

PERSPECTIVE IN THE DISCOURSE OF WAR: THE CASE OF COLIN POWELL¹

Camelia Suleiman and Daniel C. O'Connell

Abstract

The following article applies both quantitative and qualitative methods of research to markers of perspective in a TV interview of Colin Powell on the CNN *LARRY KING LIVE* program from November 26, 2001. Perspective is well established in phenomenology and social psychology; its starting point is the conviction that every utterance expresses a point of view. From previous research, we accept the dialogical nature of perspective (see O'Connell & Kowal 1998) and further argue that perspective can be observed through measures of orality and literacy and through referencing (name and pronoun reference). The following measures of orality and literacy are examined: Back channeling hesitations, interruptions, contractions and elisions, first person singular pronominals, interjections and tag questions, and turn transitions from interviewer to interviewee and vice versa. We argue further that Colin Powell's perspective stresses the division between "we" and "they" with regard to the then imminent involvement in Iraq. Theoretical implications are discussed.

Key words: Perspective, Television political interview, Dialogism, Orality/literacy, Referencing, The Middle East.

Introduction

This paper examines perspective in a television interview of Larry King with Colin Powell. Our perspectival approach assumes that every utterance expresses a point of view. The term is well established in phenomenology and social psychology. Earlier research on perspective and the political television interview emphasized the dialogic nature of perspective (see O'Connell & Kowal 1998). It also investigated indicators of perspective through markers of orality and literacy (see Alber, O'Connell, & Kowal 2002). This paper accepts the earlier premises and argues that markers of perspective can be investigated through referencing (name and pronoun reference) and not only through the markers of orality and literacy. The methods used here to investigate markers of orality and literacy and referencing are both quantitative and qualitative.

¹ The first author would like to thank Ben-Gurion University of the Negev and Smart Institute at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem for research grants that helped writing this article. Both authors would also like to thank Russell Lucas and Sabine Kowal as well as the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

The paper further argues that Powell's perspective is embedded in his political discourse and that researchers can uncover this embeddedness by means of studying the orality/literacy markers as well as referencing. Political actors seek power and one method of achieving this goal is through a hegemonic political discourse (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999). Thus, Powell's discourse will stress the division of who is with "us" and who is the "other" or "enemy" in order to justify the American military activities in the Middle East, perhaps against an international discontent with the USA military interventions in that part of the world (see also Caldas-Coulthard 2003).

Data

This paper takes as data set a CNN *Larry King Live* program. Larry King interviewed Secretary of State Colin Powell on November 26, 2001. Colin Powell discusses the Middle East peace process, terrorism, and Iraq. There are also brief references in this paper to an interview of Wolf Blitzer with Bill Clinton in CNN in January 12, 1993 shortly before Clinton's inauguration ceremony, and to excerpts from a short interview of Bernard Shaw with Colin Powell in CNN on February 10, 1993 at the beginning of the Clinton's administration when Colin Powell was still working at the Pentagon, but there were rumors that he wanted to retire (O'Connell, Kowal, & Dill forthcoming). Both are compared and contrasted with the Larry King interview. The present researchers rely on videotaped copies of the interviews in addition to derived transcripts. Rough drafts of the transcripts are available on Lexis-Nexis. From these, the researchers derive more accurate transcripts by repeated listening.

No one doubts the influence of the different types of media in shaping social attitudes towards current events, precisely because the mass media are sometimes the only source of information for so many people with different social backgrounds. Van Dijk (1993) argues that the political elites and their discourses derive their influence partly because of the "mediating" and at times "reinforcing" function of the mass media (Van Dijk 1993: 241; see also Van Dijk 2001; Wodak & Reisigl 2001). We chose the political television interview because it is a well-defined acceptable site for politicians to exert their points of view on current issues. Politicians do seek to be interviewed, and they are more likely to seek interviews on widely popular networks and with popular interviewees. *Larry King Live* on CNN fits this formula of a popular network and popular interviewers (see Suleiman 2000, and Wolfsfeld 1997 for further discussion).

The political television interview

Much has been written on the television political interview. It seems that in the effort to find a common denominator for the political interview, relevant differences have to some extent been ignored (see Clayman & Heritage 2002: 55 f.). Clayman and Heritage claim that the political interview has grown more adversarial in Britain and more deferential in the US in recent times. But that is not the entire story. For example, *Larry King Live* is characterized by friendly, light questions. Larry King avoids hard questions or questions that can embarrass his interviewees. His purpose in an interview is to 'humanize' the

interviewee.

What I find valuable about my style of interviewing is that before I get to the rest of the material - the sort of thing that everybody else covers in the first ten minutes - *I feel that I have humanized my subject*. I've opened him or her up to the audience, and in so doing I've created a context for whatever else they may say. (King 1988: 153-154; italics added)

An interview with Larry King gives the illusion that the interviewee is joining the audience in their living room. This is more in accordance with what Robin Lakoff describes as the conversationalization of the political interview (Lakoff 1990; see also Fairclough 1994, 1998).

O'Connell and Kowal, in earlier research attempted to operationalize "conversationalization". To this end they investigated the orality/literacy markers in political television interviews and found the following: a) that both interviewer and interviewee use markers of conceptual orality in their speech (see Koch & Oesterreicher 1994), b) that interviewees score much higher on the orality scale, c) that both interviewer and interviewee attempt to accommodate to the oral/literate style of each other (Alber et al. 2002; Kowal & O'Connell 1997; O'Connell & Kowal 1998, 2003), and d) that "an interviewer is expected to make use of orality markers differentially with a variety of interviewees and thereby to reflect variable intersubjectivity depending upon the interaction with the interviewee" (O'Connell et al. forthcoming).

Moreover, O'Connell and Kowal's research argues that the political television interview is, similar to all human communication, dialogic in nature and must be investigated dialogically. Dialogism is borrowed from Bakhtin, 1984 and it is understood as follows:

Any dyadic or polyadic interaction between individuals who are mutually co-present to each other and who interact through language (or some other symbolic means). (As cited in Linell 1998: 9)

Linell further argues that

Dialogism must be the overall framework for analyzing discourse and communication, and social life in general. (Linell 1998: 8, cited in O'Connell et al. forthcoming)

O'Connell and Kowal's measures of orality were the following: Pronominals, turn-initial words, hesitations, questions, emphatic and/ or repetitive yes and no, personal reference utterances (e.g., I think), relative number of syllables spoken, and interruptions and overlaps in turn taking. The relationship to dialogism is more self evident in some of these measures than others. However, the relative use of these measures between interviewer and interviewee enables us as researchers to empirically observe and explore this relationship (for further discussion see O'Connell et al., forthcoming).

Further, in agreement with earlier research, we use orality and literacy conceptually and much in parallel to informal/formal or colloquial/literate use of language, rather than as a mode of transmission of language. A television interview is orally transmitted, but that does not mean that it can be characterized conceptually as oral language. In this sense, one would expect that language use has both oral and literate elements to it. The question is "how does the interaction of orality/literacy play in interaction?" Further, we investigate the

political television interview as compared to natural conversation partly because of the tension created there between the oral and literate choices of language. On the one hand, since the interview takes place in the public domain, the interviewer and interviewee are pressed for formality and literacy. On the other hand, spontaneity, informality and orality are treasured in the discourse of politicians, especially when they want to appear close to their constituency (See also O'Connell et al. forthcoming; Jamieson 1984).

What is perspective?

Perspective entails that every utterance has a particular vantage point. This vantage point of view is in relation to both the physical and the socio-cultural world of the viewer. Graumann (2002: 25) defines perspective as follows:

A form of representation by which the parts of an object or the elements of a complex state of affairs and their interrelations are construed and presented as if seen from a given point of view.

What appears in any verbal interaction is always only a part of any individual's particular vantage point. A vantage point is very complex of necessity because of all the multiple determinants that enter into it; it only appears insofar as the communicative interaction allows it to appear. However, the dialogic nature of perspective always entails that it is socio-culturally rather than solely cognitively constructed (see also Levelt 1989; Clark 1996, 2002).

Perspective is primarily implicit in discourse and is only made explicit under certain circumstances. Graumann (2002: 29) explains that implicitness is inherent to perspective simply because perspective is about perceiving the world from a particular vantage point:

A first argument leads to the canonical situation of spatial perception and representation. If the original term of perspective refers to a representation of (part of) the world, not as it "is" (whatever that means), but as it appears from a given point of view, taken or held by whatever subject, then this point itself, although *constitutive* for the perspectival representation, remains *unrepresented* and, hence, psychologically *inconspicuous*.

Hence, one could well argue that the political television interview with its question/answer format is a good venue for revealing perspective (see also Farr 1990). This premise also takes into consideration the situatedness of human communication (Rommetveit 1974; Goffman 1981; Linell 2002). This is partly why the present researchers conduct both quantitative and qualitative analyses of their data: The qualitative analysis focuses on the local, situated level, and the quantitative analysis is more global and emphasizes the frequency of certain markers.

Linell (2002: 50) discusses some of the discursive means that evoke meaning in discourse. These means are: Sequentiality, syntactic constructions and the use of pronouns, prosody, metaphors, hints, presuppositions and inferences, and tautologies. Some of these discursive means are a reminder of Goffman's markers of keying and footing (Goffman 1974, 1981), and of O'Connell and Kowal's markers of orality (see for example, O'Connell & Kowal 1998). The present paper examines the following markers of orality for interviewer and interviewee - orality and literacy being two poles of

interviewer/interviewee perspectives: Back channeling, hesitations, interruptions, contractions and elisions, first person singular pronominals, interjections and tag questions (Table 1), and turn transitions from interviewer to interviewee and vice versa, (turn transitions being smooth with pause, smooth without pause, overlaps, successful interruptions and unsuccessful interruptions [Table 2]). These markers are adopted from O’Connell et al. forthcoming. The paper assumes that these markers are relative from one speaker to another, and that both interviewer and interviewee will adjust to each other’s style of orality/literacy markers’ use.

In addition, the paper examines referencing. Referencing is defined by, a) how both interviewer and interviewee address or refer to each other (Tables 3, 4), b) how the interviewer and the interviewee refer to themselves (Tables 5, 6), c) how both interviewer and interviewee refer to a third party (Tables 7, 8, 9, 10). The paper argues that referencing will also show adjustments between interviewer and interviewee. The markers of orality/literacy and referencing reflect an accommodation in perspective between interviewer and interviewee, or the homogenization of the political language, a discourse that inherently seeks domination (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999). Thus, Powell and King will show similar references with regard to USA administration officials and allies as compared to USA non-allies or enemies.

Markers of orality

Table 1 displays markers of orality in King and Powell’s interview and compares the results to Shaw and Powell’s interview. These markers are: Interruptions, hesitations, back channeling, contractions and elisions, first person singular pronominals, interjections, and tag questions.

Markers of Orality and Literacy: Number (#) and Percentage (%) of Syllables (Syl); Markers of Orality for Interviewers (Shaw and King) and Interviewee (Powell): Back channeling (BC), Hesitations (H), Interruptions (IR), Contractions and Elisions (C & E), First Person Singular Pronominals (FPSP), Interjections (IJ), and Tag Questions (TQ)

Speakers	#Syl	%Syl	BC Syl/BC	H Syl/H	IR Turns/IR	C&E Syl/C&E	FPSP Syl/FPSP	IJ Syl/IJ	TQ Syl/TQ
Shaw	260	14.0	--	--	--	43	87	--	--
Powell	1657	86.0	--	57	6	49	34	--	--
King	1449	17.5	362	47	4	34	121	724	724
Powell	6843	82.5	3421	37	24	61	66	1711	--

Table 1

Interruptions

In Table 1, one may note that interruptions were frequent on the part of Powell himself in the Shaw/Powell interview, whereas Shaw did not interrupt at all. Just the opposite occurs

in the King/Powell interview. King tries to interrupt every 4 turns, whereas Powell interrupts only every 24 turns.

A more detailed analysis in Table 2 indicates that more than 90% of the transitions to Powell were smooth, whereas only 65% of the transitions to King were smooth. The reason for the latter is to be found in King's successful (6) and unsuccessful (5) interruptions. With all these attempted interruptions, it is even the more noteworthy that Powell was able to maintain the floor for more than 82% of the syllables uttered in the entire interview. Still, the interruptions do not give an overly aggressive impression, but rather a friendly and informal one. King's comment on interruptions is as follows:

I interrupt whenever I feel the interview is dragging. I have to think of myself as the audience and rely on my own gut feeling. If I'm getting bored, probably my audience is, too. Finally, I never attack. Attacking is a gimmick that wears thin. If you probe guests without offending them, you're more likely to get truthful answers to your questions. When you attack, you create hostility and a return thrust, but you don't get much information. (King 1988: 138; see also Tannen 1989 on the meaning of interruptions)

The longer average pause time to Powell's transitions relative to King's ($0.44 > 0.32$ s) does not indicate a pure latency at all. In that event, fewer smooth transitions without a pause would be expected to correspond to the longer average transitional pause times. Just the opposite is the case. In other words, smooth transitions to Powell were more often without any pause than smooth transitions to King ($17 > 8$), but when Powell did pause initially, his pauses were more than a tenth of a second longer than King's ($0.44 > 0.32$ s). It is clear that we are dealing here with deliberate pauses to reflect or plan, not with automatic or articulatory pauses.

Hesitations

Table 2 outlines the categories of speech initiation by King and Powell. Speech initiations are as follows: Smooth transitions with pauses, smooth transitions without pauses, overlaps, successful interruptions and unsuccessful interruptions.

Categories of Speech Initiation: Frequencies (#) and Percentages (%) of Various Categories of Speech Initiation in the TV Interview of Colin Powell by Larry King; Mean Durations (*M*) and Standard Deviations (*SD*) in Seconds of the Smooth with Pause Category

Category	Larry King				Colin Powell			
	N	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	N	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Smooth with Pause	35	53.0	0.32	0.21	30	57.7	0.44	0.26
Smooth without Pause	8	12.1			17	32.7		
Overlap	12	18.2			3	5.8		
Successful Interruption	6	9.1			1	1.9		
Unsuccessful Interruption	5	7.6			1	1.9		
Total	66	100			52	100		

Table 2

In general, the occurrence of hesitations is not frequent in this interview. Nonetheless, compared to the Shaw/Powell interview (O'Connell et al. forthcoming), both King and Powell used more hesitations than Shaw and Powell: Shaw used no hesitations at all, whereas King used one every 47 syllables. With Shaw, Powell used a hesitation every 57 syllables, whereas he used one every 37 syllables with King. The greater number of hesitations in the King/Powell interview might have resulted from the spontaneity and relaxed atmosphere of King's interviews in general. But example # 1 exemplifies an even more and uncharacteristically frequent occurrence of hesitations in the present interview in response to the theme Iraq (hesitations in italics):

Example #1

K: . . . might we have to go on to Iraq might we

P: *III* Don't want to answer that
in the s' *in the* speculative manner that *UH* the question often comes to us
UH...

Powell's rate of hesitation here goes from the general frequency of one every 37 syllables to one every 5 syllables. A strikingly similar increase in rate of hesitation occurred already a decade earlier in a Wolf Blitzer/Bill Clinton interview in which a similar question about Iraq led to an increase from one hesitation every 33 syllables to one every 10 syllables on the part of Bill Clinton (O'Connell et al. forthcoming). Quite obviously, Iraq was then, as now a politically contentious topic. An increase in local hesitations clearly reflects this. Unlike in the Gulf War where the USA administration saw itself not only as an economic and military leader, but also a moral one (see Van Dijk 1993:76), this new war did not have an international consensus, and Powell is seemingly not at ease with that.

Other markers of orality

Table 1 shows a number of further markers of orality in both the present interview and, for purposes of comparison, in the Shaw/Powell interview reported by O'Connell et al. (forthcoming).

In general, back channeling occurs seldom if at all in news interviews. There are none at all in the Shaw/Powell interview. But in the present interview, there are 4 cases of back channeling by King and 2 by Powell. They are all clearly indicative of a characteristically oral engagement: Light hearted, friendly, and informal on the part of both interviewer and interviewee.

Both King and Powell use a relatively moderate rate of contractions and elisions (see O'Connell et al. forthcoming). In a paradoxical reversal of orality level, however, King uses contractions and elisions relatively more frequently than does Powell. Once again, it is King who sets the mood of informal friendliness in his program, even with such a distinguished guest as Colin Powell and on such serious issues as war and terrorism.

King is minimally self-referential. Compared to Shaw and to Powell in both interviews, he uses far fewer first-person singular pronominals (King uses the pronoun 'I'

13 times and Powell 104 times, see Tables 5 and 6). This is completely in accord with King's role as interviewer and elicitor of Powell's own personal perspective.

King uses 2 and Powell 4 interjections in this interview. By contrast, there are no interjections in the Shaw/Powell interview; it is a very earnest, businesslike, and literate interview.

Finally, there are no tag questions in the Shaw/Powell interview. It is not surprising that in the present interview too Powell uses none. In fact, he asks only one question of King in the entire interview, a matter of needed clarification ("UH, gone where?"). Instead, his utterances are strictly expository replies to King's questions. King uses only two tag questions, but even this small number is more than any other interviewer we have encountered, with the exception of Tim Sebastian on BBC *HARDtalk*, who uses a large number of them (Suleiman, O'Connell & Kowal 2002).

Referencing

In this article we use referencing to describe how the interviewer and interviewee address or refer to each other, how each one of them refers to himself and how each one of them refers to a third party. Third parties can be people in the administration, allies (the Russians) and enemies (the Iraqi regime or terrorists at large).

King and Powell addressing or referring to each other

Tables 3 and 4 provide details of King and Powell addressing or referring to each other.

Larry King Addressing/Referring to Colin Powell

Reference	Number	Percentage
You / Your [singular]	36	51.4
You [Powell + Administration]	3	4.3
Mr. + Position	4	5.7
United States+ Full Position + First Name + Last Name	1	1.4
Full Position+ First Name+ Last Name	6	8.6
He/Him	1	1.4
We [King+ Powell]	1	1.4
We/Our [King+ Powell+ American Administration+ American Public]	18	25.7
Total	70	99.9

Table 3

Colin Powell Addressing Larry King

Reference	Number	Percentage
First Name	7	53.8
Mr. + Last Name	1	7.7
You [singular]	5	38.5
Total	13	100.0

Table 4

King’s opening

According to Clayman and Heritage (2002), the opening of a news interview marks the interaction “as a prescheduled, impersonal, and highly formal encounter” (Clayman & Heritage 2002: 94), and “interview openings are monologic rather than interactional” (65). Neither appears to be the case for the opening of the King/Powell interview:

Example #2

- K: we’re at the John Quincy Adams reception Room United States Department of State Washington DC and it’s our special pleasure to have as our guest Secretary of State Colin Powell we are old friends but I will call him Mr. Secretary
- P: thank you Larry
- K: ah you’re welcome you
- P: I’ll call you Mr. King
- K: ok
no no don’t do that first before we get to anything else how does this job compare to all the other posts you’ve held

Protocol actually required that Powell be addressed as Mr. Secretary (see Cohen 1987: 122 f.). Powell consistently addressed King as Larry (seven times) throughout the interview. But in any event, the opening is highly interactional and does not come across as “a prescheduled, impersonal, and highly formal encounter”.

Throughout the interview King addressed Powell with the second person singular and not once with his first name. On the other hand, Powell addressed King seven times with his first name, and five times with the second person singular. The lack of reciprocity in using the first name is in accordance with the literature on address form. Most literature argues that the asymmetry in address forms reflects an asymmetrical power relation, in other words, the higher in power may address the lower in power with first name, vis-à-vis less formally, but the lower in power may not reciprocate (see Wardhaugh 2000). This seems the case in this interview. Colin Powell in his capacity as Secretary of State has more institutional power than Larry King. Relatedly, Akiba Cohen (1987), asked interviewees about what they think of interviewees addressing them with their first names. Interviewees remarked that the interviewees do it to suggest to the audiences at home that

the interviewer and interviewee share the same opinions. Cohen also commented that interviewers do not appreciate being addressed with their first names on record. This is not clear in King's case because of the friendly tone of the interview.

King and Powell referring to themselves

Tables 5 and 6 address the issue of how King and Powell refer to themselves.

Larry King Referring to Himself

Reference	Number	Percentage
I	13	30.2
We [King+ Powell]	1	2.3
We/ Our/ Us [King+ Powell+ American Administration and/or American public]	18	41.9
We/ Our/ Us [King+ Audience]	7	16.3
We [the Program]	4	9.3
Total	43	100.0

Table 5

Colin Powell Referring to Himself

Reference	Number	Percentage
I/ my/ myself	104	42.8
We [Powell+ King]	1	0.4
We/ our/ us [Powell and/ or American Administration and/ or American public]	92	37.9
We/ our/ us [Powell and /or American allies and /or international community]	17	7.0
You/ your [indefinite]	28	11.5
First+ Last name	1	0.4
Total	243	100.0

Table 6

King referred to himself with 'I' 13 times (30.2% of all references to himself). Powell, on the other hand, referred to himself with 'I' 104 times (42.8% of all references to himself). This discrepancy in the use of 'I' between interviewer and interviewee is in agreement with earlier research on television interviews (O'Connell et al. forthcoming). Interviewees generally score higher on the orality scale, and the pronoun 'I' is associated more with an oral style (see Chafe 1986). Accordingly, King referred to himself in the first

person singular once every 121 syllables and Powell did so once every 66 syllables - almost twice as often (see Table 1 for these indices).

Larry King, in addition, uses inclusive 'we' 18 times to refer to himself and the American administration and/or public, seven times to refer to himself and the audience, four times to refer to himself and the program, and once to refer to himself and Colin Powell. This adds up to 30 times of inclusive 'we' (69.8% of all occurrences of King's self referencing; see Table 5). This is in contrast to Clayman and Heritage's (2002) claim of the neutral stance of questioning in television news interviews. They claim that the question/answer format of the television news interview serves the purpose of maintaining a neutralistic stance for interviewers (but see O'Connell & Kowal forthcoming). However, Cohen (1987: 19) observes:

The interviewer generally assumes the role of questioner and tends not to express his or her opinion. ...in the case of the journalistic interviewer, however, the reporter often has well defined opinions that he or she expresses in the course of the interview.

On the other hand, Powell uses the same inclusive 'we' 92 times to include himself in the American public and the American administration, 17 times in identification with the international community against terror, and once to refer to himself and Larry King. This adds up to 110 times of inclusive 'we' (45.3% of all occurrences of self reference in Powell's speech; see Table 6).

Even though King addresses Powell with the singular 'you' 39 times (Table 3), Powell responds with inclusive 'we' 110 times, and with 'I' 104 times (Table 6). He perhaps perceives himself in his capacity as Secretary of State as representing the American people or administration almost as much as he perceives himself as an individual. In addition, he refers to himself with the indefinite 'you' 28 times, and once he refers to himself as Colin Powell (Table 6). This is a more formal/literate form of address and of pronoun use (see Wilson 1990, and Suleiman 1999, 2000 for more discussion of indefinite 'you').

King and Powell referring to third parties

Tables 7 and 8 describe third party reference for both King and Powell with regard to the US administration, Russia, Iraq, Israel and Palestine, and terrorism. The pronoun 'they' when described as definite means a reference to specific persons mentioned earlier in the interview. Indefinite means a reference to a group generically, possibly, e.g., the Russians, the Palestinians.

Larry King Referring to Third Parties

Reference	Number	Sum	Percentage
The Administration			
First + Last Name	4		
Last Name	3		
The President			
This President	2		
He/ Him	3		
The Bush Administration	1		
We [King + Administration + American people]	18		
Total		31	47.0
The Russians			
Nationality	5		
They [definite]	4		
Mr. + Last Name	1		
Last Name	1		
Total		11	16.7
Iraq			
Place	4		
There	1		
Last Name	1		
He	5		
They [indefinite]	1		
Total		12	18.2
Terrorism/ Terrorists			
First + Last Name	2		
He	1		
Terrorism / Terrorists	5		
They [indefinite]	1		
Total		9	13.6
Israel/Palestine			
Nationality [Palestinian]	1		
Place [Israel]	2		
Total		3	4.5
Total of all third party referencing		66	100.0

Table 7

Colin Powell Referring to Third Parties

Reference	Number	Sum	Percentage
The Administration			
We (Powell + Administration and/or American people)	92		
Position + Last Name	8		

Mr/Ms/Dr + Last Name	8		
He/Her/His/Hers	20		
Position	11		
Full Position	1		
First + Last Name	5		
They [definite]	7		
Total		152	57.4
The Russians			
Nationality	2		
They [Russians, definite]	13		
They [Russians + Americans, definite]	6		
Position + First + Last Name	1		
Position + Last Name	7		
He/ Him	2		
Place	1		
Total		32	12.1
Iraq			
Place	3		
It	1		
First + Last Name	2		
He/His/Him	6		
They [indefinite]	6		
Iraqi people/ Iraqis	5		
Iraqi regime	3		
Baghdad	1		
Total		27	10.2
Terrorism/ Terrorists			
First + Last Name	2		
He/Him	6		
Terrorism / Terrorists	8		
They/Those/Them/Their/Themselves [indefinite]	19		
Al-Qaida network	1		
The organization	1		
Total		37	14.0
Israel/Palestine			
Place [Israel only]	3		
Nationality [Palestinians]	5		
They [Palestinians, indefinite]	4		
Nationality [Israeli]	1		
Position + First + Last Name [Israeli]	1		
He/Him Israeli]	3		
Total		17	6.4
Total of all third party referencing		265	100.1

Table 8

Tables 9 and 10 take the categories of Tables 7 and 8 and divide them into definite and indefinite references. The definite entity means reference to a particular individual or individuals in a group. The indefinite entity means reference to a group in the generic sense.

Larry King Referring to Third Parties as Definite or Indefinite Entities

Reference	USA	Russia	Israel	Palestine	Iraq	Terrorists	Total
Definite	12	2	0	0	6	3	23
Indefinite	1	9	2	1	6	6	25
Total	13	11	2	1	12	9	48

Table 9

Colin Powell Referring to Third Parties as Definite or Indefinite Entities

Reference	USA	Russia	Israel	Palestine	Iraq	Terrorists	Total
Definite	60	29	4	0	8	9	110
Indefinite	9	3	4	9	19	28	72
Total	69	32	8	9	27	37	182

Table 10

Major third party referencing

Powell refers more to administration than King, and King refers to both Russia and Iraq more than Powell. The percentage of 'we'/ administration reference is about the same for King (41.9%, Table 5) and Powell (37.9%, Table 6), but not the percentage of 'we'/ third parties (27.3% and 34.7%, Tables 7 and 8).

Larry King refers to people in the administration by their first and last name, or collectively as the Bush administration. King's referencing is formal, but it is less formal than Powell's. They are both following the protocol, but perhaps King used less formality to develop the friendly "conversationalized" tone of his interview.

The contrast between reference to Iraq and Russia in both King's and Powell's (more so in Powell's) discourse is worth noting. The Russians are mentioned by King by nationality four times and by specific people in the government twice (formally with their title and last name or with their last name only), and with 'they' in reference to specific individuals twice. The Iraqis on the other hand, are mentioned four times as a place, once by the last name of the Iraqi president and five times by 'he' in reference to Hussein, and by the indefinite 'they' once.

As for Powell, he refers to the Russians by nationality twice, 'they' in reference to specific individuals in the Russian government thirteen times, and 'they' in reference to specific people in the Russian government and the American administration six times. The joint 'they' indicates the closeness and cooperation between the Russian and the American

governments. Powell also mentions positions and last names or position and first and last names eight times, 'he' twice, and Russia as a place five times.

Iraq is mentioned three times as place by Powell, Saddam Hussein once, 'he' in reference to Saddam Hussein six times, the indefinite 'they' six times (the indefinite 'they' was not used in reference to the Russians), and by the Iraqi people five times (the Russians as Russian people were not mentioned in Powell's speech). The Russians are referred to as specific persons in the Russian government, or formally by position and/or first and last name. The Iraqi people are generically referred to, and if they are defined, it is in reference to Saddam Hussein or the regime. Iraq/Baghdad as a place and as a metonymy for the regime was mentioned four times. Russia as a place was mentioned once, but Moscow was not mentioned at all as metonym for the government. These differences between referencing Russia and Iraq indeed reflect Powell's perspectives on the forthcoming issue of the war on Iraq. In addition, there is a correspondence between King's usage and Powell's in referencing Iraq, although their referencing to Russia is considerably different and the chi square significance reflects this discrepancy (Table 12).

Terrorism

King mentions Osama Bin Laden by first and last name twice, terrorism/terrorists five times and the indefinite 'they' once. Powell mentions Bin Laden by first and last name also twice, and 'he' in reference to Bin Laden six times, terrorism/terrorists eight times and the indefinite 'they' nineteen times. This prevalent use of indefinite 'they' is perhaps motivated by a perspective of 'us' and 'them', where 'we' stands for the 'good' and is well defined against 'them' which is undefined, faceless and 'bad'. Or as George Lakoff puts it,

This situation [the war on terrorism] does not fit our understanding of a "war." There are "enemies" and "casualties" all right, but no enemy army, no regiments, no tanks, no ships, no air force, no battlefields, no strategic targets and no clear "victory." The war frame just doesn't fit. *Colin Powell had always argued that no troops should be committed without specific objectives, a clear and achievable definition of victory, a clear exit strategy - and no open-ended commitments* But he has pointed out that none of these is present in this "war." Because the concept of "war" doesn't fit. (Lakoff 2001; emphasis added).

Thence arises the need for a search for other linguistic methods to convey the necessity of war. Portraying the enemy in generic terms and not in personalized references makes it easier to deal with the evil of war. The enemy is faceless (see also Glover 2002; Halliday 2000).

Further, Caldas-Coulthard has observed that right after the September 11 terrorist attacks politicians in the media

refer to 'we' *the civilized world, the 'free democracies', 'the West', 'the free world'*, in contrast with 'the other' Eastern countries, where the terrorists may come from. This bipolarization or dichotomy relates to metonymic processes, . . . , 'whereby one element (the USA) stands for another entity - supposed collectivity labeled "free democracies", whose real world reference however, is not determinate', but excludes or classifies negatively the 'others'. (Caldas-Coulthard 2003: 272; see also Said 2001; Roy 2001).

Israel/Palestine

Israel/Israelis always precedes Palestinians. Neither Powell nor King mentions Palestine as a name of a place. Powell initiates the topic of the Palestinian/Israeli issue, and King allows him to talk. King refers to Israel twice as a name of a place, but in contrast he mentions a Palestinian state. In other words, Palestine does not get mentioned as separate entity in contrast to Israel. Rather, it is mentioned in the adjective form as Palestinian. It is to be noted that Palestinians *do* refer to their home as Palestine in spite of the fact that it is not yet an independent state. However, it seems that neither Larry King, nor Colin Powell take that into consideration in this context.

For Powell, Israel as a place is mentioned three times, Israeli once; Palestine is not mentioned at all, Palestinians five times and 'they' as the indefinite collective Palestinians four times. 'They' as the collective Israeli is not used at all. In addition there is one mention of the Israeli Prime minister by position, first and last name. No equivalent usage is found for the Palestinian side. This is quite in accord with the way the USA media in general portray the conflict. At best, the Palestinians are often viewed "as the underdogs whose legitimate claims to territory another state has usurped" (Kaplan 2003: 88).

To sum up the use of definite and indefinite references, Powell has greater than or equal definite than indefinite references for the USA, Russia and Israel. For Palestine, Iraq, and Terrorists, he has the reverse: Indefinite more than definite. King's data are not as clear in this regard (see Tables 9 and 10).

Chi square analyses further highlight the contrast between the use of definite and indefinite references with regard to the USA administration, Russia, Iraq, Israel, Palestine and terrorists (Tables 11 and 12). In all cases, $df = 1$ (chi square frequencies were derived from Tables 9 and 10).

Chi Square Analysis within Powell of References to Third Parties as Definite or Indefinite Entities

Between	Chi Square	<i>p</i> <
Palestine & Israel	5.88	.025
USA & Terrorists	41.58	.001
USA & Palestine	33.91	.001
USA & Iraq	30.87	.001
USA & Russia	0.28	<i>ns</i>
USA & Israel	6.98	.010

Table 11

USA and Russia are the same on this dimension. All the others are different. One exception is Israel and Palestine as indicated by their variation from one another.

Chi Square Analysis between Powell and King

Between	Chi Square	<i>p</i> <
USA	0.29	1 ns
Terrorists	0.30	1 ns
Palestine	not possible	
Iraq	1.50	1 ns
Russia	21.35	0.001
Israel	1.67	1 ns

Table 12

In other words, Powell and King are largely consistent in their views of these entities as expressed in the definite/indefinite dimension of reference. The one glaring exception is King’s different pattern in this regard with respect to Russia.

Examples of third party referencing

Qualitative analysis supports these findings. The following discussion of an imminent war on Iraq shows how King and Powell are attuned to each other in their reference to Iraq and how the ‘we’ and ‘they’ are contrasted. We have italicized the relevant references.

Example # 3:

- K: all right *President Bush* when asked what would happen if uh *Iraq* does not allow inspectors in uh *Hussein* did not allow inspectors in *he* said that today quote *he’ll* find out end quote
- P: that’s an excellent answer *he’ll* find out
- K: what does that mean
- P: well *the President* didn’t say what it meant today so I’m not going to prejudge what it might mean but *we* have been pressing *Iraq* for uh the last several years since 1998 when *they* threw the inspectors out to let the inspectors back in the inspectors are not there to to to to do anything harmful to *the Iraqi people* the inspectors are going back in for one single purpose and that’s to make sure that *Iraq* is complying with the agreements *it* made at the end of the Gulf War to give up all weapons of mass destruction activity and the only way *we* can be sure of that is the inspectors go back in and are allowed to do their work the way they see it proper to do their work and that’s what these UN resolutions are about and that’s what the economic sanctions are about

King introduces the topic of Iraq through reference to the place name as metaphor for one person (as the repair shows in the first two lines), namely the Iraqi president who had the power to let the UN inspectors do their work or not. In other words, Iraq is substituted for by Hussein and later ‘he’ in reference to Hussein, whereas the president of

the USA gets mentioned by his position and last name and not as synonymous to the American people. Powell's reference is in agreement with King with regard to reference to Iraq. He refers to Hussein as 'he', and then refers to Iraq as a whole with regard to defying the UN, 'they', the Iraqi people, Iraq, whereas the president of the USA gets mentioned as 'the President' since Larry King already introduced him in the discourse, and then 'we' to refer to Powell, the administration and a third entity, perhaps the UN. The 'we/us' is definite, or at least partly definite, whereas 'them' is wholly undefined.

The next example contrasts the relation to Russia,

Example # 4:

- K: you talked to *the your Russian counterpart* today about sanctions on *Iraq*
 P: yes
 K: can you tell us anything about that
 P: well I talk to uh *foreign minister Igor Ivanov* uh frequently I this is the second time *we've* spoken in the last five days as you know, the current sanctions uh rollover period expires at the end of this month uh which is the end of this week and so *he and I* have been working on uh what the new rollover should look like and *we're* talking to *our* other friends on the Security Council

King refers to the Russian counterpart, an undefined entity, but then repairs it to 'your'. Powell refers to specific individuals in the Russian government with full position and full name. However, King's usage of the repair 'the your' and 'counterpart' triggers a response from Powell with reference to specific individuals with specific functions.

Conclusions

Our evidence has empirically shown that perspective is discursively present, cognitively and socio-culturally constructed, highly important to argumentation, and measurable in terms of the scale of orality/literacy and in terms of referencing. In addition, the paper showed that:

- a) Markers of orality were found in both of the interviewer's and the interviewee's speech, namely back channeling, hesitations, interruptions, contractions and elisions, first person singular pronominals, interjections, tag questions, and turn transitions. However, King uses more back channeling, contractions, elisions, and interruptions, perhaps to set the friendly tone of the interview, but at the same time he is less self-referential than Powell, possibly as a means to elicit Powell's perspective.
- b) Both interviewer and interviewee adjusted their markers of orality to each other, in other words, their use of interjections, hesitations, contractions etc. maintained the friendly tone of the interview.
- c) Both interviewer and interviewee were attuned to each other in terms of their usage of referencing. The discrepancy in the usage of definite and indefinite references

with regard to USA allies and non-allies or enemies is highlighted in both Powell's and King's speech. Qualitative analysis of referencing Russia as compared to Iraq further supported the quantitative findings.

The paper also found that Powell's discourse divided the world into "us" - the USA and its allies (Russia and Israel) and "them" (Iraq, Palestine, and Terrorists). King's usage is generally similar except for Russia, and for Palestine (in which case the data are insufficient for a chi square test), though a closer look at specific adjacency pairs dealing with Russia showed adjustment in King and Powell's speech. When the enemy is faceless it is easier to justify an attack in the absence of other evidence. Allies were referred to as specific individuals and not as unknown, anonymous entities. This is in accordance with Chouliaraki and Fairclough's (1999) argument that political discourse seeks hegemony and consensus, and with Graumann's (2002) argument regarding the implicitness of perspective. In addition, the division of the world in terms of "we" (standing for everything positive,) and "they" (standing for everything negative) has been critically noted in the discourse of politicians from Western countries (see for example, Caldas-Coulthard 2003). The present research adds a quantitative measure to that literature.

Colin Powell's differential reference to Iraq, Palestine and terrorism as opposed to Russia, the USA administration and Israel reflects largely USA policy towards the Middle East. The USA has been criticized for waging the war against terrorism in Afghanistan, and later in Iraq and for generally siding with Israel with regard to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict (See Said 2001, 2002).

To sum up, the paper argues that markers of orality and literacy can reveal perspective. The markers studied are: Back channeling, hesitations, interruptions, contractions and elisions, first person singular pronominals, interjections and tag questions, and turn transitions from interviewer to interviewee and vice versa. These markers are used differentially between interviewer and interviewee. It is precisely this relative use of these markers between interviewer and interviewee that allows researchers to empirically examine perspective. Further, the paper shows that perspective can be studied through referencing as well. Referencing revealed a perspective, particularly with regard to Powell with political implications for the USA's positions regarding the Middle East. Colin Powell's political perspective is also revealed through his hesitations and the repetitive use of first person singular pronoun with regard to a question on an upcoming war in Iraq (see example # 1).

Several interesting questions arise from this research: How is an interview managed when both interviewer and interviewee are not attuned to each other in perspective, such as when an Israeli is interviewed on an Arab network, or vice versa, and how is that going to be reflected in their use of orality markers and referencing? One would assume a great discrepancy between the interviewer and interviewee with regard to these markers. Another question would follow: Is perspective going to be less implicit and easier to uncover in that case?

References

- Alber, J., D. O'Connell, and S. Kowal (2002) Personal perspective in TV news interviews. *Pragmatics* 12.3: 257-271.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981) *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist, ed. M. Holquist). Austin, TX: Texas University Press.
- Caldas-Coulthard, C. (2003) Cross-cultural representation of 'otherness' in media discourse. In G. Weiss and R. Wodak (eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity*. Great Britain: Palgrave, pp. 272-296.
- Chafe, W. (1986) Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. In W. Chafe and J. Nichols (eds.), *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 261-272.
- Chouliaraki, L., and N. Fairclough (1999) *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Clark, H. (1996) *Using language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, H., and M. Ven der Wege (2002) Psycholinguistics. In D. Medin (ed.), *Steven's handbook of experimental psychology: Memory and cognitive processes*. Vol. 2, 3rd ed.. New York: Wiley, pp. 209-259.
- Clayman, S., and J. Heritage (2002) *The news interview: Journalists and public figures on the air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, A. (1987) *The television news interview*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.
- Fairclough, N. (1994) Conversationalization of public discourse and the authority of the consumer. In R. Keat, N. Whiteley and N. Abercrombie (eds.), *The authority of the consumer*. London: Routledge, pp. 253-268.
- Fairclough, N. (1998) Political discourse in the media: An analytical framework. In A. Bell and P. Garrett (eds.), *Approaches to media discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 142-162.
- Farr, R. (1990) The social psychology of the prefix "inter": A prologue to the study of dialogue. In I. Markova and K. Foppa (eds.), *The dynamics of dialogue*. New York: Springer-Verlag, pp. 25-44.
- Glover, R. (2003) The War On---. In J. Collins and R. Glover (eds.), *Collateral Language: A user's guide to America's new war*. New York and London: New York University Press, pp. 207-222.
- Goffman, E. (1974) *Frame analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Graumann, C. (2002) Explicit and implicit perspectivity. In C. Graumann and W. Kallmeyer (eds.), *Perspective and perspevation in discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 25-40.
- Halliday, F. (2000) *Nation and religion in the Middle East*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Jamieson, K. (1984) *Packaging the presidency: A history and criticism of presidential advertising*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kaplan, A. (2003) Homeland insecurities: Reflections on language and space. *Radical History Review* 85 (winter 2003): 82-93.

- King, L. (1988) *Tell it to the King: Larry King with Peter Occhiogrosso*. New York: G.P. Putnam's.
- Koch, P., and W. Oesterreicher (1994) Schriftlichkeit und Sprache. In G. Gunther and L. Otto (eds.), *Schrift und Schriftlichkeit. Writing and its use. Ein interdisziplinäres Handbuch internationaler Forschung*. An interdisciplinary handbook of international research, 1. Halbband/Volume 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 587-604.
- Kowal, S., and D. O'Connell (1997) Theoretical ideals and their violation: Princess Diana and Martin Bashir in the BBC interview. *Pragmatics* 7.3: 309-323.
- Lakoff, G. (2001) Metaphors of terror. September 16, 2001 (www.press.uchicago.edu/News/911lakoff.html.)
- Lakoff, R. (1990) *Talking power: The politics of language in our lives*. New York: Basic Books.
- Levelt, W.J.M. (1989) *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Linell, P. (1998) *Approaching dialogue: Talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspectives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Linell, P. (2002) Perspectives, implicitness and recontextualization. In C. Graumann and W. Kallmeyer (eds.), *Perspective and perspectivation in discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 41-58.
- O'Connell, D., and S. Kowal (1998) Orality and literacy in public discourse: An interview of Hannah Arendt. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30: 543-564.
- O'Connell, D., and S. Kowal (2003) Psycholinguistics: A half century of monologism. *American Journal of Psychology* 116: 191-212.
- O'Connell, D., and S. Kowal (Forthcoming) The research status of Clayman and Heritage's (2002). *The news interview*.
- O'Connell, D., S. Kowal, and E. Dill (Forthcoming) Dialogicality in TV news interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Reisigl, M., and R. Wodak (2001) *Discourse and discrimination: Rhetoric of racism and anti-Semitism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Rommetveit, R. (1974) *On message structure: A framework for the study of language and communication*. London: Wiley.
- Roy, A. "The algebra of infinite justice. *The Guardian*. September 29, 2001.
- Said, E. Islam and the West are inadequate banners. *The Observer*, September 16, 2001.
- Said, E. Low point of powerlessness. *Al-Ahram Weekly*, October 1, 2002.
- Suleiman, C. (1999) Pronouns and self presentation in public discourse: Yasser Arafat as a case study. In Yasir Suleiman (ed.), *Language and Society in the Middle East and North Africa*. London: Curzon Press.
- Suleiman, C. (2000) Pronoun use in television interviews: Social interaction and the Middle East peace process. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Georgetown University: Washington D.C.
- Suleiman, C., D. O'Connell, and S. Kowal (2002) "If you and I, if we, in this later day, lose that sacred fire...": Perspective in political interviews. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 31: 281-299.

Tannen, D. (1989) *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Dijk, T. (1993) *Elite discourse and racism*. London: Sage Publications.

Van Dijk, T. (2001) Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and H. Hamilton (eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 352-371.

Wardhaugh, R. (2002) *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wilson, J. (1990) *Politically speaking: The pragmatic analysis of political language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wolfsfeld, G. (1997) *Media and political conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.