English interviews resulted in decreasing the number of address terms, specifically ones that are associated with disagreement and disputes, such as *collective* terms. The type *title & adj*, e.g. *akhi al-aziz* ‘dear brother’ appears to be used only by ASs, even in disputes and confrontational talk, based on my daily observation of TV interviews in both languages. However, this observation would need further investigation to confirm it using a larger set of data.

It is clearly evident from Table 38, which shows the averages and frequencies of the functions by which address terms are used by ASs and ESs, that ASs and ESs used them for different functions to some extent. For example, whereas the majority of address terms used by ESs are limited to basic functions like directing a turn or referring, mostly employed by the IR, ASs, however, used such terms for functions that are mostly related to disagreement and dispute, such as showing agreement, holding the floor, with the highest frequencies of usage, in contrast to ESs who did not use them at all, adding further support for our observation that the English program had instances of disagreement and dispute that would increase the usage of address terms.

In addition, although speakers of the two languages used address terms for referring with high frequency, their usage is different than what it first appears. The majority of use of address terms for referring by ESs comes from the IR’s attempts to refer to the other interviewee as a means of encouraging disagreement, while most of the ASs’ usage of address terms to refer is by the IEs in an effort to show disagreement to each other.

Table 38: The average and percentage of the functions of using address terms by Arabic and English participants

Function	A. IR	E. IR	A. IEs	E. IEs	Total percentage By AS	Total percentage by ES
To direct or change a turn	11	7.8	0.0	0.0	12.6%	57.3%
To show disagreement	0.6	0.0	16.2	0.0	19.2%	0.0%
To challenge	4.2	0.0	5	0.2	10.5%	1.4%
To manage a disagreement	10	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.4%	0.0%
To introduce an argument	0.0	0.0	9.4	2.4	10.7%	17.6%
To hold the floor	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	3.6	0.0%
To take the floor	4.6	0.0	5.8	0.0	10.6	0.0%
Sarcastic	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.9%	0.0%
To show agreement	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.2	0.6%	1.4%
To refer	5.2	2.2	10	0.8	17.4%	22%
Total	35.6	10	51.6	3.6	100%	100%

In addition, address terms can be used sometimes for certain functions in environments that have escalating dispute and confrontation between two speakers. One of these functions is sarcasm, which ASs employed at a very low frequency, while ES did not use it at all. Despite the low level of usage by ASs, ESs were not expected to employ such a function on the basis of the apparent low level of disagreement witnessed in all English interviews. However, it is premature to claim that ESs do not use address terms for the sake of sarcasm in political interviews based on the current study only. Rather, this would require further exploration using a very large data involving a variety of American and British political interviews.

In summary, the close examination of the data yields a number of important and interesting findings that shed some light on the address terms usage by Arabic and

English speakers in the context of political interviews. The main results found in this study include the observation that Arabic speakers use address terms more frequently, and for a greater variety of functions than English ones. Additional differences have been also observed in the types of address terms used by Arabic and English speakers.

Having examined and analyzed in detail address term usage in this chapter by speakers of Arabic and English, it is time to present the major conclusions and implications of the current study in the next chapter.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

The close analysis and description conducted in this project yields a number of important findings that could shed some light on the patterns of language use by speakers of Arabic and English within the context of panel news interviews. Our examination involved the study of the use of interruption, the moderator's role, and the use of terms of address. In essence, this study was a descriptive, comparative, and analytical one, which was designed to explore the linguistic behavior of the speakers of the two languages mainly at the level of frequency and function of use. To this end, we have employed a combination of quantitative and qualitative analyses to give additional strength to the study, resulting in many interesting and important results and observations. In what follows, we present a summary of the general findings of the study, followed by some commentary about the limitations, implications, and applications of the study.

Summary of findings

Interruption

Arabic-speaking participants were found to employ interruption more than double the frequency of use of the English ones, at both the level of the IR and the IEs. In terms of the function of use, Arabic speakers were also observed to utilize interruption for up to

13 functions, including changing a turn, showing disagreement, limiting topic of discussion, correcting, taking the floor, asking a follow-up question, clarifying, limiting time of discussion, managing disagreement, announcing the results of a poll, commenting, and closing. Further, the functions of showing disagreement and challenging were the most frequent types used by Arabic speakers, respectively. On the other hand, with the exception of four functions, including challenging, correcting, managing disagreement, and announcing the results of a poll, English speakers used interruption for the same functions of interruption employed by Arabic speakers. Although the function of announcing the results of a poll was related to the design of the Arab program, the rest of the unused functions were normally used in extreme disagreement and dispute, which might indicate that there was a lack of such environments in the English interviews. Among the functions of interruption employed by English speakers, the function of clarifying was the most frequent one. Additionally, our close analysis of a number of examples extracted from the database of the study indicated that interruption was employed by both Arabic and English speakers for more than one function in some cases, suggesting that there is a strong overlap between such functions.

The Moderator's Role

In examining the role of the moderator, we have limited our analysis to three tasks: encouraging disagreement, challenging the IEs, and managing extreme disagreement and disputes. For encouraging disagreement, we have found that Arab and American moderators usually carry out this task similarly by employing specific strategies, such as asking the interviewee to respond to a co-IE's previously stated point,

preceded sometimes with a paraphrasing of it, or asking the interviewee a challenging point with distanced footing. The Arab and American IRs were found to carry out this task similarly, with the exception that Arab IR was more direct than the American one, particularly in raising points mentioned by one interviewee to be discussed by the other interviewee.

With regards to challenging the IEs, the Arab IR was found to carry out this task through a variety of means, including pointing out any inconsistencies in the IE's statements, repeating questions that were avoided by the IEs, confronting the IEs' opposing views as if they were accusations about the other IEs. Unlike the Arab moderator, the American moderator's challenge of the interviewees was less frequent and more indirect using mitigated strategies that softened the directness of his challenges, such as pointing to other views that the IEs seemed not to consider, or by making an inference from the interviewee's point and associating it with the actual situation in a negative way. We explained the differences between the IRs in performing this task as a result of the differences between them in framing their expectations in this specific context. The Arab IR expected his role to include the attempt to challenge the IEs directly and engage them in direct confrontational talk with each other. On the other hand, the American IR appeared to hold the expectations that his role constituted a challenge of the IEs, but in the most indirect way that would change the interaction in confrontation.

For the third task, managing disagreement, our examination reported the use of various strategies to accomplish this task by the Arab IR, including interrupting the disputing IEs to ask a question of one or both of them, calling the IEs using a collective

term of address, such as *Jama'ah* 'group', or *akhwan* 'brothers', expressing complaints to the IEs that the audience cannot hear their talk, and reminding the IEs that the program's time is over. The results of the study indicated that the use of such strategies vary from one interview to another according to the intensity of the dispute. Likewise, the American IR fulfilled this task using similar strategies, such as asking an interviewee to respond to an opposing point previously mentioned by the interviewee after paraphrasing it in most cases, or by mentioning an opposing point that is not necessarily stated by the other speaker, while distancing himself from it.

Address Terms

The detailed examination of the address terms use by Arabic and English speakers showed a number of common and different uses of address terms. In terms of the relative frequency of use, the results indicate clearly, particularly by the IEs, that Arabic-speaking participants use address terms more frequently than English ones at all levels by IR, the IEs, and the IR & IEs, as shown in the average use as well as the percentage of use per turn.

Additionally, a number of similarities and differences have been detected in the types of address terms used by Arabic and English speakers. Whereas Arabic-speaking participants used titles, such as *sidi* 'sir', *akhi* 'brother', and *ustaz* 'master' most frequently in addressing each other, particularly by the IEs, English-speaking participants, however, were found to use the type *first name* most frequently. Further, the results of the study indicate that while Arabic speakers used up to eleven types of address, including *first name*, *title*, *title & first name*, *title & last name*, *adjective & title*, *title & full name*, *full name*, *collective*, *sarcastic*, *adjective*, and *pronouns*, English

speakers, on the other hand, limited their use to only four types of address, including *first name, title, title & last name, and full name*.

At the level of function of use, English-speaking participants were found to use certain limited functions that are normally seen in news interviews, such as directing a turn or referring, mostly by the IR. In contrast, Arabic-speaking participants were found to use address terms for many more functions, reaching up to nine functions, mostly used in disagreement and dispute, such as showing disagreement, challenging, managing disagreement, introducing an argument, taking & holding the floor. An additional difference was observed in the use of terms of address for the function of referring. While the majority of uses of address terms for referring by English speakers came from the IR's attempts to refer to the other interview as a means of encouraging disagreement, most of the Arabic speakers' usage of address terms to refer was employed by the IEs in an effort to show disagreement with each other.

A number of common patterns and uses have been identified by Arab participants in that the IR and the IEs employ certain types of address terms for specific functions. The use of the type *title & last name* was found to be used frequently by the Arab and the American IRs to direct the turn to their IEs, usually to respond to an opposing point, suggesting that this type would be the most appropriate one in terms of formality, neutrality and showing respect in this context, which also would help the IRs in achieving neutrality with the IEs. Also, the Arab IR was found to use the type *collective* (e.g., *jama'ah* 'group') exclusively to manage disagreement between the IEs. Our explanation for such a pattern of address term use was that it offered the IR a neutral way to end disputes by calling both interviewees at the same time. Another interesting common

pattern of address terms used by Arab IEs was their employment of the type *title & first name* in most editions to take the floor from the IR, whereas they use the type *title*, particularly the titles *sidi* ‘sir’, *akhi* ‘brother’, and *azizi* ‘dear’ to achieve this function with each other, suggesting that the IEs shift their use of address terms in achieving a specific function according to the addressee’s role in the interview.

The results also showed some discrepancies between the way IR and the IEs address each other by speakers of the two languages, confirming Clayman’s (1998) observation about this phenomenon. For Arabic speakers, while the Arab IR mostly addressed the IEs using the type *title & last name*, the IEs addressed him using the type *title & first name*. For English speakers, whereas the IR in most cases addressed his IEs using the type *title & last name*, the IEs addressed him using the type *first name*. Arab and American IEs were also found to have different patterns of use to achieve the function of introducing an argument. Whereas Arab IEs frequently used the type *title*, particularly the titles *sidi*, ‘sir’, *akhi* ‘brother’, and *azizi* ‘dear’ to introduce arguments, English IEs used the type *first name* for this function.

In spite of the great difference found between Arabic and English speakers’ use of interruption and address terms as well as the moderator’s employment of certain tasks, we should be cautious in drawing conclusions based on these findings. Throughout most of the Arab and American interviews, we have observed a great amount of difference between the two types of interviews in terms of the level of disagreement and dispute between the IEs, as well as the behavior of the IRs. While the English-speaking participants had very rare occurrences of intense disagreement and confrontational talk, the Arabic-speaking participants had numerous occasions of such talk, which possibly

influenced the use of the linguistic behaviors investigated in the current study.

Furthermore, there are certain differences between the Arab and American programs in terms of the IR and the IEs' expectations and role of participation in such programs, which would make the two programs incomparable. Thus, these variables should be emphasized and considered strongly to find whether the great difference between the speakers of the two languages are due only to their cultural backgrounds or to other reasons.

Nevertheless, the various factors that seem to be involved in changing the patterns of the linguistic behaviors researched in this project does not necessarily diminish the results found in this study. Rather, they should be considered as a baseline for future studies to investigate the cultural differences between Arabic and English speakers in their use of language in the context of news interviews.

Limitations

Despite the fact that the database employed in the current study is appropriate to some extent to draw conclusions that would shed light on the language use of Arabic and English speakers, there are certain limitations that should be considered before generalizing the findings. These limitations are the following:

1. The findings mentioned in this project, specifically the use of address terms and interruption are context-limited, i.e., they are limited to the context of panel news interviews. They would not be observed in the same frequency and function of use in similar contexts, such as news interview due to their relative lack of disagreement and dispute, with which the use of address terms and interruption are so associated. The same thing can be said about normal conversation in which

the use of address terms has been observed previously to be different (Clayman, 1998).

2. For the moderator's role, the findings presented in this project are limited to the moderators in the two channels: Jim Lehrer from PBS and Faisal al-Gassim from Al-Jazeera. Thus, the employment of the features used by the two IRs in carrying out the three tasks studied may vary from IR to another, and it is impossible to generalize the use of them by other IRs. In fact, as stated in Chapter III, the purpose of examining the moderator's role is descriptive in the first place in order to explore the possible means by which the IRs perform certain tasks that are part of their role. Moreover, although the results of this project indicate that there are some differences between the IRs in their administration of the interviews as a result of their cultural background, it is premature to confirm the existence of these differences for other Arab and American IRs. To make such a conclusion would require a larger set of data involving many Arabic and English speaking IRs from a variety of TV channels.
3. As we have observed in examining the use of address terms by Arabic speakers, there was a variation in the use of certain types of address terms by speakers of particular dialects of Arabic. For example, there was a higher use of the address term *rajul* 'man' by the speakers of the Iraqi Arabic dialect than speakers of other dialects. This would suggest that the dialects that the Arabic speakers use may influence their use of address terms. Because the Arabic-speakers participating in the current study use some of the major Arabic dialects, including Egyptian, Sudanese, Lebanese, Iraqi, Syrian, Jordanian, and Palestinian Arabic dialects,

results must be limited to the speakers of such dialects. The same can be said about English speakers for whom the results of the study might be limited to adult educated American speakers.

4. The findings reported in this study are limited to male speakers. Although there has been no firm conclusion found about gender-based differences in employing interruption (James & Clarke, 1993), it is still too risky to generalize the use of interruption for certain functions by female interlocutors. The same can be said about the use of address terms and the moderator's role.
5. As stated in our discussion and analysis of the use of the interruption, the political positions that TV channels would take in general, and the IRs in specific, may vary from one network to another, which would influence their use of interruption with the IEs, particularly those who have opposing views to the IR and the channel's political views. Therefore, the patterns of using interruption found in this study may be limited to the two TV channels.

Implications and Applications

One of the main contributions of the current study is that it provides initial understanding for the patterns of language use by the speakers of Arabic and English within the context of panel news interviews. Although the study was not designed to examine cross-cultural interaction, it however raises potential areas of misunderstanding and conflict which might arise between the speakers of the two languages. Furthermore, it has practical applications in other fields of research, such as second language learning, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, dialectology, etc. In the following section, we will

demonstrate some of these implications and applications, as well as some ideas for future studies.

Another major contribution of the current study is the provision of linguistic description and analysis of Arabic and English speakers' use of language based on naturally occurring data that are broadcast live in the two TV channels, Al-Jazeera and PBS. Thus, it offers deeper insights of the actual use of language in panel news interviews based on real data. Further, its results appear to be stronger than other studies utilizing edited data or other types of data sources, such as movies, stories, or oral and written completion tasks.

Adding to the growing number of studies conducted to investigate language use across cultures and languages (e.g., Scollon & Scollon, 1981; Blum-Kulka, 1990), this study indicates that language use of Arabic speakers in their use of address terms and interruption is quite different from English speakers. Such differences appear to be due mainly to the difference in their norms and social and cultural rules of interaction within the setting of panel news interviews. This was also manifested by the relatively lower use of address terms and interruption compared with other editions, in the edition where the participating interviewees were two Kurds. Additionally, the difference in challenges by the two moderators would indicate differences between the Arab and American cultures in terms of using politeness strategies. In other words, the reasons the American moderator did not use some of the means of challenging the IEs could be because they may seem rude or inappropriate in the English setting; therefore they either use indirect strategies to save face or abandon using them at all. These results confirm the finding observed in previous studies (e.g., Blum-Kulka & Kasper, 1989; Al-Shalawi, 1997) that

Americans in general use indirect and mitigated strategies in performing certain speech acts, particularly ones that may involve face-threatening acts, such as refusals, disagreement, and complaints. Further research on the use of challenges by Arab and American IRs would be valuable in identifying and understanding the politeness measures by which Arab and American moderators determine the accomplishment of this task.

In analyzing address terms, this study demonstrates that both Arabic and English speakers employed them as a resource for carrying out their expected institutional roles in news interviews as either an interviewer or an interviewee. This is clearly shown in the use of address terms for turn taking, which is not found as often in other settings, such as ordinary conversation. The great use of address terms by Arabic speakers indicates that the way Arabic and English speakers realize their use of address terms could be different. While English speakers employ them mainly as receipts for turn taking, i.e., directing the turn by the IR, and receiving it by the IEs) Arabic speakers however rely on them heavily as a means to support their argumentation, persuasion, and getting attention. In addition, my observation of the great of address terms by Arabic speakers in other contexts that involve disagreement, such as computer chatting and court interaction suggest that the contextual situation of panel news interviews may not be the main explanatory variable for this use; rather a cultural difference could better explain the differences between Arabic and English speakers. While English speakers appear to show their opposing views by focusing on the content of their arguments as well as the strategies by which they can present them without interruption, Arabic speakers, on the other hand, appear to rely on address terms in presenting their opposing views as a strategic means that is

influenced by the Arab culture, which gives importance and value to using them. The results of the study also confirm the observations made by Clayman (1998) that address terms are employed in specific environments within the context of news interviews, including disagreements, challenges, floor fights, and agenda shifting. The current study also confirms that address terms are more frequently used in these environments not only by English speakers but also by Arabic speakers, implying that such use of address terms is influenced by the context, and how the participants view their roles. In addition to Clayman's observations, this study found further uses of address terms including, directing and changing turns, referring, managing disagreement, introducing an argument, and sarcasm, particularly by Arabic-speaking participants.

The finding that Arabic speakers use interruption frequently and directly in panel interviews would cast some doubt about the widely cited claim that Arabs tend to employ *musayara* (accommodation and going along with) communicative pattern (Griefet & Katriel, 1989; Feghali, 1997) at least in this specific context. Although the Arab *musayara* communicative style would help in understanding the differences between the Arab communication style and the Israeli *dugri* (straightforward) one, particularly in cross-cultural communication, the investigation of the employment of such a style would require further research to find its application in various settings and with speakers from different cultural backgrounds. In other words, the explanation of not finding the *musayara* conversational pattern to be used in Al-Jazeera panel news interviews could be due to the fact that it was used in previous studies in a specific context, dialogue events with Israelis in Israel, whereas this study involved the examination of political interviews between Arabs in an Arab country in most cases. Therefore, Arabic-speaking

participants might change their conversation style according to the difference in context and participants. Further studies would be necessary to investigate this change in style.

Furthermore, the current study contributes to the field with invaluable information on the linguistic behavior of Arabic and English speakers' use of language in panel news interviews since it is probably the first single study that provides a descriptive, comparative, and analytical account of Arabic speakers' use of language in such a context. Although the results of this study remain tentative at this stage, they identified the possible differences between Arabic and English speakers based on detailed examination of many features working together within a limited and contextualized database. Moreover, the results of the present study can be considered as a foundation for future research, which would grant depth and breadth to the examination of such features by the speakers of Arabic and English.

The concepts employed in discourse analysis research, particularly in interactional sociolinguistics, such as 'frame', 'face', and 'footing' have been found very helpful in understanding and interpreting language use in a specific context like panel news interviews. The concept of 'frame', in particular, provided the major explanation for identifying the differences between Arabic and English speakers in using the three features investigated in this study by focusing on the different framing expectations that the speakers of the two cultural groups might have about their participation in the two programs.

The provision of cultural variability between Arabic and English speakers would add further implications for second language learners of the two languages. For example, Arabic-speaking learners of English could be taught that address terms in English are

used for limited and different functions that are not necessarily the same as those utilized in Arabic. They also could be informed that the use of certain types of address terms, such as *adj & title* might not be understood clearly by American interlocutors, and possibly its function might be vague to them. The curriculum designers of Arabic as a second language could use the results of the current study to be part of Arabic textbooks about the types and functions of address terms in Arabic, specifically in environments that have intense and escalating disagreement.

Second language learners of the two languages could also benefit from this study by knowing the acceptable degree of using interruption with speakers of the two languages. The same thing can be said about the IRs of Arab and American TV programs interviewing guests speaking the other language. For example, the IRs of Al-Jazeera TV channel programs might be informed that using repeated interruption and challenging may make an educated American political speaker consider the interaction as confrontational and unacceptable. Furthermore, TV hosts of panel news interviews would benefit the most from this study by making them aware of the potential violation of neutrality associated with the overuse of interruption and challenging. Moreover, they would benefit from the possible use of interruption for more than one function, which would save time and possibly make their programs more interesting and entertaining.

The examination of the strategies employed by English speaking-participants to respond to opposing views without interrupting the co-IE indicates that Arabic speakers might benefit from using such a strategy that would not only reduce the times of interruption, and accelerate the flow of discussion, but also would provide them with an effective way to present their views without having frequent confrontational and

overlapped talk. Instead of relying on making accusations and raising their voices, panelists could employ such a strategy for better presentation of themselves as well as their positions.

Implications for future research

As stated earlier, the current study provides an invaluable foundation for future inquiry about panel news interviews in general and interruption, address terms, and the moderator's role in specific. Future research could use the same dataset used in this study to examine the differences between Arabic and English speakers' use of disagreement. Do they use the same features of disagreement or not? To what extent does disagreement interact with other features like interruption and address terms use? What are the means by which the IRs attempt to maintain neutrality with their IEs when showing disagreement to their views? Is the IR in Al-Jazeera more biased than the IR in PBS? Do Arabic speakers have different ways of argumentation than English ones? Or do they have variation in their conversational styles within such a context?

Expanding the current database to include more panel news interviews from a variety of TV channels, specifically Americans ones, such as MSNBC *Hardball*, CNN *Crossfire*, ABC *Nightline*, NBC *Meet the Press*, etc. would provide a chance for confirmation or refutation of the findings discovered in this study. Furthermore, by including female participants as moderators and interviewees, further questions could be asked about the interaction between gender and role, and whether that results in differences between male and female participants during panel news interviews. Do Arabic-speaking females have similar or different patterns of language use in this

context? Do Arabic speakers use address terms and interruption the same way during their participation in English TV programs?

In addition, it would be very interesting to discover the difference between the use of address terms or interruption in news interviews and other contexts, such as normal conversation or court-talk. Variables such as age, educational background, and profession could also be investigated. Additional ideas for further research include looking at the differences between the speakers of the various Arabic dialects in their use of address terms in more than one setting. Finally, the easy-to-collect data including voice and video recordings as well as transcriptions of programs in both Arab and American TV networks at this time offer an endless list of ideas for future inquiry.

REFERENCES

- Adams, K. (1999). Deliberate dispute and the construction of oppositional stance. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9: 231-248.
- Al-Aridi, Y. (1986). *A discourse analysis of political television interviews: Variation in interactants' manipulation of language*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Georgetown University.
- Al-Rojaie, Y. (2002). Differences between Arabic and English speakers in using address terms and interruption in news interview. Unpublished manuscript, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.
- Al-Shalawi, H. (1997). *Refusal strategies in Saudi and American Cultures*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Michigan State University, East Lansing.
- Akinnaso, F. & Ajirotutu, C. (1982) Performance and ethnic style in job interviews. In: Gumperz, J. (ed.) *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 119-144
- Austin, J. (1962). *How to Do Things in Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bavelas, J., Black, A., Bryson, L, and Mullett, J. (1988). Political equivocation: a situational explanation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 7: 137-146.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1983). The dynamics of political interviews. *Text*, 3: 131-153.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1990). You don't touch lettuce with your hand. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14: 259-288.
- Blum-Kulka, S, & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: requests and apologies*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, S., Blondheim, M., and Hocohen, G. (2002). Traditions of dispute: from negotiations of Talmudic texts to the arena of political discourse in the media. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34: 1569-1594.

- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. In E. Goody (ed.) *Questions and politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 56-310.
- Bull, P. (1994). On identifying questions, replies, and non-replies in political interviews. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 13: 115-131.
- Bull, P. (1998). Equivocation theory and news interviews. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 17: 220-244.
- Bull, P. (2000). Equivocation and the rhetoric of modernization. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 19: 222-226.
- Bull, P. & Elliott, J. (1998). Level of threat: a means of assessing interviewer toughness and neutrality. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 17, 220-244.
- Bull, P., Elliott, J., Palmer, D. and Walker, L. (1996). Why politicians are three-faced: the face model of political interviews. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 267-284.
- Bull, P. & Mayer, K. (1988). Interruptions in political interviews: A study of Margaret Thatcher and Neil Kinnock. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 7(1): 35-45.
- Beattie, G. (1982). Turn-taking and interruption in political interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan compared and contrasted. *Semiotica* 39:93-114.
- Beattie, G.W. (1989). Interruptions in political interviews: A reply to Bull and Mayer. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. 8(5): 327-339.
- Braun, F. (1988). *Terms of address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures*. New York: Mouton.
- Brown, R. & M. Ford (1961). Address in American English. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 62: 375-385.
- Brown, R. & A. Gilman (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T. Sebeok (ed.) *Style in language*. Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 253-276.
- Clayman, S. (1988). Displaying neutrality in television news interviews. *Social Problems*, 35: 474-492.
- Clayman, S. (1992). Footing in the achievement of neutrality: the case of news interviews discourse. In P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds.) *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 163-198.

- Clayman, S. (1993). Reformulating the question: a device for answering/ not answering questions in news interviews and press conferences. *Text*, 13: 159-188.
- Clayman, S. (1998). Some uses of address terms in news interviews. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the National Communication Association, San Francisco, November, 1998.
- Clayman, S. (2001). Answers and evasions. *Language in Society*, 30: 403-442.
- Clayman, S. (2002a). Disagreements and third parties: dilemmas of neutralism in panel news interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34: 1385-1401.
- Clayman, S. (2002b). Environments of address term usage. Paper presented at the Western States Communication Association meetings, Long Beach, California, February, 2002.
- Clayman, S. & Heritage, J. (2002b). *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cooke, J. (1968). Pronominal Reference in Thai, Burmese and Vietnamese. *University of California Publications in Linguistics*, 54. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dickerson, P. (2001). Disputing with care: analysing interviewees' treatment of interviewers' prior turns in televised political interviews. *Discourse Studies*, 3: 203-222.
- Dijk, T. (1985). *Handbook of discourse analysis* (ed.), 1, p.xi. New York: Academic Press.
- Duncan, S. (1972). Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 23(2): 283-292.
- Duncan, S. & Fiske, D. (1977). *Face-to-Face Interaction: Research, Methods and Theory*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Edelsky, C. & Adams, K. (1990). Creating inequality: breaking the rules in debates. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 9: 171-190.
- Elliott, J. & Bull, P. (1996). A question of threat: face threats in questions posed during televised political interviews. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 6, 49-72.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1972). Sociolinguistics rules of address. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*, pp. 225-241. Harmondworth: Penguin.

- Feghali, E. (1997). Arab cultural communication patterns. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 21: 345-378.
- Galasinski, D. (1998). Strategies of talking to each other: Rule breaking in Polish presidential debates. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 17: 165-182.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday/ Anchor.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goffman, E. (1981). Footing. In E. Goffman (ed.) *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Greatbatch, D. (1986). Aspects of topical organization in news interviews: the use of agenda shifting procedures by interviewees. *Media, Culture and Society*, 8, 441-455.
- Griefat, Y. & Katriel, T. (1989). Life demands Musayra: Communication and culture among Arabs in Israel, in S. Ting-Tooney and F. Kozenny (eds.) *Language, Communication, and Culture: Current Directions*. London: Sage.
- Gumperz, J. (1978). The conversation analysis of interethnic communication. In E. Ross. (ed.) *Interethnic Communication*, pp. 13-31. Southern Anthropological Society Proceedings, No.12, Athens, University of Georgia Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1982a). *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1982b). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hassanain, K. (1989). A sociolinguistic study: Address rule system in the western region of Saudi Arabia. Unpublished PhD. Dissertation. University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Harris, S. (1986). Interviewer's questions in broadcast interviews. In *Belfast Working Papers in Language and Linguistics* Vol. 8, ed. J. Wilson and B. Crow, Jordanstown: University of Ulster, pp. 50-85.
- Heritage, J. (1985). Analyzing news interviews: aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience. In T.A. Dijk (ed.) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Volume 3. New York: Academic Press, pp. 95-119.
- Heritage, J. (2002). The limits of questioning: negative interrogatives and hostile question content. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34: 1427-1446.

- Heritage, J., Clayman, S. and Zimmerman, D. (1988). Discourse and message analysis: the micro-structure of mass media messages. In R. Hawkins, S. Pingree, and J. Weimann (eds.), *Advancing Communication Science: Merging Mass and Interpersonal Processes*, Vol. 16. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 77-109.
- Heritage, J. & Greatbatch, D. (1991). On the institutional character of institutional talk: the case of news interviews. In D. Boden and D.H. Zimmerman (eds.) *Talk and Social Structure*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 93-137.
- Holmes, J. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman..
- Hutchby, I. (1997). Building alignments in public debate: A case study from British TV. *Text*, 17: 161-179.
- Hymes, D. (1972). Toward ethnographies of communication: The analysis of communicative events. In P. Giglioli (ed.), *Language and Social Context*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, pp. 21-43.
- James, D. and Clarke, S. (1993). Women, men, and interruptions: A critical review. In D. Tannen, (ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction*, (pp. 231-280). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jaworski, A. & Galasinski, D. (2000). Vocative address forms and ideological legitimization in political debates. *Discourse Studies*, 2: 35-53.
- Johnson-Evans, D. (2000). A discourse analysis of the 1998 United States Senate candidates' pre-election debates. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Texas, Arlington.
- Johnstone, B. (1986). Arguments with Khomeini: Rhetorical situation and persuasive style in cross-cultural perspective. *Text*, 6: 171-187.
- Johnstone, B. (1991). *Repetition in Arabic discourse: Paradigms, syntagms, and the ecology of language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jucker, A. (1986). *News Interviews: A Pragmalinguistic Analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Katriel, T. (1986). *Talking Straight: Dugri Speech in Israeli Sabra Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Koh, H. (2002). *A cross-cultural study of address terms in Korean and English*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of Hawaii.
- Kotthoff, H. (1993). Disagreement and concession in dispute: on the context of sensitivity of preference structure. *Language in Society*, 22: 193-216.

- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- McIntire, M. (1972). Terms of address in an academic setting. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 14: 286-291.
- Moder, C. & Halleck G. (1998). Framing the language proficiency interview: Native and non-native speakers' questions. In R. Young and A. He (Eds.), *Language proficiency interviews: A discourse approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Moles, J. (1974). Decisions and variability: The usage of address terms, pronouns and languages in Quenchua-Spanish Bilingual in Peru. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 16: 442-463
- Moles, J. (1978). The influence of differential "power" and "solidarity" upon the predictability of behavior: A Peruvian Example. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 20: 38-51.
- Murata, K. (1994). Intrusive or co-operative? A cross-cultural study of interruption. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21: 385-400.
- Parkinson, D. (1982). *Terms of Address in Egyptian Arabic*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Parkinson, D. (1995). *Constructing the Social Context of Communication: Terms of Address in Egyptian Arabic*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Potter, T. (1994). Moroccan terms of address in the film Dmu al-Nadem (Tears of Regret). *The Georgetown Journal of Languages and Linguistics*, 3: 218-226.
- Potter, T. (1999). "Si Mohammed!": Names as address forms in Moroccan Arabic. *Names*, 47: 157-172.
- Roger, D., Bull, P. & Smith, S. (1988). The development of a comprehensive system for classifying interruptions. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 7: 27-34.
- Roth, A. & Olsher, D. (1997). Some standard uses of "What about"-prefaced interrogatives in the broadcast news interviews. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 8: 3-25.
- Roth, A. (1998). Who makes the news: social identity and the explanation of action in the broadcast news interview. Unpublished PhD dissertation: University of California, Los Angeles.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50 (4): 696-735.

- Schegloff, E. (1989). From interview to confrontation: Observation of the Bush/Rather encounter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 22:215-240.
- Schiffrin, D. (1985). Conversational coherence: the role of "well". *Language*, 61: 640-667.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). Jewish argument as sociability. *Language in Society*, 13: 311-335.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. (1981). *Narrative, literacy and face in interaction communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Scott, S. (1998). *Patterns of Language use in adult face-to-face disagreements*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff.
- Scott, S. (2002). Linguistic features variation within disagreement: An empirical investigation. *Text*, 22: 301-328.
- Searle, J. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simon-Vandenberg, A. (1996). Image-building through modality: the case of political interviews. *Discourse & Society*, 7: 389-415.
- Shaw, S. (2000). Language, gender and floor opportunities in political debates. *Discourse & Answers*, 11: 401-418.
- Slobin, D., Miller, S., and Porter, L. (1968). Forms of address and social relations in a business organization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8: 289-293.
- Suleiman, C. (2000). *Pronoun Use in Television Interviews: Social Interaction and the Middle East Peace Process*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.
- Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Tannen, D. (1989). Interpreting Interruption in Conversation. Papers from the 25th Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. Part Two: Parasession on Language in Context, ed. by Bradley Music, Randolph Graczyk, and Caroline Wiltshire, 266-287. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

- Tannen, D. (1993). The relativity of linguistic strategies: rethinking power and solidarity in gender and dominance. In D. Tannen (Ed.) *gender and Conversational Interaction*, pp. 165-188. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Upadhyay, S. (2003). Nepali requestive acts: Linguistic indirectness and politeness reconsidered. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35: 1651-1677.
- Watanabe, S. (1993). Cultural differences in framing: American and Japanese group discussions. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Framing in discourse*, pp. 176-209. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1998). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- West, C. (1979). Against our will: Male interruptions of female in cross-sex conversations. In J. Orasanu, M. Slater, and L. Alder (eds.) *Language, sex and gender*. New York: Annals of the New York Academy of Science, pp. 81-97.
- West, C. & Zimmerman, D. (1983). Small insults: A study of interruptions in cross-sex conversations between unacquainted persons. In B. Thorne, C. Kramarae and N. Henley (eds.) *Language and sex: Difference and dominance*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, pp. 103-117.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1985). Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9: 145-178.
- Yassin, M. (1978). Personal names of address in Kuwaiti Arabic. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 20: 53-64.
- Yemenici, A. (2001). Analysis of the use of politeness maxims in interruptions in Turkish political interviews. In A. Bayraktaroglu, M. Sifianou, and Sachiko I. (eds.), *Linguistic politeness across boundaries: The case of Greek and Turkish*, (pp. 307-339). Amsterdam: Pagination.
- Young, R. & He, A. (1998). *Language proficiency interviews: A discourse approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zimmerman, D. & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions and silence in conversation. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.) *Language and sex: Difference and dominance*, pp. 105-129. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Zupnik, Y.-J. (1994). A pragmatic analysis of the use of person deixis in political discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21: 339-383.
- Zupnik, Y.-J. (1995). Analysis of conflict discourse: Evidence from Israeli-Palestinian 'dialogue' events. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University.

Zupnik, Y.-J. (1999). The use of 'sociopolitical identity- displays' in Israeli-Palestinian 'dialogue' events. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31: 471-508.

Zupnik, Y.-J. (2000). Conversational interruptions in Israeli- Palestinian 'dialogue' events. *Discourse Studies*, 2: 85-110.

VITA 2

Yousef Ibrahim Al-Rojaie

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF INTERRUPTION, MODERATOR ROLE,
AND ADDRESS TERMS IN ARAB AND AMERICAN PANEL NEWS
INTERVIEWS

Major Field: English

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, On August 23, 1971, the son of Ibrahim

Education: Graduated from al-Yarmouk High School, Buraydah, Saudi Arabia in May 1990; received Bachelor of Arts degree in English from King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia in May 1995; received Master of Arts degree in English from Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado in May 2001. Completed the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree with a major in English at Oklahoma State University in December, 2003.

Experience: Employed as a teacher of English in an intermediate school in Burayadh, Saudi Arabia for two years; employed as a teaching assistant of English for two years at the College of Technology, Buraydah, Saudi Arabia. Head of the General Studies Department for one year and a half, the College of Technology at Hail, Saudi Arabia.

Professional Memberships: American Association of Applied Linguistics (AAAL), TESOL, Linguistic Society of America (LSA), Phi Kappa Phi.