Politeness Strategies Used by The Interviewer of BBC World's "Hard Talk" Programme

Assistant Lecturer: Maysoon Khaldoon Khattab

Al- Iraqia University

College of Arts.

LIST OF ABBRIVIATIONS

D Distance
DM David Milliband
GK Ghassan Al-Khatib
FTA Face Threatening Act
H Hearer
IE Interviewee
IR Interviewer
P Power
PP Politeness Principle
R Rank of imposition
S Speaker
SS Stephen Sackur
Wx Weightiness of the FTA

1. Introduction:

This research has been motivated by a general concern for the study of the politeness strategies in political interviews which are among the most common programmes broadcast by TV channels. Also this study has been inspired by the work of Brown and Levinson, exploring mainly their distinction between 'positive' and 'negative' politeness.

According to their theory of politeness, face can be distinguished into two components: positive face and negative face. Positive face occurs when the individual desires to be liked, approved of, respected and appreciated by others, whereas negative face is the individual's desire not to be impeded or put upon and to have the freedom to behave as one chooses (Brown and Levinson, 1978).

Lakoff (1975: 64) suggests that "politeness is developed by societies in order to reduce friction in personal interaction". Similarly, Leech (1980: 19) defines "tact" as "strategic conflict avoidance", adding that it "can be measured in terms of the degree of effort put into the avoidance of a conflict situation". For Holmes, linguistic politeness means " recognizing the autonomy of others and avoiding intrusion (negative politeness), as well as emphasizing connectedness and appreciation (positive politeness)

(1995:24). Goffman (1967) refers to face in his attempt to define politeness as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself". "Face is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes" (Ibid. : 5), i.e. a person's feeling of self-worth and self-image (Thomas,1995:169). In a later work, Brown and Levinson (1978) have used Goffman's concept of face to explain politeness. Despite the great significance of 'politeness', it is only in recent years that this concept has become a major issue in linguistics. This is evidence in the vast range of publications which followed Brown and Levinson's (1978) original extended essay on politeness phenomena, including both confirming and disconfirming findings for their theory.

2. Review of Literature:

2.1Politeness Strategies

According to Brown and Levinson certain acts may damage or threaten another person's face. Brown and Levinson (1978) view politeness essentially as a complex system for softening face threatening acts (FTAs). Thus, "communication is seen as a fundamentally dangerous and antagonistic endeavor" (Kasper, 1990: 194). FTAs can come with four strategies:

1. Do the FTA without redressive action: badly on record.
2. Do the FTA with redressive action: positive politeness.
3. Do the FTA with redressive action: negative politeness.
4. Do the FTA off record.
5. do not do the FTA

"On record" means directly saying something in an unambiguous way, while "off record" means expressing it in an indirect way so that it can be interpreted ambiguously as a way to minimize the extent to which the addressee's face is threatened. On record FTAs can be committed with redressive action, which is action that 'gives face' to the addressee, that is, the attempts to counteract the potential face damage of the FTA.

Brown and Levinson (1976: 106-30) list fifteen positive politeness strategies which appeal to hearer's (H's) desire to be liked and approved. They involve the following:

Strategy 1: Notice, attend, to H (his interests, wants, needs, goods)

Strategy 2: Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H)

Strategy 3: Intensify interest to H.
Strategy 4: Use in –group identity markers
Strategy 5: Seek agreement
Strategy 6: Avoid disagreement
Strategy 7: Presuppose / raise / assert common ground
Strategy 8: Joke
Strategy 9: Assert or Pre-suppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants
Strategy 10: Offer, Promise
Strategy 11: Be optimistic
Strategy 12: Include both S and H in the activity
Strategy 13: Give (or ask for) reasons
Strategy 14: Assume or assert reciprocity
Strategy 15: Give gifts to the H (goods, sympathy, understanding cooperation)

In negative politeness strategies, speaker (S) shows that he respects H's territory and that he does not want to hinder his freedom of action. Brown and Levinson (1978:106-30) list ten negative politeness strategies:

Strategy 1: Be conventionally indirect
Strategy 2: Questions, hedge
Strategy 3: Be pessimistic.
Strategy4: Minimize the imposition.
Strategy5: Give deference.
Strategy 6: Apologize
Strategy 7: Impersonalize S and H
Strategy 8: State the FTA as a general rule.
Strategy 9: Nominalize
Strategy 10: Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H

A politeness strategy is employed by assessing the 'weightiness' of FTA. The weightiness is calculated by speakers (Ss) from the social variables such as power difference between S and H (P), the perceived social distance between speaker and hearer (D), and ranking of imposition (R). Mainly the selection of strategy will be made on the basis of the speaker's evaluation of the size of the FTA. . Thus, weightiness is calculated as follows: Wx = D (S, H) + P (S, H) + Rx

2.2Neutralism in Political interviews

The interviewer is expected to maintain varied and often conflicting aspects of objectivity simultaneously. For instance, to promote ideological *balance,* an interviewer may be moved to act as devil's advocate by aggressively challenging an interviewee. But this adversarial approach can, in turn, threaten the ideal of *neutrality* if the interviewer is seen to be promoting his or her own political biases or the biases of the news organization's owners or sponsors. How are these divergent goals reconciled in practice? More specifically, *how do interviewers manage to declare themselves in an adversarial manner while maintaining a formally independent or neutralistic attitude?* Clayman and Heritage (2002:151) suggest certain techniques or solutions to this "puzzle".

A partial solution to this puzzle is the turn-taking system for news interviews. It is organized around questions and answers, and presents an important basis for interviewer neutralism. Interviewers normally limit themselves to asking questions and thus avoid actions whose main purpose is to express a point of view – straightforward assertions as well as receipt tokens (*yeah, uh huh,* etc.) that might be taken to indicate approval or agreement with the interviewee. When assertions are made, they are normally rendered in combination with a subsequent question, and are treated as assistant to the activity of questioning rather than as separate actions in their own right. Evidently, no question can be completely neutral in an absolute sense. Nevertheless, because the apparent function of a question is to ask for the interviewee's point of view rather than to express a viewpoint in itself, this type of speech act has an inherently neutralistic quality.

Another technique which can be utilized by the interviewer to introduce views which are potentially hostile or damaging to the interviwee or his country, party, association etc., is speaking on the behalf of a third party (Clayman,1992; Clayman and Heritage 2002; Partington,2003).This demands attributing the presuppositions and opinion in the questions to other sources and authorities (e.g. by quoting from the press, other agencies, including governmental ones, other politicians and so on). In this way the interviewer distances himself from any aggressive opinions expressed in his question (Heritage,1985). Also this technique can be used

strategically to affect the interviewee's response. Clayman (1992:187) adds that this neutral position is not always completely innocent. When the interviewee feels that the interviewer is biased, he will refuse to cooperate during the course of the interview (Partington,2003:92). Examples of such breakdown are presented and discussed by Clayman and Heritage (2002).

3.Hard Talk Programme:

This programme often made a lot of figures in the spotlight squirm with very difficult questions. "Hard Talk" programme is task oriented and it is one type of transactional discourse. Most of the questions or exchanges in "HardTalk" programme can be considered a global face threatening act and the whole programme of "Hard Talk" can be considered a face threatening genre**.** The person asking these questions was Tim Sebastian. He has been removed from the programme, and it is clear from his final statement that it was because of the difficult questions he asked:

Hard Talk has survived –and prospered , I think, because we treated everyone the same, regardless of race or political persuation. We have become the case for prosecution- a minutely researched case-and people who came on the programme were obliged to answer for their arguments and their actions. This is an important part of democratic society-and yet these days it's the democratic governments that are fighting very bit as hard as the dictatorship to obscure the truth and prevent access to "inconvenient" information. This is a worrying trend. Look no further than Iraq.

Tim Sebastian's successor is Stephen Sackur the main presenter of "Hard Talk".

4. Aims of the study

The present study tries to answer the following questions:

1-What are the politeness strategies utilized by the interviewer of BBC World's "Hard Talk" programme with his guests?

2-Does the interviewer of “Hard Talk” programme utilize less politeness strategies with interviewee from the Middle East than he does with the interviewee from Britain? Does this mean that he is biased?

5. Methodology:

Brown and Levinson's approach is found most suitable for investigating politeness behaviour in negotiation interaction because the approach acknowledges conflict, especially in face threatening acts (FTAs). Since negotiation in Hard Talk interviews by its nature entails conflict, clashes in interest or disagreement between negotiators, it is supposed that interview participants during this negotiating activity work towards settling the conflict and establishing common ground. Politeness will most probably be exercised as a way to redress FTA and to maintain cooperation during the negotiating activity. Politeness strategies may prevent negative consequences in the negotiation relationship because the face-management view to politeness is centralized on the notion of conflict and redress to conflict (Paramasivam,2007). TV interviews in the "Hard Talk" programme were video recorded, transcribed and used as a sample text for the analysis. The analysis focuses on the interviewer turn and the politeness strategies utilized by him.

6.Subjects:

The data consists of two "Hard Talk" programme interviews recorded and transcribed. Each interview is about 30 minutes long. The interviews were presented by Stephen Sackur (SS), the main presenter of "Hard Talk" programme, and he is British. One of the interviews is with the Foreign Secretary in the Foreign Office in London David Milliband (DM). The other interview is with Ghassan Al- Khatib (GK), the Palastanian Minister of Planning.

7. Data analysis and Results:

As to the first research question concerning the politeness strategies, the interviewer uses different positive and negative politeness strategies that are listed in table 1 and 2. The results for the second research question showed that on the whole politeness strategies occur more frequently per interview when the interviewee is from Europe especially Britain than when he is from the Middle East (Palestine). That is to do not mainly with the interviewer's bias with a specific guest from a specific

country, but with certain important demands and norms and certain practices that sustain the conduct of the interview. Politeness strategies are used slightly from time to time according to the situation. The choice of these strategies is made by SS on the basis of his assessment of the size of FTA. When the 'weightiness' of the FTA is great, SS tends to use more politeness strategies.

7.1 Positive Politeness Strategies

The following positive politeness strategies are identified in SS's interview with DM:

Table 1. Number of positive politeness strategies in SS interview with DM and GK.

Strategy	Frequency of occurrence	
	DM	GK
Strategy 1: *Notice, attend, to H (his interests, wants)*	1	0
Strategy 2*: Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy)*	2	0
Strategy 3: *Intensify interest to H.*	5	0
Strategy 4: *Use in –group identity markers*	2	0
Strategy 5: *Seek agreement*	4	0
Strategy 10:*offer promise*	0	1
Strategy 12: *Include both S and H in the activity*	3	2
Strategy 13: *Give (or ask for) reasons*	2	3
Total	19	6

The following positive politeness strategies are utilized by SS:

Strategy 1: *Notice, attend, to H (his interests, wants, needs, goods)*

DM: *Well they've, they, they've not actually walked away from it. President Obama, Secretary Clinton have reiterated their, the US commitment in that respect and what we need to see// …*

SS: ***But I'm sorry Foreign Secretary, I know how you, irritated 'cause I'm interrupting you a lot but …***

DM: *No, no I'm not irritated at all, I'm// *…*

SS indicates that he takes notice of DM condition and never ignores it after many interruptions.

---

*// double slashes mark interruption IE: That's our policy

S

This strategy is accomplished with exaggerated intonation, stress, and other aspects of prosodic features, in addition to the use of intensifying modifiers (Brown and Levinson,1976: 109). This strategy is used twice by SS with DM :

SS: *They haven't yet, and another Middle Eastern problem looms, and that is Iran. In brief* ***for all the pressures you and others have tried to apply to Iran*** *the situation seems to get worse rather than better. We now have the Iranians openly acknowledging that they are now enriching uranium to the twenty per cent level which many experts say is a new and dangerous step.]*In the above example SS appreciates the effort of DM and he indicates the latter did his duty and that he is not responsible of the bad situations concerning Iran and its attempts to enrich uranium.

SS mitigates the assertion of British failure in solving this serious problem of developing nuclear weapons in a diplomatic way. Here SS wants to say that the UK has to take another step and asks DM about this:

SS: *What are you going to do?*

IR: But should it be?

DM emphasises the diplomatic means in dealing with Iran and he refuses any military option.

Strategy 3: Intensify interest to H.

This strategy is used by SS five times with DM when he used the expression "*you well know*" to indicate that the interviewer knows or understands, on the basis of the shared experience and shared knowledge. The two participants are British and they are discussing important issues in the UK's policy. Sometimes it is used by SS to mitigate interruption (cf. Brown and Levinson,1978:112, Holmes,1995:87).But this strategy is never used with GK:

DM: *We've, well we've never denied what was in those cables that were sent to us, it wasn't done by British officials, it was never done according to British direction or British policy// …*

SS**:** *No, can we //…*

DM: *… and we absolutely //…*

SS: *… that, that's not the nub of the issue* ***as you well know*** *…*

Strategy 4: *Use in –group identity markers*

By using contraction and ellipses the interviewer conveys in-group membership, and he can suggest common ground with the interviewee. Brown and Levinson,1976:116). SS used this strategy twice with DM:

SS: *... the, the nub of the issue, and it is still important because we need to establish accountability, the nub of the issue is that* ***MI5*** *sent operatives to talk to Binyam Mohamed when they knew that Binyam Mohamed had been abused, you can say tortured, by the US authorities*.

Strategy 5: *Seek agreement*

SS expresses his agreement with the assertions of DM four times.

DM: *I, what I've said in the House of Commons just this afternoon is that on a scale of nought to ten I'm not yet ready to give marks for how, the degree of cooperation that we're getting but we expect cooperation with the investigation that's been established. I'm also not going to lose sight of the wider Middle Eastern dimension to this. The last time I did this programme a year ago we talked about the window of opportunity for a two state // ...*

SS: ***That's right.***

DM: *... solution closing. And my goodness, the dangers of that two state solution closing are profound indeed. This country has stood very firm for a long time for a two state solution, for Jerusalem as the capital of both states,* for a resolution based on 1967 borders, for a fair settlement for the refugees, and we have to devote every ounce of energy to maintaining the space for that to be achieved.

SS: *How disappointed are you then that the Obama Administration walked away from the demand for a complete and total settlement freeze for the Israeli Government?*

SS asks DM as a foreign secretary about 12 fake British passports that were used in the plot to murder Mr Mabhouh - the founder of Hamas's military wing - in his hotel room in Dubai on 19 January. Israel was believed to be responsible for the misuse of the British passports. Israel has previously said there is no proof it was behind the killing at a Dubai hotel. The incident represents a profound disregard for the sovereignty of the United Kingdom. SS asks DM about the degree of Israel's cooperation in this important issue, but DM's replies are evasive and he refuses to say

bluntly that Israel ignores the issue and it refuses to give any information about the incident. This is damaging to the face of UK because Israel is one of its important allies. Therefore, DM tries to shift the topic by speaking on the Middle East issue. SS interrupts DM by using the acknowledgement token "*That's right*" in his attempt to take the turn preventing the interviewee from changing the agenda of the question because this threatens the role of the interviewer as the agenda setter. But DM does not give his turn to SS and continues his speech.

Direct agreement with the interviewee's opinion is a kind of support for his point of view. Clayman and Heritage (2002) consider this as a departure from questioning. Such assertion and agreement compromise the neutralistic stance of the interviewer which is maintained by questioning. But It is noticed that the use of acknowledgement tokens "*Yeah*" and "*right*" by SS is not to agree with DM's assertion. SS utters these acknowledgement tokens to intervene and interrupt DM and to represent the opposite point of view. So it is a way used by SS to take the turn from the speaker. In the following example SS asks DM whether the British war against terror in Afghanistan is fruitful, then he comments on DM's previous remarks on the importance of war to the security of British people. SS concludes that DM considers the war important and "winnable", but British People have the opposite point of view and that threatens the face of DM as representative of British policy. SS appears to agree with DM when he says "Yeah", but he goes to present the opposite point of view depending on the last BBC poll:

DM**:** *… is it winnable. That's the question that people are also right to ask. Is it worth it? Can it work? And I //…*

SS: ***Yeah*** *and they say no, and you say yes.*

Strategy 10:*offer promise*

SS uses this strategy once with GK in order to save the FTA of interruption and he claims that within the course of the interview, they will speak about the Israeli settlements. Also he uses positive strategy 13 *(give reason)* to satisfy GK's positive face that was threatened by interruption. SS asks GK about the reason behind Palestinian celebration Israel pull out from Gaza. GK answers that they were happy by Israel withdrawal but at the same time there were many Palestinian occupied lands and he goes to enumerate them. SS interrupts him and promises that they will tackle on

this issue later, but SS wants to press GK to talk more about the reason for Palestinian's celebration and at the end he wants to seek an answer to the question 'who was behind Gaza liberation?'.

GK: ……Israel is evacuating settlements from the total of two to three thousand apartments Israel is building in the West Bank six thousand four hundred apartments in order to include new thirty five thousand Israeli Settlers //……

SS : ***We'll talk about we'll about that later,*** *but the reason I asked my question is because I get very mixed signals from Palestinian Authority particularly from from your leader Mahmoud Abbas on the one hand he said he believes disengagement first step on the road of Palestinian State including the West Bank and Jeru-Jerusalem and at the same time he also said it is not the time to celebrate, I do not understand?*

In the above example SS implicates that Mahmoud Abass does not want to celebrate because he is not behind the achieved victory. SS exerts pressure on GK to confess that his government was not behind Israel withdrawal by repeating the question many times and using negative politeness strategy 7 by citing the opinion of others.

Strategy 12: *Include both S and H in the activity*

Interviewer can entail the cooperative assumption to redress FTA when he joins the 'I' and 'you' into inclusive 'we'. SS used this strategy three times with DM and twice with GK to mitigate the FTA of topic change and to include both S and H in the activity:

DM: *We have, we have never tortured.*

SS: *But then let's get to collusion. Are you saying we have never been complicit, ever, ever been complicit, in torture?*

Strategy 13: *Give (or ask for) reasons*

This strategy is used twice with DM when SS gives reasons as why he interrupts DM in order to make a certain issue clear; also he mitigates the FTA of topic change. It is used three times in SS interview with GK.

SS**:** *No, can we// …*

DM: *… and we absolutely //…*

SS: *… that, that's not the nub of the issue as you well know …*

DM: *Well the //…*

SS: *... the, the nub of the issue, and it is still important* ***because we need to establish accountability****, the nub of the issue is that MI5 sent operatives to talk to Binyam Mohamed when they knew that Binyam Mohamed had been abused, you can say tortured, by the US authorities.*

In the above example SS is speaking about Binyam Mohamed who was charged by US with conspiring with members of al-Qaeda to murder and commit terrorism. He was held by US with other detainees at secret detention centres around the world. SS blames the British Government for not taking sufficient steps to protect him from ill-treatment, including torture. This is another threat to British reputation.

In the coming example SS gives reasons as to why he is asking his question and insisting on repeating it. Thus GK is led to see the reasonableness of SS's repeated question. This strategy is an indirect way of seeking GK cooperation and imposing him to speak more about the topic and to justify the reason behind Palestinians celebration by Israel disengagement from Gaza. SS may be trying to push GK to say something that he have not said yet:

SS: *We'll talk about we'll about that later****, but the reason I asked my question is because I get very mixed signals from Palestinian Authority particularly from from your leader Mahmoud Abbas*** *on the one hand he said he believes disengagement first step on the road of Palestinian State including the West Bank and Jeru-Jerusalem and at the same time he also said it is not the time to celebrate, I do not understand?*

7.2 Negative Politeness Strategies:

The following negative politeness strategies are identified in SS's interview with DM:

Table2. Number of negative politeness strategies in SS's interview with DM and GK.

Strategy	Frequency of occurrence	
	DM	GK
Strategy 1: *Be conventionally indirect*	2	2
Strategy 2: *Hedge*	8	2
Strategy 4: *Minimize the imposition*	1	0
Strategy 5:*Give deference*	3	0
Strategy 7: *Impersonalize S and H* (distance tactic)	19	18
Strategy 7: *Impersonalize S and H* (Inclusive/ exclusive we)	17	0
Strategy 10: *Go on record as incurring a debt*	2	2
Total	52	24

Strategy 1: *Be conventionally indirect*

This strategy is used once by SS with DM when he disagrees with and interrupts the interviewee. Thus the interviewee's negative face is threatened because his freedom of action is hindered; therefore, the interviewer uses two negative strategies at the same time, being indirect and using strategy 7 when he impersonalizes S and H by using inclusive 'we'.

DM: *We've, well we've never denied what was in those cables that were sent to us, it wasn't done by British officials, it was never done according to British direction or British policy// ...*

SS**:** *No**, can we** ...*

Be conventionally indirect, this strategy is used twice with GK. These questions treat GK responses as optional rather than obligatory and they indicate that GK's will not be pressed by SS if he does not care to respond:

SS: ***How can you explain** then how Jamal Abu Sahadani says that he was invited to join Palestinian authority military intelligence?*

GK: *I want to add//*

SS**:** ***Can you explain that to me**?*

Strategy 2: *Hedge:*

'Hedge' is "a particle, word, or phrase that modifies the degree of membership of a predicate or noun phrase in a set" (Brown and Levinson 1978:150). Also "it is an item that softens the force of an expression in

some way, e.g. *sort of, if you se what I mean*" (Partington,2003:146) .This strategy is used eight times with DM to redress insult, reduce the imposition and to soften the FTA of disagreement or interruption. It is used twice with GK. Consider the following examples:

SS: *So everybody is saying, **you know**, we'll be getting a draw down in 2011 and it, at the same time we see there are deep concerns about the quality of the Afghan forces. It, it's a difficult square to (indistinct) …*

Here the hedge "*you know*" is used to disclaim the assumption that SS 's assertion is to inform the interviewee, but in fact he wants to inform the audience. Also it indicates that the interviewee's knowledge is equal to the interviewer's knowledge. In SS interview with GK, he mitigates the force of his assertion by using the hedge "I think":

SS: ***I think** the one reason you haven't given is the reason that many Palestinian give and that is seventy percent according to one pole into Palestinian areas say he is retreating from Gaza because of the success of militant attacks on Israeli forces and settlers.*

In the above example "*I think*" is a quality hedge which may indicate that SS is not taking full responsibility for the truth of his utterance; he thinks that something is so but he is not sure (Brown and Levinson,1976:169). SS asks GK about the reason behind Sharoon's disengagement from Gaza, GK mentions many reasons "*Gaza is a demographic border, second Gaza is a security border……and the bilateral negotiations*". GK does not mention one important reason behind Gaza liberation which was Hamas, the largest Palestinian militant Islamist organization. Hamas campaigned forcefully on its claim that Israel's withdrawal from Gaza in the summer of 2005 was a victory for its commitment to armed conflict with the Israelis. Hamas was out of the structure of the Palestinian government; therefore, GK as a member in the Palestinian authority avoids mentioning this fact overtly because this threatens the face of his government because it was not behind the achieved victory. SS concentrates on a certain point "*who was behind Sharoon withdrawal from Gaza*" and he mentions that in the opening of the programme. Moreover the first question in the programme is " *Why do you think Sharoon is disengaging from Gaza?*". At the beginning SS does not mention a specific organization; he only says it was the "*militant attacks*" behind Shroon's retreating from Gaza. He attributes this assertion to "*one*

pole" and thus SS strategically makes use of the negative politeness strategy 7 when he distances himself from the FTA of disagreement with the host, and on the larger level he distances himself from threatening the face of the Palestinian authority. SS depicts that view as wide spread "*the reason that many Palestinians give*", also he enhances the credibility of his view by referring to the poll.

Strategy 4: *Minimize the imposition*

It is one way to indicate that the imposition is not great. So indirectly this may pay the interviewee deference (Brown and Levinson,1978: 181-83). This strategy is used once with DM when SS uses 'just' to convey the literal meaning of 'only' which limits the extent of the FTA of questioning by its conventional implicature 'merely'.

DM: *... we've got an investigation going on at the moment as to who was behind the fraudulent use of British passports because over a dozen British passports seem to have been used in a fraudulent way, completely contrary to the way in which we run our passport system, and that's a very serious issue, as is the question of stability in the Middle East.*

SS: ***Just** on that point you had a meeting with your Israeli counterpart, Avigdor Lieberman, not so long ago in Brussels. Mr Lieberman apparently said to you he had no information to give you. Is that acceptable?*

In the above example SS threatens the negative face of DM and Britain because their desire to reveal the information they need for the investigation was ignored by Israel. SS distances himself from the threat by using negative politeness strategy 7 *"Avigdor Lieberman….said to you he had no information"*.

Strategy 5:*Give deference:*

This includes the use of title and names as address forms. It is used three times with DM. The title "Foreign Secretary" is used with DM at the opening of the interview to welcome the guest, to encode respect and as a way to introduce the guest to the audience.

SS: ***Foreign Secretary**, welcome to Hardtalk.*

DM: *Glad to be with you.*

The title of the guest is used by SS at the end of the interview in the course of expressing thanks, also it is used as a way of reminding the audience of the identity of the guest.

SS*:* ***Foreign Secretary****, thank you very much for being on Hardtalk.*

Title is used strategically by SS outside of greetings, attention getter, and farewell when he performs the FTA of interruption. Here "*Foreign Secretary*" initiated the interruption:

SS: ***But I'm sorry Foreign Secretary****, I know how you're, irritated cause I'm interrupting you a lot but ...*

SS never uses the title of GK in the opening or at the end of the interview:

SS: ***Ghassan Khattib*** *welcome to hard talk.*

SS uses the first and family name of his guest only without any formal addressing form such as Mr., or Minister . This "stripping" strategy is designed to set the two participants on equal footing. From the beginning till the end of the interview, the guest is present in his capacity as a conversant talking with a person who is in charge of the role of presenting the interview.

Strategy 7: *Impersonalize S and H:*

It is a way of indicating that S does not want to impinge on H . One way is to phrase the FTA as if the agent were other than S (Ibid. :196) .Here SS impersonalizes the verb and delete the agent:

DM: *Well the //...*

SS: *... the, the nub of the issue, and* ***it is still important*** *because we need to establish accountability, the nub of the issue is that MI5 sent operatives to talk to Binyam Mohamed when they knew that Binyam Mohamed had been abused, you can say tortured, by the US authorities.*

Another way of performing this strategy is when SS distances himself from the FTA of accusation, disagreement and blaming. This strategy is used about equally with both DM and GK- 19 times with DM and18 times with GK. This strategy is used with great frequency by SS with the two interviewers when he utilizes direct or indirect reported speech, and thus he presents himself as conveying the views of others:

SS: *No but that's not what I'm asking you. Will you publish the guidance that that operative was operating under in 2002?*

DM: *No because the civil …*

SS: *Why not?*

DM: *… because there are civil cases underway at the moment. In our system any British citizen has right to recourse to the law and you and I know it would be quite wrong to interfere with that …*

SS: ***Well the world is going to judge**, based on what they see unfold. Now **Trevor Phillips**, who has a role in this because he's the **Head of the UK's Equality and Human Rights Commission and he will ultimately be reporting on some of this to the United Nations**, he says, 'There must be an independent review as transparent to the public as possible. Given the UK's role', he says, 'as a world leader on human rights', his phrase, 'it would be inexplicable for the Government not to put in process an independent process to assess the truth of these very serious …*

In the above example SS asks DM if the administration is going to reveal the directions the British intelligence were operating under because the British public should be informed about this important issue. There are serious doubts that the British government cross legal red lines in pursuit of the post 9-11 war on terror and it was accused of working with US and overlooking torture and bad treatment of the detainees. SS distances himself from direct disagreement or agreement with DM. He presents the issue not as his personal concern but as a matter of general interest at large "*Well the world is going to judge*".

Another distancing technique is citing the view of the expertise in the subject. SS presents 'Trevor Phillips' as having first- hand knowledge of the issue concerning human rights in Britain. SS insinuates that the British Government is not clear and transparent about one sensitive issue concerning the behaviour of some security officials working for the British Government in the years after 9/11 which was against human rights. SS 's assertion threatens the reputation of Britain as a democratic state that acts according to international law and human rights standards. Therefore, he enhances the credibility of the viewpoint he is conveying by highlighting the authoritativeness of the third party and giving elaborate description of him as knowledgeable on the issue at hand.

In another example again SS asserts people ground for his conduct *"something deeply that has worried people"*, as if he is indirectly asking

what are you going to do as a Ministry of Foreign Affairs and as government concerning this important issue:

SS: *And quality of governance as well. You made great play when the Afghan Conference was held in, here in London not so many weeks ago of saying that Karzai and the Afghan Government must act on good governance and rooting out corruption, but what have we seen since? One of the main acts Karzai's taken in the last few weeks is announcing that he is taking control of the appointments to the Electoral Complaints Commission, something that has* ***deeply worried people*** *who watch Afghan politics. What have you said to him since then?*

Reference of the public is made frequently when SS presents his question as something either public wants or needs to know. This puts pressure on the interviewee to answer the questions or provide more information. Thus he could not disregard the question being asked by the interviewer. At the same time the interviewer distances himself from the question or the accusation encoded in the question.

SS: *But* ***your supporters want to know*** *if you still have the hunger because you were accused at different times over the last twelve months of, of bottling the opportunity to fight for the Labour leadership. They want to know if you still have the hunger …*

Again SS uses distance strategy to soften the FTA of accusation when he accuses DM of 'stretching the truth':

SS: *… is that not stretching the truth?* ***I mean Obama has indicated now that he would be satisfied with a temporary freeze and it would not necessarily have to include East Jerusalem*** *because Netanyahu has made it quite plain it won't include East Jerusalem and also Netanyahu has said it won't include housing starts which have already gone through the official planning pipeline.*

DM: *Well, well, no with, with great respect you're the one who's stretching the truth. You said that the American Administration were walking away from their demand …*

SS: *For a total and complete settlement freeze.*

The above example is remarkable because DM challenges SS's neutralistic stance. SS formulates his question in a negative way that entails an affirmative answer as if SS is saying that DM is stretching the

truth and this threatens the face of DM and on a larger scale the face of the Ministry which he represents. Negative question is among the most coercive forms of question design that an interviewer can employ (Clayman and Heritage,2002:209). SS does not end his turn with negative question but he tries to mitigate its affect. He moves from one strategy to another which is safer and less adversarial, they are hedging "*I mean*" and third party attributed statement " *Obama has indicated* ". But DM does not allow SS's accusation to pass peacefully and he regards SS's question "*is that not stretching the truth?*" as an assertion rather than as part of questioning turn and he attacks SS's "*you're the one who's stretching the truth*". SS by ignoring the accusation, he may appear to have no answer and he never defends himself.

In SS's interview with GK, he distances himself from the points that are opinionated, controversial or adversarial and he uses many distances techniques such us expertise, knowledgeable people, polls. Also he invokes the public when talking about sensitive issues. This pattern can be seen in the following example when SS accuses the Palestinian authority of being corrupted. Here it is the reputation of the government which is in danger and needs defending. SS avoids asserting this accusation on his own behalf, instead he makes use of distancing strategy by invoking the speech of Mohmood Abbas the leader of Palestine who confesses that there is corruption inside Palestinian authority :

GK: *There is very limited corruption there used to be, there has been enough reform activities within the Palestinian authority// that enable that anable*

SS: *Well Well that about* ***your own leader****, he says in his speech just the other day he said: "Yes, there is corruption we have the will and power to end it" but" he said there are still some people continuing to break the law and its time to ask them where their wealth comes from?*

SS tries to minimize the importance of the government's achievements concerning corruption and he presents the opposite point of view. GK defends his government stating that there were many reform steps inside the government, but SS emphasizes the point of corrupted members by citing the opinion of "Hassan Huraishy" who expresses his doubts concerning the government's reform. SS introduces him as a Palestinian

deputy speaker of the Palestinian legislative council and thus SS distances himself from threatening the face of the government by invoking the speech of a knowledgeable person:

SS: Well you may be proud about that some Palestinian people, we spoke on Hard Talk ***Hassan Huraishy*** *today, the first deputy speaker of the Palestinian legislative council. He told us that "Yes Mahmood Abbas is full of fine words, but" he said "Where is the delivery? Where are the members Arafaat old guards who have been put on trial, who have been convicted of serious corruption? He says these but this has not happened". Why has not this happened?*

The use of exclusive/inclusive 'we' is one of the negative politeness strategies in which the speaker avoids to use 'I' or 'you'. This tactic is never used with GK but there were a total of seventeen occurrences of inclusive/exclusive 'we' with DM. There are several examples of the inclusive use of 'we' to refer to 'us' and 'you', that is the interviewer and the interviewee. The frequent use of inclusive 'we' with DM can be explained in terms of the context and the relative roles and the positions of the participants. The interviewer is British and he is talking with the Foreign Secretary in the Foreign Office in London on a range of UK foreign policy topics. When SS uses inclusive 'we' he casts himself as a representative and mouthpiece of general public or as a representative of his country. This suggests that the interviewer and the interviewee are on the same side. The next example illustrates this:

SS: *But* ***we*** *worked with them when* ***we****, they,* ***we*** *knew that they had changed the rules in a way which* ***we*** *regarded as unlawful // ...*

DM**:** *Well no we// ....*

SS: *... but* ***we*** *continued to work with them ...*

DM: *... we came //...*

SS: *... and* ***we*** *did not blow the whistle*.

SS is blaming the foreign secretary and the British Government for their cooperativeness with the American Government that was accused of following illegal rules in its anti- terror operation which is deeply alarming to the British public. SS uses exclusive 'we' when he means plural 'you' to refer both to the interviewee and the British Government. SS does so to indicate solidarity (Brown and Levinson, 1978:207-8; Partington, 2003:62-3).

Sometimes SS strategically uses 'us' to mean plural 'you' to refer to the interviewee and his government, to redress insult. A very clear example

SS: *To put it bluntly the Israelis are playing* ***us*** *for fools aren't they?*

Sometimes SS changes to the use of 'you' which encodes less solidarity and more distance between the interviewer and the interviewee. SS strategically casts the responsibility of taking the important decision on the interviewee and on his administration. SS asks DM if they will uncover the directions that the British intelligence were operating under:

SS: *... will* ***you*** *publish that guidance?*

DM: *we are publishing the guidance that is extant today // ...*

SS: *No but that's not what I'm asking you. Will* ***you*** *publish the guidance that that operative was operating under in 2002?*

Strategy 10: *Go on record as incurring a debt:*

This strategy is embodied in the expression of gratitude in the closing of the interview. SS thanks the interviewees for their participation. This form of closing can be explained in terms of the impersonal and task-oriented character of the programme and it is used with both DM and GK.

SS: *Foreign Secretary,* ***thank you very much for being on Hard Talk****.*

DM: *thank you.*

SS: ***Thanks very much indeed*****.**

8.Discussion:

In SS's interview with GK he uses less politeness strategies because the ranking of the imposition and the FTAs are less than that in SS's interview with DM. SS does not use politeness strategies in most of the questions with GK because they show least risk to the interviewee. Many questions are designed to solicit the interviewee's point of view on the topic which the question raises. Some of the questions are very open like " *Why do you think Areal Sharoon is disengaging from Gaza?*" which exerts less pressure on the interviewee. In more dangerous FTAs SS exploits more politeness strategies with GK such us accusation of being corrupted, disagreement, interruption and criticism. Negative politeness strategy 7 is most frequently used by SS to distance himself from the FTA of criticism, accusation and disagreement. Also SS softens the FTA of interruption and topic change by using positive strategies (10) (*offer promise),*(12*)(include both S and H in the activity*) and (13) *(give reasons).*

I want to call attention to small but possibly important differences in the use of the deferential negative politeness strategy. SS never uses the title of GK in the opening or at the end of the interview which encodes less solidarity. SS uses the first and family name of his guest only without any formal addressing form. Whereas the title "*Foreign Secretary*" is used with DM at the opening of the interview to welcome the guest, to encode respect and as a way to present the guest to the audience

In SS's interview with DM he utilizes more politeness strategies, that is because the risk of the FTA encoded in the questions and assertions is high (cf. Brown and Levinson, 1987:78). Most of the questions are designed in such a style to exert pressure on the interviewee and they convey preference to one response over another. Such as questions that are framed using negative, interrogative syntax e.g. "*isn't this stretching the truth*?" which was treated as assertion an attacked by the interviewer. From the beginning of the interview SS challenges DM " *How Does that square with what we know about the behaviour of some security officials?*" This question is designed to accuse the interviewee and his government rather than searching for an answer. SS is talking about a very sensitive subject which was Britain's reputation as a democratic country that acts according to international law and human rights. Britain was accused of being complicit in torture with US. DM refuses SS's insinuation of behaving against law and he adopts defensive stance to strengthen the image of UK. SS expresses his disagreement by using negative strategy 7 when he cites information from other sources such as polls, leaders, expertise and knowledgeable persons. This strategy has the highest frequency of occurrence among other politeness strategies.

SS frequently uses inclusive or exclusive 'we' to show solidarity. Since the topic of the discussion is about countries 'we' could include reference to the interviewer's country UK. Also it is used to redress insult. In the heat of the interview, participants strive to have turns. When SS finds himself having to interrupt DM sometimes he tends to minimize the abruptness of the interruption by using politeness strategies, such as positive politeness strategies (1) *(Notice, attend, to H needs*), (5) *(seek agreement)*, (13) *(give reasons)*, and negative politeness strategies such as (5)*(give deference)* and (6) apologies. Acknowledgement token is

employed by SS not to agree with the interviewer but to claim the right to intervene and to interrupt and take turn from his interlocutor.

5-Conclusion:

On the whole politeness strategies occur more frequently per interview when the interviewee is from Europe especially Britain than when he is from the Middle East (Palestine). I think that is to do not mainly with the interviewer's bias with a specific host from a specific country, but with certain important demands and norms and certain practices that sustain the conduct of the interview. Politeness strategies are used slightly from time to time according to the situation. The choice of these strategies is made by SS on the basis of his assessment of the size of FTA. When the 'weightiness' of the FTA is great, SS tends to use more politeness strategies. He did so not only to mitigate the ranking of imposition, but also to cast credibility and objectivity and to guarantee the cooperation of the interviewee.

Abstract:

The present study concentrates on the politeness strategies utilized by the interviewer of BBC World's "Hard Talk" programme.

It is hypothesized that Stephen Sackur, the main presenter of "Hard Talk" programme, is biased in his coverage of the Middle East issues and he utilizes less politeness strategies with interviewees from the Middle East than he does with the interviewees from Britain.

The procedure consists of surveying the model that will be used in the analysis of the data. This includes in particular the model proposed by Brown and Levinson (1978). Also surveying the available literature on broadcast political interview. TV interviews in the "Hard Talk" programme were video recorded, transcribed and used as a sample text for the analysis. Then, data analysis was carried out and conclusion was set.

On the whole, politeness strategies occur more frequently per interview when the interviewee is from Europe especially Britain than when he is from the Middle East (Palestine). It has to do not mainly with the interviewer's bias with a specific host from a specific country, but with certain important demands and norms and certain practices that sustain the

conduct of the interview. In Stephen Sackur's interview with David Milliband, he utilizes more politeness strategies; that is because the risk of the face threatening act encoded in the questions and assertions is high. SS does not use politeness strategies in most of the questions with Ghassan Al-Khatib because they show least risk to the interviewee.

المستخلص

يتناول البحث (استراتيجيات التأدب) التي يستخدمها مقدم برنامج"Hard Talk" الذي تقدمه هيئة الإذاعة البريطانية . تفترض الدراسة ان (ستيفن ساكر) المقدم الرئيسي للبرنامج متحيز وغير حيادي في تغطيته للقضايا التي تتعلق بالشرق ألأوسط وهو يستخدم استراتيجيات تأدب اقل مع المتحاور من الشرق الأوسط بينما يستخدم استراتيجيات تأدب أكثر مع المتحاور من بريطانيا.

تم استقصاء الأدبيات المتوفرة عن تعريف ومعنى (التأدب) وكذلك استقصاء وتوضيح ألنموذج الذي يستخدم في تحليل مادة البحث والذي قدمه براون و ليفنسن (١٩٧٨). تم استقصاء الأدبيات الخاصة بحيادية المقابلات السياسية المذاعة. كما تم تسجيل المقابلات المختارة من برنامج Hard Talk» وقد جرى تدوين هذه المقابلات التي استخدمت كعينة للتحليل. ثم تم تحليل« المقابلات المختارة اعتمادا على النموذج المذكور. في ضوء النتائج المذكورة فقد خلص البحث الاستنتاجات التالية: ان المحاور يتبع استراتيجيات تأدبية اكثر مع المتحاور من بريطانيا بينما يتبع استراتجيات تأدبية اقل مع المتحاور من الشرق ألأوسط . أتضح من التحليل ان الاستخدام لاستراتيجيات التأدب لايعبر عن حيادية أو عدم حيادية المحاور. ان المحاور يتحدد بظروف ومتطلبات وممارسات تتعلق بأدارة المقابلة. في مقابلة ستيفن ساكر مع المحاور من بريطانيا يوظف المحاور الكثير من استراتيجيات التأدب لأن المتحاور يكون معرضا للتهديد بصورة كبيرة لذلك فأن المتحاور يحاول ان يقلل من التهديد المتضمن في الأسئلة عن طريق استخدامه لأستراتيجيات التأدب. أما في مقابلة ستيفن ساكر مع المتحاور من الشرق ألأوسط فهو يوظف استراتيجيات تأدبية أقل لان حجم التهديد في اسئلة المحاور هو اقل.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1978) Politeness "Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena". In E. N. Goody (ed.) *Question and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction* (pp. 56-311) Cambridge University Press.

Clayman, S (1990) " From Talk to Text: Newspaper Accounts of Reporter-Source Interactions". *Media, Culture and Society*,12 (1): 79-104.

_____ . (1992) "Footing in the achievement of neutrality: the case of news interview discourse." In P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds.) *Talk at Work* (pp. 163–98).Cambridge University Press.

Clayman, S. and J. Heritage (2002) *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Goffman, E. (1967) Interaction ritual: *Essay on Face- to Face Behavior*. New York. Doubleday.

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* (pp. 95–119), Vol.3. New York: Academic Press,.

Holmes, J. (1995) *Women, Men and Politeness*. London: Longman.

Kasper, G.(1990) "Linguistic politeness: current research issues", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14:193-218

Lakoff, Robin. (1975) *Language and Women's Face.* New York: Harper Row.

Leech, G. (1980) *Explorations in Semantics and Pragmatics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Paramasivam, SH. (2007) "A Discourse-oriented Model for Analysing Power and Politeness in Negotiation Interaction:A Cross-linguistic Perspective", Journal of Universal Language, 8:91-127.

Partington, A. (2002) *The Linguistics of Political Argument: The Spin-Doctor and the Wolf-Pack at the White House.* New York: Routledge.

Thomas, J. (1995) *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics.* New York: Longman.