WHOSE SIDE ARE WE ON? VIEWERS' REACTIONS TO THE USE OF IRONY IN NEWS INTERVIEWS

Galia Hirsch

Abstract

This research seeks to identify and analyze the reaction to irony in Israeli political news interviews, in view of the specific nature of this genre, which has been known to allow a certain level of adversarialness (Liebes et al. 2008; Blum-Kulka 1983; Weizman 2008; Clayman &Heritage 2002a and 2002b). Our intention was to examine whether the audience regards the use of irony as over-aggressive, and whether they believe interviewees regard it as such, in order to shed light on the potential consequences the use of indirect discourse patterns has for the interviewer.

Based on Goffman's (1981) notion of footing, and on the concept of positioning as defined by Weizman (2008: 16), we focused on the audience's capacity to grasp the positioning and repositioning in the interaction as a possible influential factor in their reaction to the employment of irony. The research is based on two conceptual paradigms: Media studies and pragmatic studies of irony.

The findings indicate that Israeli audiences tend to regard interviewers' employment of irony in political interviews as slightly hostile, and as such it is viewed as a possible threat to interviewees' face (Goffman 1967), but also as a legitimate and comprehensible tool, especially when the irony is accompanied by humor or mitigating non-verbal signs. Hence, the risk for the interviewer is not as great as we assumed. Accordingly, viewers also tended to judge interviewees' conception of the employment of irony as only slightly adversarial, perhaps because they have assumed the interviewees' attitude towards the interaction, identified with them and chosen their side.

Keywords: Media; Political news interviews; Irony; Hostility.

1. Introduction

This paper focuses on the reaction to irony in political news interviews, examining the case of the Israeli media from the audience's point of view, seeking to discover whether the audience regards the use of irony as over-aggressive, and whether they believe interviewees regard it as such.

In order to understand the implications of the use of irony in political interviews for audiences and interviewers in terms of its detection and reaction[1] towards it – that is to say, whether audiences conceive it as over-aggressive or believe interviewees consider it as such – an experiment was conducted whereby fifty Israeli students were

---

[1] For the study of the detection of irony see Hirsch & Blum-Kulka (2014).

presented with three interviews and their reactions towards them were tested through a questionnaire. It was assumed that if irony is considered too hostile by the audience, its employment might be dangerous for the interviewer.

In what follows we present the rationale for the experiment, its method, and the results. Our findings indicate that in the case of Israeli political news interviews, audiences tend to regard irony only as slightly hostile, especially when accompanied by humor or mitigating non-verbal signs.

As opposed to other studies, such as Weizman's (2008) investigation of the employment of irony and reaction towards it of interviewers and interviewees, in this presentation we seek to investigate viewers' reaction to irony authored by interviewers and directed towards interviewees, in order to understand what it implies for the former, in terms of its detection and attitude towards it.

The present contribution purports to provide an answer for the following questions:

(1) The implications the use of irony has for the audience and interviewee, and whether it is in the interviewer best interest or not, how audiences react to it, including the possibility of them considering it over-adversarial.

(2) Audiences' sensitivity to positioning and keying as a determinant factor in the employment of irony in political interviews.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. *Hostility in political interviews*

The genre of news interview has been studied from various angles, which were briefly introduced in a former paper addressing the present experiment (Hirsch & Blum-Kulka 2014. For a more detailed overview see Weizman 2008, 2013).

Our focus of interest is the political interviews. In contrast with other types of news interviews, political interviews are conventionally "conducted in the form of dispute; their agendas are in part institutionally predetermined; they foreground public figures; unfold dialogically but also target overhearing audiences; have a high level of tolerance for equivocal talk; and allocate different interactional rights and obligations to interviewers and interviewee" (Kampf & Daskal 2011: 178-179). In this vein, we chose to explore whether the employment of irony is regarded as aggressive or a mitigating factor by the audience and the participators themselves, and how they respond to such moves.

The political interview, denominated by Montgomery (2007) "the accountability interview", can be distinguishable from other three major types: The experiential interview, which provides eyewitness accounts or personal reactions of ordinary people to an event in question, for which they are not expected to answer for; the expert interview conducted with accredited experts, chosen for their specialized knowledge; and usually not affiliated to the broadcast institution; and the affiliated interviews conducted with fellow correspondents under the umbrella of the news institution (*ibid*: 145-176).

The accountability interview is where public figures are required to justify their recent words or actions or those of the institution they represent. The classic example of

this case is indeed interviewing politicians, called to account for the issue at hand, but also at the risk of producing statements for which they could be held accountable for in the interview's aftermath (*ibid*: 146-154).

Although different interactional rights and obligations have been conventionally allocated to interviewers and interviewee (Kampf & Daskal 2011: 178-179), nowadays there seems to be a higher degree of symmetry in the speakers' selection of discourse patterns and in the use of challenge strategies, especially in the context of the Israeli media (Weizman 2006, 2008): Social roles are modified and negotiated, when participants position and reposition themselves and the co-participants, performing challenging moves. Among these challenges is the employment of irony (Weizman 2001, 2006, 2008).

From the interviewers' end, they are held accountable for being either too aggressive or too deferential (Kampf & Daskal 2011). Even though the growing tendency towards symmetry in this discourse genre may lead hosts to perceive political interactions as too collegial, it may also encourage them to display hostility, "assuming that dramatic, emotional and confrontational interaction sells" (*ibid*: 178-179). Be that as it may, interviewers face the risk of public criticism for not raising the relevant problematic issues, but also for not maintaining the appearance of objectivity (Clayman & Heritage 2002a: 150-151, 234-235).

The accountability interview points the audience towards identification with the interviewer, since he or she is supposed to ask the questions in their behalf (Montgomery 2007: 159). In view of this specific nature of the accountability interview, which also commonly tends to focus on disputable events (Blum-Kulka & Weizman 2003), thus allowing for a certain level of adversarialness (Liebes et al. 2008; Blum-Kulka 1983; Weizman 2008; Clayman & Heritage 2002a and 2002b,), this research seeks to examine whether the use of irony is considered over-aggressive from the audience's point of view, taking into consideration the interviewee's response; but first some key concepts will be outlined.

2.2. *Positioning and keying*

Building on Goffman's terminology (1981), Montgomery (2007) describes broadcast news discourse as taking "shape out of complex production formats and participation frameworks" (p. 29). News interviews are also characterized by the pre-allocation of roles institutionally defined: The interviewer asks the questions and controls the length, shape and style of the encounter (*ibid*: 146), the interviewee answers, while the broadcasters predefine much of the topic, structure and roles of the talk (Scannell 1991: 3).

In order to describe the different players in each encounter, Goffman (1981) distinguishes between the "animator" – the sounding box in use, "author" – someone who has selected the words, and "principal" – someone committed to the position established by the words (p. 144-145). From the listeners' perspective, Goffman distinguishes between addressed recipients, overhearers and eavesdroppers (*ibid*: 9-10, 132). These may constitute the often complicated participation framework which guides the delivery, a case in point being radio and TV talk (*ibid*: 137-138).

News interviews are characterized as a talk for an overhearing audience, hence the discourse is bidirectional: Oriented first towards the interviewee but also to the

audience beyond. "Thus broadcast talk minimally has a double articulation: it is a communicative interaction between those participating […] and, at the same time, is designed to be heard by absent audiences" (Scannell 1991: 1). In other words, media discourse is anchored at the media co-participants who constitute the first frame interaction, as well as to the generic audience, who has the overhearer perspective and form the second frame interaction (Fetzer & Weizman 2006: 147). That is to say, in the participation framework of news interviews, the speaker, ratified addressees and the audience are all reciprocally positioned (Weizman 2008: 14).

The concept of positioning "involves the assignment, shaping and negotiations of reciprocal relations between all parties involved in the interaction" (Weizman 2008: 16). Among others, it builds on Goffman's (1981) notion of footing, which has to do with the participant's alignment, set, stance, posture or projected self. A change in footing means a switch in the frame of events, it "implies a change in the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance" (p. 128). In other words, a switch to a unidirectional orientation can be described as a change in footing, which implies a shift in alignment (Montgomery 2007: 30, 145).

Goffman's notions of footing is integrated into Clift's (1999) conception of irony, considering the construction of an ironic turn and its placement a cause for a discernible shift of footing, and thus for the visibility of the frame. She suggests that the shift of footing allows for the ironic evaluative detachment and lack of commitment, which is also typical of journalists' discourse: "In conversation, it is standardly assumed that animator, author, and principal are one and the same, except when sanctioned by activity (as is the journalist or actor); but the ironist, as we shall see, effects a shift of footing from committed participant to detached observer" (p. 532). Positioning in terms of footing and the distinction between animator, principal and author (Goffman, 1981), is considered by Blum-Kulka, Liebes and Kampf (2003) "conversation positioning", as opposed to positioning towards the contents of the interaction, "positioning as a speaker", and to the self presentation in the interaction, "self positioning" (p. 68). The double articulation of media talk, which calls for shifts in footing, can affect the politician's degree of accountability for the different kinds of positioning described (Blum-Kulka & Weizam 2003).

The research of positioning as a conversational phenomenon deals with sociological features as well as discursive features: The storylines of given situations assign meaning to the co-participants positioning and repositioning. That is to say, the notion of positioning is relative and dynamic, always vis-à-vis someone else, and although either symmetrical or asymmetrical, it does not deal exclusively with power (Weizman 2008: 13-15).

Weizman's (2008) study of positioning in the media is an empirically-based textual micro-analysis of discourse patterns, distinguishing between the interactional versus the social level. According to her approach, due to their conflictual nature, in news interviews positioning may be often achieved through challenging strategies (the concept of challenge will be further detailed in the following sub-section), in which discourse practices such as irony play an important part.

In the context of humor, Hamo, Kampf, and Shifman (2010) discussed shifts from serious to humorous and sometimes aggressive keying as a discursive challenge to politicians and a test for their communicative competence in the genre of mock

interviews, investigating *Da Ali G show* and an Israeli counterpart, *The Great Pini Show*.

The concept of "keying" employed here derives from Blum-Kulka's (2005) distinction, building on Hymes (1972/1989) and on Goffman (1974), between the external institutional framing of an event and the internal framing, defined as "keying" (Blum-Kulka & Huck-Taglicht 2002). Namely, the negotiated process of shifting and marking discourse stance along axes such as formal/informal, goal oriented to sociable, in earnest or playful, and distanced to engrossed (Blum-Kulka & Hamo 2004). The various framings, "keying" or "rekeying" in Goffman's terms, are not differentiated by the topic of the interaction but by its "musical scale" (Blum-Kulka & Huck-Taglicht 2002: 81).

Regarding the genre of news interviews, Blum-Kulka and Hamo discuss how the keying upheld by the interviewer throughout news interviews may seldom shift between the formal to the personal (Blum-Kulka & Hamo 2004). While in typical news interviews the keying tends to shift between friendliness to hostility, when interviewing the enemy, Blum-Kulka at el. (2003) find a breach of these norms and a move towards one of two extremes: Friendliness becomes over-intimacy and hostility turns into a direct attack (*ibid*).

In what follows we will show how the audience's capacity to grasp the positioning and repositioning and to detect the specific keying influences on the identification of irony.

2.3. *Face and challenge*

Over-aggressiveness is regarded by Kampf and Daskal (2011) as an actual violation of the public's expectations from journalists, they differentiate between face threatening acts to face damaging acts – which may have the same linguistic form but differ at the interpretative level – (p. 182-183). Their distinction relays on Goffman's term of face (1967) and Brown and Levinson's concept of FTA's – Face Threatening Acts – "acts that by the nature run contrary to the face wants of the addressee and/or of the speaker" (Brown & Levinson 1987: 65) – which is considered an inherent part of any human communication (Blum-Kulka 1997).

According to Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness, in view of these acts that "intrinsically threaten face" (Brown & Levinson 1987: 65), individuals struggle to maintain their positive face – the desire to be appreciated and approved by others – and their negative one – the desire to have freedom of action and freedom from imposition (*ibid*). Jucker (1986) argues that in the context of the media politicians ultimately thrive to maintain their positive face, in order to ensure their political survival, more than the negative one, which has already been limited (p. 70-77), "because the willingness to answer relevant questions has been given previously" (p. 74).

Bull et al. (1996) go as far as to claim that face maintenance in political interviews is not merely a strategy but a goal, while politicians seek to enhance their and their party's face, sometimes at the expense of their opponents. The concept of face also provides a rationale for the equivocal nature of this genre, which has been described by Bull as mostly the outcome of face management performed by the interviewees underlying the avoidance-avoidance conflicts (Bull 2000). Avoidance-avoidance conflict is, according to Bavelas et al.'s theory of communication (1990: 261-

262), a situation where an answer is expected but all clear and direct messages may lead to negative consequences. Building on their view of equivocation as a typical result of this situation, experiments conducted by Bull (2000) and Bull et al. (1996) supported the latter's claim that in view of the danger of losing face "politicians do not reply to a large proportion of questions in political interviews" (Bull 2000: 223).

The greater tolerance for equivocal talk, the tendency to focus on disputable events and the specific geography of the situation, give grounds to the flexing of conversational norms (Blum-Kulka & Weizman 2003: 111-112), and typical departures are interpreted as Gricean implicatures and not as cues for misunderstandings (*ibid*: 112). The fulfillment of Gricean maxims and the level of cooperation required are constantly negotiated by interviewers and interviewees (Blum-Kulka 1983: 146-147). Social roles are modified and negotiated, when participants position and reposition themselves and the co-participants, performing challenging moves (Weizman 2008), among these challenges is the employment of irony (Weizman 2001, 2008).

In her studies of the discursive practices used to construe and negotiate positions in news interviews on Israeli television, especially the employment of irony and terms of address, Weizman considers the realization of FTA's in broadcast interviews as occurring mainly through challenges (Weizman 2003, 2008). She relies on Labov and Fanshel's (1977) definition of challenge as "a speech act that asserts or implies a state of affairs that, if true, would weaken a person's claim to be competent in filling the role associated with a valued status" (p. 97), and could resulting in lowering the status that other person (*ibid*: 64) or even in the loss of some rights that accompany it (*ibid*: 97).

Weizman distinguishes between interactional and social roles, the former being in the interviewee's case the obligation to provide proper answers and opinions, and the latter varies according to the role they play in society. However, obligations are assigned by virtue of which they were invited. Therefore, interviewees may be challenged at both levels: Interactional and social, amongst others by the employment of discourse patterns such as irony (Weizman 2001, 2006).

In Blum-Kulka's (1983) discussion of the dynamic structure of political interviews, where she examined both supporting and non-supportive opening moves, challenges are defined, following Burton (1980), as moves "that in some way hold up the topic introduced by previous utterances". As opposed to supportive-moves (topical shifts, questions for clarification), the non-supportive moves (challenging reformulations) follow prior moves that fail to adhere to various criteria of discourse coherence.

These non-supportive moves are regarded legitimate means for expressing adversarialness in news interviews (Kampf & Daskal 2011), which to a certain level has become common practice in the past thirty years (Liebes et al. 2003), hence the relatively high tolerance of interviewers to evasive responses (Blun-Kulka & Weizman 2003; Bull 2000).

Moreover, political discourse featured in Israeli mass media is considered highly argumentative. Blum-Kulka et al. (2002) suggest that the confrontational style displayed in political talk shows is a carryover from the religious/scholarly milieu. Such characteristics often invite challenging moves.

However, such moves have the potential to cause damage to the face of journalists and politicians (Kampf & Daskal 2011), amongst which is the employment of irony, which according to Ettema and Glasser (1994), "is potentially so destructive of

its own ultimate purpose" (p. 7), because irony as corrective in journalism can work only when there are clear moral grounds to appeal to, otherwise it is just a contribution to the decline and loss of faith in public discourse (*ibid*: 31).

Our approach to the analysis and interpretation of irony is a pragmatic one, focusing on the audience's sensitivity to keying as a possible means to interpretation and the reaction to it; relevant studies concerning the reaction to irony will be briefly described in the next sub-section.

2.4. *Reactions to irony[2]*

As most accounts of irony claim, irony necessarily involves criticism (Clark & Gerrig 1984; Garmendia 2010; Grice 1978; Haverkate 1990; Sperber & Wilson 1981; Weizman 2008), and as such it inherently poses a threat to face (Brown & Levinson 1987). In this vein, Jucker (1986) points out that an interviewer may threaten a politician's face by criticism. The question is whether compared to a directly expressed critique, the level of adversarialness is enhanced by the employment of irony or reduced by it.

Some researchers have explicitly or implicitly pointed that the use of irony is a mitigating factor. Brown and Levinson considered it to be an off-record strategy, which facilitates posing a threat to the addressee's face without assuming responsibility for the act (Brown & Levinson 1987: 69). Leech (1983: 142-145) believed that ironic utterances heed the Politeness Principle, and as such protect the addresser from direct confrontation. Following them, Barbe also presented irony as a face saving device while stating implied criticism, but did not regard it as ensuring the avoidance of conflict, especially when directed towards non-present victims (Barbe 1995: 89-91, 97).

Some experimental studies (Dews, Kaplan & Winner 1995) reported that irony mutes the criticism conveyed by a more direct insult, because the positive literal meaning tinges the addressee's reception of the intended meaning. Jorgensen's results (1996) even showed that sarcastic irony can serve a face saving function.

However, Colston's (1997) findings suggested that in many cases irony enhances rather than dilutes condemnation, because it contrasts the desirable state of affairs with the current situation, making it look worse by comparison.

Glasser and Ettema (1993) argued that irony in journalism facilitates maintaining the appearance of neutrality and discretion, while rendering judgment, making it possible for the writer to avoid taking responsibility and for the victim to keep his public reputation unscathed. Nonetheless, they present three reports, out of which the ironical is the most critical one.

In an attempt to account for these seemingly contradicting results, Weizman (2008) suggested that the experiments followed different methodological designs. She further proposed that since the attitude towards certain degrees of indirectness varies between cultures (Blum-Kulka, Kasper & House 1989), "irony too could be evaluated as impolite, especially when particularly opaque" (Weizman 2008: 105).

Weizman (ibid.) has claimed that in the context of news interviews a direct response to an ironic criticism is highly uncommon, thus it presents an additional challenge for the target. This might explain why she found that interviewers employed

---

[2] In this section we discuss only the reactions to irony and not its interpretation, for a discussion of the relevant process of interpretation see Hirsch and Blum-Kulka (2014).

irony only when addressing politicians (not experts, colleagues and ordinary people) in accountability interviews, and only towards ratified interviewees, not towards an absent third party. Interviewees, on the other hand, directed irony either towards a third party or towards the interviewer. In addition, interviewers as well as interviewees criticized the other party's interactional role, but only interviewers ironically criticized the others' stances and ideologies. Weizman's findings that irony in news interviews on Israeli national television was rather rare (2008: 105) were interpreted as attesting to the face-threat inherently embedded in irony. Considering this local environment, we seek to analyze the audience's interpretation of the relatively rare ironic sequences found in this research.

3. An empirical test: Method

As has been noted before (section 1), it was our intention to investigate the implications the use of irony has for the audience and interviewee, how they react to it, including the possibility of the audiences considering it over-adversarial; as well as the audiences' sensitivity to positioning and keying as a determinant factor in the employment of irony in political interviews.

For this purpose, an experiment was conducted whereby fifty Israeli students were presented with three interviews, which will be detailed and analyzed in section 4, in order to evaluate the audience's reaction to the use of irony, whether they conceive it as over-aggressive, and how they consider the interviewees' reaction towards it. In addition, as was described in a former contribution (Hirsch & Blum-Kulka 2014), we sought to discover whether viewers tend to detect irony employed by interviewers and directed towards interviewees and whether they believe the latter have interpreted it.[3]

3.1. *Data selection*

The interviews were selected through a method devised for the purpose of this article, and relying on the following assumption: Ironic utterances are not unanimously interpreted as such; given their inherently indirect nature, they will induce different audience's reactions. Accordingly, our working hypothesis was that an interview that employs irony will lead to contradictory and inconsistent feedbacks from viewers. This type of feedbacks will guide us towards the selection of ironic interviews.

A useful source for these reactions was found in the feedbacks or comments published by web surfers after the interview. User comments are found at the end of the news production process and are originated by a relatively small fraction of the overall audience. However, comment threads represent a spontaneous, informal and sometimes aggressive public forum (Reich 2011). In Israel, these comments are referred to as "talkbacks" and the users themselves are referred to as "talkbackers" (Vaisman & Gonen 2011). Although controversial in nature, their growing popularity (Reich 2011) can provide a useful sample of the audience's perception of the media discourse in question.

---

[3] The materials and results of this part of the experiment were discussed in Hirsch and Blum-Kulka (2014)

 Based on the above, we then proceeded to localize incongruent comments without learning the nature of the interviews that preceded them. By incongruent we mean positive assessments of the interview management alongside negative appreciation of the same conduct. Notice that the responses are inconsistent in their attitude to the way the interview was conducted and to the language patterns employed by the interviewer, and not in the sense of differing approaches to the propositional content in question. A disagreement over issues at hand is extremely typical in this kind of comments and it was decided that it would not serve as means to detect the use of indirect discourse patterns. After much scrutiny, three interviews, which will be later discussed (section 4), were found to induce incongruent reactions in the sense defined above. We then proceeded to analyze them and found out that they indeed demonstrated instances of irony. [4]

3.2. *Participants and design*

Three different groups of 22, 11 and 11 students attending Israeli institutions of higher education (Photographic Communications, Hadassah College; ISL Interpreters program, Bar-Ilan University; MA in Translation Studies, Bar-Ilan University) participated during class time. A few questionnaires were excluded, either because the students were not native Hebrew speakers, or due to some technicalities. None of the participants took part in other similar experiments, nor did they attend classes on indirect discourse patterns from a pragmatic perspective.

3.3. *Procedure and materials*

Participants were asked to watch three short segments of interviews that had been broadcasted on TV. They were told that the presentation would be interrupted a few times, and that each time they would be required to provide answers relevant to the segment shown: Questions 1-3 regard the way they perceive the interaction, and 4-6 regard the way they believe the interviewees perceive the interaction. Participants were specifically told they would have to complete the task after watching each segment only once.

 Although interrupting the flow of the interview after each segment presents the disadvantage of creating unnatural circumstances, it holds the clear advantage of providing an opportunity to concentrate on the relevant utterances.

The three interviews were presented in different orders to the three groups of participants. All interviews were conducted with politicians, so as to reduce the influence of other variables.

 Participants were presented with closed as well as open-ended questions, providing opportunity for elaboration on several instances. The alternatives regarding the level of hostility and appropriateness of the turn were presented to them as following:

Set A:

---

[4] For a sample of the responses found to one of the interviews in question see Hirsch & Blum-Kulka (2014).

0. Don't know/irrelevant
1. Very supportive
2. Supportive
3. Slightly supportive
4. Neither supportive nor hostile
5. Slightly hostile
6. Hostile
7. Very hostile

Set B:
0. Don't know/irrelevant
1. Very appropriate
2. Appropriate
3. Slightly Appropriate
4. Neither that nor the other
5. Slightly inappropriate
6. Inappropriate
7. Totally inappropriate

The turns for discussion were chosen randomly according to the order of events presented in the show, and not according to the level of adversarialness as in Clayman & Heritage (2002b), so as to avoid interference of additional variables. Only one of the four turns of each interview was an ironic utterance, and its place in the questionnaire varied, in order to avoid drawing special attention to it. For the relevant part of the questionnaire see Appendix B, where the ironic questions are highlighted in bold.

In the following section (4) the interviews will be presented followed by a summary of a pragmatic analysis conducted according to a theoretical framework described in a former contribution (Hirsch & Blum-Kulka 2014).

4. Interviews and analysis

In this section we present the background for each interview, along with the relevant turns and a short analysis of the cues for irony it presents.

4.1. *Ilana Dayan interviewing Ehud Barak (Channel 2- 1.12.08)*[5]

In this interview, Ilana Dayan, an acclaimed Israeli journalist, is hosting Ehud Barak, at the time leader of the Labor Party and former highly decorated Chief of staff, in

---

[5] For fuller versions of the interviews see appendix A. Transcripts translated by the authors. We wish to thank Dr. Sara Friedman for her invaluable feedback. Original Hebrew transcripts are available upon request. Transcription conventions: [words] – overlapping talk; = – overlatch; (0.2) – timed pauses, in seconds; ↑ – a sharp rise in pitch; ↓– a sharp decline in pitch; **word in bold** – high volume; ˚word˚ – low volume; word – emphasis; wo::rd – sound stretch; wor- – cut off; >words< – fast rhythm; <words> – slow rhythm; ((comment)) – transcriber's comments; #words# – use of unique tone of voice, specified in a comment; 1,2,3 – subsequent numbering of turns.

investigative television program *Uvda* ("Fact") on the Israeli Channel 2. Dayan purports to bring Barak's response to the polls that predict poor prospects to Barak's labor party in the coming up Elections for the 18th Knesset (to be held on 10 February 2009).

1. Ilana Dayan: do [you know] what my fantasy is?
2. Ehud Barak: [ok] well?
3. ID: that I'll tell you let's talk sincerely (0.8) I'll turn back (0.8) and I'll ask you (0.6) what makes you fail?
4. EB: (0.8) I don't- I don't think- you're not going to have a problem with me regarding sincerity, that's no:t=
5. ID: so what makes you fail?
6. EB: I don't know. Are we starting with the interview now? Have we started?
7. ID: we have started.
8. EB: so you'll have to tell me that again. Bring some co<u>ffee</u> becau:se I: really need some coffee. Ok. You can start again.
9. ID: what makes you fail?
10. EB: (1.0) look I:, first of all, I am not a commentator on myself and I: would be much happier if I- if you were asking me what makes you succeed or look so successful without doing anything- [any-]
11. <u>ID: [((laughing)) let's start that way,] what makes you look so successful-</u> <u>[to lift off- to take off like that?]</u>
12. EB:[any] effort [eh-]
13. ID: [without] you having to sweat at all.
14. EB: e:h- no effort. I a:h don't know- I don't know how to answer that, I: know that I: am [eh- trying.]
15. ID: [what? seriously? Seriously?]

As was suggested by Kampf and Daskal (2013), this interview is potentially polysemic in meaning. At first it seems supportive, when the interviewer signals solidarity with her body language (leaning over) and with a broad smile, while posing with familiarity the question "Do you know what my fantasy is?" (turn 1), which is followed by offers of sincerity "Let's talk sincerely" (3). Therefore, at the beginning, the interview appears to be a hybrid genre and not the typical accountability interview. Furthermore, the interviewee himself claims to be unsure with regard to the framing of the event, back stage small talk or an official interview, and asks "Are we starting with the interview now? Have we started?" (turn 6).

As the interview unfolds, on the level of keying, interviewer and interviewee simulate what Norrick denominates a "customary joking relationship" (1994: 423), where the metamessage is a competitive game in which participants play the roles of ritual antagonists, and mutual-teasing is expected to increase solidarity rather than cause offense (*ibid*). This non-serious key is continued by Barak's rejection of Dayan's highly challenging question "what makes you fail" (9) and its underlying assumption, offering instead a non-serious (with a smile) reformulation in his favor (10).

The following turn, "what makes you look so successful [...] to take off like that?" (11), is an ironic question, whose audience's reaction this research purports to investigate. Dayan accepts the interviewee suggestion to propose a question, thus breaking the norms and creating an ironic position toward their roles in the interactions. The interviewer's question itself, which is accompanied by laughter assigning a non-

serious keying to the situation, is an echoic mention (Sperber & Wilson 1981; Wilson & Sperber 1992) of the interviewee's suggestion that she reformulate her initial question, "would be much happier if I- if you were asking me what makes you succeed or look so successful without doing anything?" (10), and serves as a first cue (Dascal & Weizman 1987; Weizman & Dascal 1991) for irony. The echoic mention theory (Sperber & Wilson 1981; Wilson & Sperber 1992) also provides an essential clue for the interpretation of the ironic meaning (Weizman 2001, 2008),), since it sustains that the target of irony is most plausibly the originator of the utterance being echoed (Sperber and Wilson 1981: 314), thus making Ehud Barak the target of the irony.

Barak's suggestion was seemingly non-realistic or a prolongation of the friendly keying. However, Dayan surprised him and the audience by accepting the possibility of success (at the literal level), and criticizing it (for those who understand the irony). Nonetheless, in Sperber and Wilson's terms (1981; Wilson & Sperber 1992), she is merely "mentioning" this possibility rather than "using" it, in order to show her ironic attitude towards it.

An additional cue for the detection of irony renders this reformulation even more ironic: It violates the impositive sincerity condition underlying the felicitous performance of a question (Haverkate 1990: 87-100); because in view of the interviewer's initial question, "What makes you fail?" (9) and the mutually shared information on the poor prospects of Barak's labor party in the coming up elections, she could not have possibly been sincerely asking an informative question and wishing simply that her "interlocutor carry out the act specified by the proposition" (*ibid*: 87).

A shift of keying is explicitly announced only later on, in turn 15 (seriously, seriously).

4.2. *Yaron London and Moti Kirschenbaum (interviewers) with Haim Oron and Gideon Levi (interviewees) (Channel 10-31.01.2010)*

In this interview of the daily current affairs evening program "London & Kirschenbaum" on Israel TV Channel Ten, two journalists and media personalities, Yaron London and Moti Kirschenbaum, host Haim "Jumas" Oron, an Israeli politician and at the time MK for the political left-wing party New Movement-Meretz, and Gideon Levi, a highly controversial Israeli columnist in the daily Ha'aretz, who focuses on Israeli occupation of Palestinian territories. The discussion towards the end of the interview revolves around Meretz's small political size after the elections and its lack of influence as a consequence.

42. Moti Kirschenbaum: [Friends] =
43. Haim Oron: = [One moment], the square is empty because everybody-many people were convinced by what you tell them that it's dead, so no one goes to funerals.
44. Gideon Levi: [I think it's dead, I wish it were] =
45. M.K: [Excuse me just a moment], here on the program we give our speakers airtime according to their political size, so we have to finish up. =
46. G.L:= [Then I shouldn't even get one second, going by that I shouldn't even get one second.]=

47. H.O: = [You have broken that rule] =
48. M.K: = [Then we have to finish.}=
49. Yaron London: Real left is China, right?

Kirschenbaum attempts to put an end to the interview with the words "here on the program we give our speakers airtime according to their political size, so we have to finish up" (turn 45), accompanied by a non-verbal sign for non-serious keying: A smile. His comment manifests a few cues for irony. A blatant flouting of the Gricean maxim of Quality (Grice 1975: 26), since it is clear to all the participants and possibly to the audience that the speaker is aware of the fact that the program's timetable is fixed and unchangeable, that his assertion is unacceptable, and that anyhow his remark is made at the end of the program (which ended as usual). Similarly, it may be considered as an intentional violation of the assertive sincerity condition underlying the felicitous performance of the speech act of assertion, because the speaker does not believe that the proposition expressed is the true state of affairs (Haverkate 1990).

Judging from their response, the two guests seem to share this meta-linguistic conventional knowledge (Dascal & Weizman 1987; Weizman & Dascal 1991) and engage in a non-serious keying, pretending to accept the utterance meaning at its face value: Gideon Levi – "Then I shouldn't even get one second" (46), Haim Oron – "You have broken that rule" (47). After Kirschenbaum insists "Then we have to finish" (48), his co-host concludes with a still non-serious remark "Real left is China, right?" (49)

Following Hirsch (2011a, 2011b, 2011c), we argue then that the non-serious keying of the interviewer's comment can be identified as both ironic and humorous, locating it between the two extremes (to which the typical cases belong), since we also perceive cues for the interpretation of the utterance as humorous.[6]

The first cue for humor is an overlap between two opposing scripts (Raskin 1985) or incongruity (Attardo 1997) between the existing timeframe of the program and Kirschenbaum's unrealistic comment. According to Attardo, in humor, the first and more accessible script usually creates certain expectations and these are disconfirmed when the second, more informative, script is activated and the opposition resolved (Attardo 1997: 398). Raskin's approach (1985) classifies three basic types of script opposition, all of which form part of the real/unreal dichotomy: The actual and the non-actual, the possible and the impossible, the normal and the abnormal (pp. 108-114).

The second cue is what Jeffers (1995) denominates "non-sense", not a lack of sense but a different sense characteristic of the humoristic text. The idea that the program will adjust its timeline to the political size of the interviewees can be considered as "non-sense". It follows then that the non-serious keying of the interviewer's comment can be identified as both ironic and humorous.

In the following section (5) we will show how this may affect the audience's reaction to Kirschenbaum's comment.

---

[6] Theories concerning the differentiation between irony and humor will not be discussed here, for further details see Hirsch (2011a; 2011b, 2011c).

4.3. *Yaron London and Moti Kirschenbaum with Dov Khenin (Channel 10-04/11/08)*

In the third interview, from the same program, "London & Kirschenbaum" as well, Yaron London and Moti Kirschenbaum host Dov Khenin, at the time a mayoral candidate for the *Ir Lekhulanu* ("City for All") party in Tel Aviv's municipal election. Khenin is a member of the central committee of Maki, the Israeli Communist Party and the largest faction within the Hadash Party. The discussion revolves around whether as a sworn Communist he is capable of representing the majority of Tel Aviv's citizens and answering their needs.

17. Yaron London: = How can the municipality influence the-? =
18. Dov Khenin: = Who is in charge of planning and building? The Local Planning and Construction Committee that is an extension of the <u>municipality</u>.
19. Y.L: So what you are going to tell- you are going to tell a developer who will come to you and say "I've purchased a plot of land and I want to build a high-rise on it"=
20. D.K: So the question is-=
21. Y.L: =And- ah- so you are going to tell him he can't do it?
22. D.K: No=
<u>23. Y.L: You are going to tell him you will build six floors of apartments of sixty five meters each and I have the last say for [the interior of the apartments?]</u>
<u>24. D.K: = [No.] =</u>
<u>25. Y.L: =And **which kind of faucets to [use?]**</u>
26. D.K: ((laughing)) [No,] No. I will not have the last say for the kind of faucets to use, but I will definitely tell him that I want and I will definitely say, we say that too, that future projects in Tel Aviv will include <u>small and medium sized apartments</u>.=
27. Y.L: [How w-?]
28. D.K: [By the way], I want to tell you, you know, I am not a great fan of contractors, and I am not known for representing their side, but I do not want them to suffer any injustice. It is not the contractors' interest to build large apartments necessarily. The contractors, I have talked to them, they are willing to build small apartments, because there is a **demand** for that. It is a municipal policy, a wrong one in my opinion, that assists the- richer sectors in the population and doesn't see the rest the way it should.
29. Y.L: So in order to make the city wealthier? [to collect more taxes? That's the idea?]
30. D.K: = [That's right. Could be. Could be.]

The interviewee claims that as an activist for socio-economic equality, he is going to change the municipal building policy (turn 18), and as a response the interviewer asks him whether he pretends to force entrepreneurs to construct the kind of housing he wants. London constructs the question in incremental way, moving from serious (21) to ironic: "You are going to tell him you will build six floors of apartments of sixty five meters each and I will have the last say for the interior of the apartments […] And **which kind of faucets to use?"** (23, 25)

The challenging rhetorical question proposed by Yaron London is considered in this framework ironic, because it presents several cues for irony. First, it is a violation of the sincerity condition (Haverkate 1990): Clearly London knows that this exaggerative scenario is unrealistic and the mayor of the city does not discuss faucets with the contractors, although some mutually shared knowledge is required in order to obtain that interpretation. Another cue is provided by Wilson and Sperber (1992) analysis of irony as an interpretation of an attributed thought or utterance (p. 66), meaning that it is not necessarily mentioned but can merely find its interpretative resemblance in the echoic mention (p. 64-65). In this vein, Yaron London may be echoing what he considers Khenin's own naïve aspirations. This interpretation provides us with a clue leading towards the target of the irony (Sperber & Wilson 1981: 314; Weizman 2001, 2008). Accordingly, Dov Khenin and his unreal pretensions are being ironically criticized here.

The interviewee's denial accompanied by a little laugh might be a sign to a possible detection of ironic framing: "No. I will not have the last say for the kind of faucets to use ", which is followed by a more serious keying: "but I will definitely tell him that […] future projects in Tel Aviv will include small and medium sized apartments" (26).

We turn now to the participants' reactions to the use of irony. Recall that the research purports to investigate these questions:

(1) The implications the use of irony has for the audience and interviewee, and whether it is in the interviewer best interest or not, how audiences react to it, including the possibility of them considering it over-adversarial.

(2) Audiences' sensitivity to positioning and keying as a determinant factor in the employment of irony in political interviews.

In the next section, we will discuss the results of the experiment.

5. Results and discussion

The results for the reaction to the three ironic questions were as following: For the first interview, the most common answer was 5 – Slightly hostile, and the second most common answer was 4 – Neither supportive nor hostile; for the second interview, the most common answer was 4 – Neither supportive nor hostile, and the second most common answer was 5 – Slightly hostile; and for the third interview, the most common answer was 5 – Slightly hostile, and the second most common answer was 6 – Hostile.

It seems therefore that viewers perceived irony as only slightly hostile, and thus considered its use in this context an acceptable challenge.

The second question concerned the viewers' conception of the interviewees' reaction to the three ironic questions. The results were very similar to the answers the participants provided to the first question and read as following: For the first interview, the most common answer was 5 – Slightly hostile, and the second most common answer was 4 – Neither supportive nor hostile and 3 – Slightly supportive; for the second interview, the most common answer was 4 – Neither supportive nor hostile and 5 – Slightly hostile; and for the third interview, the most common answer was 5 – Slightly hostile and 6 – Hostile.

It follows then that answers regarding the interviewee's conception of the employment of irony were almost identical to the pattern of the audiences' perception of these utterances.

| Type of Answer | In your opinion, to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards | | | | | | In your opinion, according to the response to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards the stands of…. | | | | | |
| | Ehud Barak's stands? | | Gideon Levy and Haim Oron's stands? | | Dov Khenin's stands? | | Ehud Barak | | Gideon Levy and Haim Oron | | Dov Khenin | |
	Respondents	Percentage	Respondents	Percentage	Respondents	Percentage	Respondents	Percentage	Respondents	Percentage	Respondents	Percentage
0 Don't know/irrelevant	2	5.9%	6	17.1%	1	2.8%	1	2.9%	6	17.1%	1	2.8%
1 Very supportive	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
2 Supportive	1	2.9%	2	5.7%	3	8.3%	1	2.9%	2	5.7%	1	2.8%
3 Slightly supportive	2	5.9%	1	2.9%	1	2.8%	6	17.6%	2	5.7%	3	8.3%
4 Neither supportive nor hostile	11	32.4%	13	37.1%	2	5.6%	6	17.6%	14	40.0%	9	25.0%
5 Slightly hostile	14	41.2%	8	22.9%	12	33.3%	15	44.1%	9	25.7%	10	27.8%
6 Hostile	4	11.8%	3	8.6%	9	25.0%	4	11.8%	2	5.7%	10	27.8%
7 Very hostile	0	0.0%	2	5.7%	8	22.2%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	2	5.6%
Total	34	100.0%	35	100.0%	36	100.0%	34	100.0%	35	100.0%	36	100.0%
Average	4.25		4.38		4.50		4.25		4.38		4.50	
Standard Deviation	5.31		4.37		4.50		4.95		4.96		4.38	
Most common answer - Z value*	1.84		1.97		1.67		2.17		1.94		1.26	
Most common answer - Probability	3.32%		2.43%		4.79%		1.49%		2.60%		10.44%	
Conclusion (considering normal distribution)	The Slightly hostile answer is statistically reliable the most common idea.		The Neither supportive nor hostile answer is statistically reliable the most common idea.		The Slightly hostile answer is statistically reliable the most common idea.		The Slightly hostile answer is statistically reliable the most common idea.		The Neither supportive nor hostile answer is statistically reliable the most common idea.		The Slightly hostile and the Hostile answers are not statistically reliable the most common idea.	

*The Z value of the most common answer is its distance from the average divided by the standard deviation.

Before we attempt to provide further elaboration on these finding, these are some of the explanations offered by the participants regarding the level of adversarialness:

1) In your opinion, to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards Ehud Barak's stands?
* Again, small nuances in Ilana Daya's tone of voice and face show that she isn't greatly fond of the interviewee and has formed a personal biased opinion about him.
* The question's aim is to put Ehud Barak in an awkward position and in a way to push him into a corner; it shows especially in her reaction to the answer.
* The questions are tricky and demanding even though they are pronounced with a smile and in a sympathetic manner.
2) In your opinion, to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards Gideon Levy and Haim Oron's stands?
* The question was formulated in a heated manner, a bit aggressively.
* They laugh at them for being small and marginal and therefore uninteresting
* All in all it was a demeaning remark.
3) In your opinion, to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards Dov Khenin's stands?
* Yaron asked the question scornfully and critically, as if he considers Dov Khenin's idea radical and unrealistic.
* Yaron interrupted him, posed a question aggressively and didn't provide enough space for Dov Khenin to answer.
* Here Yaron suddenly changes his style and moves on to a slight attack on the interviewee. He doesn't really want an answer regarding the faucets, he just attacks him.

Overall, the results seem to indicate that irony is perceived as only slightly hostile, and thus an acceptable means for the interviewer to use as challenge. The question directed at Dov Khenin, "You are going to tell him you will build six floors of apartments of sixty five meters […] And which kind of faucets to use?" (turn 23-25), was perceived as more adversarial than the other two utterances, possibly because it was not accompanied by any form of mitigation.

Ilana Dayan's question, "what makes you look so successful without having to sweat at all" (11), was pronounced with a mitigating non-verbal sign, namely laughter. Moti Kirschenbaum's remark that they give speakers' airtime "according to their political size" (45) was similarly accompanied by a smile, and presented additional cues for its interpretation as humorous: The turn presents an overlap between two opposing scripts (Raskin 1985) and it can even be considered "non-sense" (Jeffers 1995), thus locating it on a continuum between the two extremes. In other words, the non-serious keying of the interviewer's comment can be identified as both ironic and humorous, and we suggest that this affects the audience's reaction to the utterance. Thus, more people regarded Yaron London's rhetorical question to Khenin as slightly more challenging than the other two ironic utterances, possibly due to a lack of non-verbal signs for non-serious keying, solemn facial expressions, no laughter or smiles, and perhaps also a rise in the question's tone which could have been interpreted as an indication of anger.

The interviewee's reactions are another indication for the nature of the utterances and might have influenced the participants' answers. The results regarding interviewee's

conception of the employment of irony were almost identical to the pattern of the audiences' perception of the ironic utterances. A possible explanation may be that, although those interviews are categorized as the accountability type, the viewers have identified with the interviewee and assumed his attitude towards the interaction.

The experiments thus far have demonstrated that, as a whole, audiences regard the employment of irony, both from their point of view and the interviewee's, as a challenge, but not as an over-aggressive or an unfair act performed by the interviewer. Hence, the employment of irony does not seem to have extremely dangerous ramifications for the interviewer.

These findings may be compared to the results for the audiences' interpretation of irony, detailed in a former contribution derived from the same experiments (Hirsch & Blum-Kulka 2014), which may be briefly summarized as followed: Irony was identified in most cases, with a clear detection in the interview conducted by Ilana Dayan, perhaps because apart from the many linguistic cues for the detection of irony, it was accompanied by a very distinguishable non-serious keying: Laughter. The participants' input was coherent with our classification of Ilana Dayan's question as a clear-cut case of irony with many cues for its interpretation.

In the other two interviews, Kirschenbaum's and London's utterances presented more difficulties for the detection of the indirect discourse pattern. In the interview with Gideon Levi and Haim Oron, the non-serious keying of the interviewer's comment can be identified as keyed as both ironic and humorous, and we suggest that this affects the audience's interpretation of the discourse. Nonetheless, the detection was possible in most cases, because the comment was accompanied by a clear non-linguistic sign for a non-serious keying: A smile. The interview conducted with Dov Khenin presented various cues for irony, but a lack of non-linguistic signs for non-serious keying – solemn facial expressions, no laughter or smiles – might have convinced some of the participants that the literal meaning of the utterance is a plausible candidate for the speaker's meaning. Therefore, less participants identified irony in these two interviews, even though on the whole the speaker's intention was detected.

The comparison of the two sets of results shows that typical cases of irony might be more easily detected, but not necessarily perceived as more hostile than other less characteristic cases. The seemingly influential factor is whether the adversarialness of the interviewer's turn is mitigated by non-verbal signs.

As to the viewers' remarks, most of them implicitly or explicitly express criticism of the ironic utterance, some more than others;   "Ilana […] has formed a personal biased opinion"; "Yaron […] posed a question aggressively and didn't provide enough space"; and "He doesn't really want an answer […] he just attacks him". However, and in line with the results obtained, judging from the comments as a whole, the viewers did not consider the interview management unacceptable, or went as far as to question the legitimacy of the employment of irony itself. Thus, it would appear that although face threatening to a certain extent, irony is not too dangerous for the interviewer to employ, at least in Israeli news interviews.

6. Conclusion

In this study we addressed the issue of hostility audiences attribute to the use of irony in Israeli political interviews. The results of this study aim to provide answers to the questions (1) the implications the use of irony has for the audience and interviewee, and whether it is in the interviewer best interest or not, how audiences react to it, including the possibility of them considering it over-adversarial; (2) audiences' sensitivity to positioning and keying as a determinant factor in the employment of irony in political interviews.

Our findings indicate that, as a whole, audiences regard the employment of irony both from their point of view and the interviewee's as a certain challenge, but not as an over-aggressive or an unfair act performed by the interviewer. These conclusions are in line with a previous experiment which showed that as far as the utterance comprehension is concerned, the risk of employing irony for the interviewer in political interviews in Israel is not as great as we assumed; at least not to the point that it poses a potential threat to the audiences' stand vis-à-vis the interaction, especially when accompanied by humor or mitigating non-verbal signs.

Acknowledgements

References

Alexander, J. Richard (1997) *Aspects of Verbal Humour in English.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.

Attardo, Salvatore (1994) *Linguistic Theories of Humor.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Attardo, Salvatore (1997) The semantic foundation of cognitive theories of humor. *Humor* 10: 395-420.

Attardo, Salvatore (2000) Irony as relevant inappropriateness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 793-826.

Bavelas, J.B., A. Black, N. Chovil, and J. Mullet (1990) *Equivocal Communication.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana (1983) The dynamics of political interviews. *Text* 3.2: 131-153.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana (1997) Discourse pragmatics. In T.A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction.* London: Sage, pp. 38-64.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana (2005) Modes of meaning in making in young children's conversational storytelling. In J. Thornborrow, and J. Coates (eds.), *The sociolinguistics of narrative*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 149-170.

Blum-Kulka, S., G. Kasper, and J. House (eds.) (1989) *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics Requests and Apologies.* Norwood: Ablex.

Blum-Kulka, S., and D. Huck-Taglicht (2002) The contribution of peer-interaction to the development of literate discourse: Genres and keying. *Script – Literacy: Research, Theory and Practice* 3-4: 75-111 (Hebrew).

Blum-Kulka, S., M. Blondheim, and G. Hacohen (2002) Traditions of dispute: From negotiations of Talmudic texts to the arena of political discourse in the media. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34.10-11: 1569-1594.

Blum-Kulka, S., Z. Kampf, and T. Liebes (2003) Talking to the Enemy?: Interviews with Palestinians during the Second Intifada. In Y. Shlesinger, and M. Muchnik (eds), *Lamed Le ILASH (Studies in Modern Hebrew)*. Jerusalem: Tzivonim Publishing, (Hebrew).

Blum-Kulka, S., and E. Weizman (2003) Misunderstanding in political interviews. In J. House, G. Kasper, and S. Ross (eds.), *Misunderstanding in Social Life: Discourse Approaches to Problematic Talk.* London: Pearson, pp. 107-128.

Blum-Kulka, S., and M. Hamo (2004) The importance of doing keying: Broadcast talk from a Goffman-inspired perspective. *Ross Priory Broadcast Talk Seminar.*

Brown, P., and S.C. Levinson (1987) *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bull, Peter (2000) Equivocation and the rhetoric of modernization: An analysis of televised interviews with Tony Blair in 1997. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 35: 267-284.

Bull, P., J. Elliott, D. Palmer, and L. Walker (1996) Why politicians are three-faced: The Face Model of political interviews. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 35.2: 267-284.

Burton, Deirdre (1980) *Dialogue and Discourse*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Clark, H.H., and R.J. Gerrig (1984) On the pretense theory of irony. *Journal of Experimental Psychology/ General* 113.1: 121-126.

Clayman, S.E., and J. Heritage (2002a) *The News interview: Journalists and public figures on the air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clayman, S.E., and J. Heritage (2002b) Questioning presidents: Journalistic deference and adversarialness in press conferences of Eisenhower and Regan. *Journal of Communication* 52.4: 749-775.

Clift, Rebecca (1999) Irony in conversation. *Language in Society* 28: 523–553.

Colston, L. Herbert (1997) Salting a wound or sugaring a pill: The pragmatic functions of ironic criticism. *Discourse Processes* 23: 25-45.

Colston, L. Herbert (2000a) On necessary conditions for verbal irony comprehension. *Pragmatics & Cognition* 8.2: 277-324.

Colston, L. Herbert (2000b) Dewey defeats Truman: Interpreting ironic restatements. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 19.1: 46-65.

Dascal, M., and E. Weizman (1987) Contextual exploitation of interpretation, clues in text understanding: An integrated model. In J. Verschueren, and M. Bertuccelli-Papi (eds.), *The Pragmatic Perspective.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 31-46.

Dews, S., J. Kaplan, and E. Winner (1995) Why not say it directly? The social functions of irony. *Discourse Processes* 19: 347-367.

Ettema, J.S., and T.L. Glasser (1994) The Irony in -- and of − journalism: A case study in the moral language of liberal democracy. *Journal of Communication* 44.2: 5-28.

Fetzer, A., and E. Weizman (2006) Issues in the study of political discourse: An introduction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 143-153.

Garmendia, Joana (2010) Irony is critical. *Pragmatics & Cognition* 18.2: 397-421.

Gibbs, W. Jr. Raymond (1984) Literal meaning and psychological theory. *Cognitive Science* 8: 275-304.

Gibbs, W. Jr. Raymond (1986) On the psycholinguistics of sarcasm. *Journal of Experimental Psychology/ General* 115.1: 3-15.

Giora, Rachel (1995) On irony and negation. *Discourse Processes* 19: 239-264.

Glasser, T.L., and J.S. Ettema (1993) When the facts don't speak for themselves: A study of the use of irony in daily journalism. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 10: 322-338.

Goffman, Erving (1967) *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior.* New York: Anchor Books.

Goffman, Erving (1974) *Frame Analysis.* New York: Harper and Row.

Goffman, Erving (1981) *Forms of Talk.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Grice, H. Paul (1975) Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, and J. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, vol 3: Speech Acts.* New York: Academic Press, pp. 41-58.

Grice, H. Paul (1978) Further notes on logic and conversation. In P. Cole (ed.), *Pragmatics 9.* New York: Academic Press, pp. 113-127.

Hamo, M., Z. Kampf, and L. Shifman (2010) Surviving the "Mock Interview": Challenges to political communicative competence in contemporary televised discourse. *Media, Culture and Society* 32.2: 247-266.

Haverkate, Henk (1990) A speech act analysis of irony. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 77-109.

Hirsch, Galia (2011a) Redundancy, irony and humor. *Language Sciences* 33*:* 316-329*.*

Hirsch, Galia (2011b) Between irony and humor: A pragmatic model. *Pragmatics and Cognition* 19.3: 530-561.

Hirsch, Galia (2011c) Explicitations and other types of shifts in the translation of irony and humor. *Target* 23.2: 178-205.

Hirsch, G., and S. Blum-Kulka (2014). Identifying irony in news interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics* 70: 31-51.
DOI information: 10.1016/j.pragma.2014.06.002

Hymes, Dell (1989/1972) Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz, and D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, pp. 35-72.

Jeffers, Jennifer (1995) Beyond Irony: The Unnamable's appropriation of its critics in a humorous reading of the text. *The Journal of Narrative Technique* 25.1: 47-66.

Jorgensen, Julia (1996) The functions of sarcastic irony in speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26: 613-634.

Jucker, H Andreas (1986) *News Interviews: A Pragmalinguistic Analysis*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

Kampf, Z., and E. Daskal (2011) When the watchdog bites: Insulting politicians on air. In M. Ekström, and M. Patrona *(eds.), Talking Politics in the Broadcast Media: Cross-cultural perspectives on political interviewing, journalism and accountability* (Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp.177 – 198.

Kampf, Z ., and E. Daskal (2013) Too hostile, too deferential: Processes of media answerability in the wake of political interviews. *Journalism: Theory, Practice and Criticism.* 14.4: 522-540.

Kotthoff, Helga (2003) Responding to irony in different contexts: On cognition in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1387-1411.

Kumon-Nakamura, S., S. Glucksberg, and M. Brown (1995) How about another piece of pie: The allusional pretense theory of discourse irony. *Journal of Experimental Psychology/ General* 124.1: 3-21.

Kroon, L.A., and G. Eriksson (2010) Interviews as communicative resources in news and current affairs broadcasts. *Journalism Studies* 11.1: 20-35.

Labov, W., and D. Fanshel, D. (1977) *Therapeutic Discourse*: *Psychotherapy as Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.

Leech, Geoffrey (1983) *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Liebes, T., Z. Kampf, and S. Blum-Kulka (2008) Saddam on CBS and Arafat on IBA: Addressing the enemy on television. *Political Communication* 25.3: 311-329.

Montgomery, Martin (2007) *The Discourse of Broadcast News: A Linguistic Approach*. London: Routledge.

Norrick, R. Neil (1994) Involvement and joking in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22: 409-430.

Oring, Elliot (1989) Between jokes and tales: On the nature of punch lines. *Humor* 2.4: 349-364.

Raskin, Victor (1985) *Semantic Mechanisms of Humor*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Raskin, V., and S. Attardo (1994) Non-literalness and non-bona-fide in language: An approach to formal and computational treatments of humor. *Pragmatics & Cognition* 2.1: 31-69.

Reich, Zvi (2011) User comments: The translation of participatory space. *Participatory Journalism: Guarding Open Gates at Online Newspapers*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Scannell, Patrick (1991) Introduction: The relevance of talk. *Broadcast talk*. London: Sage.

Sperber, D., and D. Wilson (1981) Irony and the Use-Mention distinction. In P. Cole (ed.), *Radical Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 295-318.

Sperber, D., and D. Wilson (1992) On verbal irony. *Lingua* 87: 53-76.

Vaisman, C.L., and I. Gonen (2011) *Hebrew Online*. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing (Hebrew).

Weizman, E., and M. Dascal (1991) On clues and cues: Strategies of text understanding. *Journal of Literary Semantics* XX/1: 18-30.

Weizman, Elda (2001) Addresser, addressee and target. In E. Weingand, and M. Dascal (eds.), *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 125-137.

Weizman, Elda (2003) News interviews on Israeli television: Normative expectations and discourse norms. In S. Stati, and M. Bondi (eds.), *Dialogue Analysis* 2000. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, pp. 384-94

Weizman, E., and M. Dascal (2005) Interpreting speaker's meanings in literary dialogue. In A. Bethen, and M.Dannerer (eds.), *Dialogue Analysis IX: Dialogue in Literature and the Media. Part 1: Literature*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, pp. 61-72

Weizman, Elda (2006) Roles and identities in news interviews: The Israeli context. Pragmatic aspects of political discourse in the media, *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 154-179.

Weizman, Elda (2008) *Positioning in Media Dialogue*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Weizman, Elda (2013) News interviews. *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics (EHLL)* 2: 825-828.

Wilson, Deirdre (2006) The pragmatics of verbal irony: Echo or pretence? *Lingua* 116: 1722-1743.

Appendix A

(Readers interested in the original Hebrew version of the following interviews, may contact the author.)

Ilana Dayan interviewing Ehud Barak (Channel 2 - 1.12.08)

1. Ilana Dayan: do [you know] what my fantasy is?
2. Ehud Barak: [ok] well?
3. ID: that I'll tell you let's talk sincerely (0.8) I'll turn back (0.8) and I'll ask you (0.6) what makes you fail?
4. EB: (0.8) I don't- I don't think- you're not going to have a problem with me regarding sincerity, that's no:t=
5. ID: so what makes you fail?
6. EB: I don't know. Are we starting with the interview now? Have we started?
7. ID: we have started.
8. EB: so you'll have to tell me that again. Bring some co<u>ffee</u> becau:se I: really need some coffee. Ok. You can start again.
9. ID: what makes you fail?
10. EB: (1.0) look I:, first of all, I am not a commentator on myself and I: would be much happier if I- if you were asking me what makes you succeed or look so successful without doing anything- [any-]
11. ID: [((laughing)) let's start that way,] what makes you look so successful- [to lift off- to take off like that?]
12. EB:[any] effort [eh-]
13. ID:[without] you having to sweat at all.
14. EB: e:h- no effort. I a:h don't know- I don't know how to answer that, I: know that I: am [trying- trying.]

15. ID:[what? seriously? Seriously?]
16. EB: [yes], I don't pretend I know, I=
17. ID: =so I am pretending=
18. EB: =ok.
19. ID:(0.5)Suggestion number one, the right forgave Bibi, the left does not forgive you. Does not forgive you.
20. EB: (1.0) Well look I don't– it is no news to me– I would have been very happy if there was- if I had found only people who were all e:h with me. It is no news to me th:e complaints and th:e criticism- leveled against me. E:h I think that some of them e:h are founded.=
21. ID: =Which ones?=
22. EB: I think that when I a:m focused on a t<u>ask</u> I, don't look around. Possibly there- there are some wonderful people who worked alongside me that sometimes I didn't pay enough attention to. I Certainly didn't pay enough attention t:o everything that has to do with- (0.5) eh- (0.5) issues that are part of the fundamental values surely of ours of the Labor Movement breaching the gaps the social aspect, and people were disappointed- some people were disappointed also with the results of the peace process I would have been glad myself if the results had been much more far reaching=
23. ID: =[That's too easy]
24. EB: =[And I also today I]
25. ID: =[That's too easy that's too easy] because it doesn't explain the bug in the program. How come a person so level headed, so courageous , with such an ability for carrying far reaching moves I am not saying that to flatter you, I am saying that because I am not the only one who thinks so, manages to fall into failure again and again?
26. EB: Look Ilana I- I am saying that I was raised i:n a different environment I was trained all my whole life as a e:h combat field officer. There the test of leadership, is the ability in the most difficult moments, e:h- to know what the right thing, to do it, and to be prepared to be the first who does it. And this is what brings you the- eh- motivation. There it's not about love, I definitely failed in drawing the peoples' love to me.

Yaron London and Moti Kirschenbaum with Haim Oron and Gideon Levi (Channel 10-31.01.2010)

1. Yaron London: Gideon Levy, perhaps eh- of the most radical left wing marker in eh- the large, circulation Israeli press, published a column today that attracted our attention, since in it he attacks not eh- the fascis:t righ:t, but rather the left, his <u>own camp</u>. And his claim is that the left has stopped fighting, on the- pretext of the- pardon granted to al-l those accused of rioting during the disengagement, the left did not fight that, on the other hand, says Gideon Levi, they constantly <u>harass</u> the left winger, who carry out eh- more moderate actions, and that why we asked him to come, along eh- with him MK, Haim Oron, chairman of Meretz. Meretz too is one of the victims of Gideon Levi's biting style in Haaretz today. So, why are you, why are you attacking eh- your people?
2. Gideon Levi: You've said it. Look I would be very happy not to do it, but when you see what's going on all around you and when you see that Kadima, by the way it's also on that list, because so many on the left or at least that's what they call themselves voted for them, Kadima is busy with Shaul Mofaz, Labor with Ehud Barak, and Meretz is busy with municipal taxe:s for synagogues and- fatherhood- leave benefits and rates for writers, all very worthy issues!↑ [But look around you]=
3. Y.L:[yes.]
4. G.L: On the other hand, the right wing, with these four hundre:d- people who were just granted this outrageous pardon, it didn't come from nowhere, someone <u>fought</u> for that, someone <u>took care</u> of them, and when there are eight hundre:d detainees after Operation Cast lead-, eight hundred people [were detained]=
5. Y.L: [Detained.]=
6. G.L: [Detained!]= and six hundred eighty fiv:e of them ended up with a criminal record↑, yes, and in the same breath=
7. Y.L: [Demonstrating against Operation Cast Lead]=
8. G.L: =[against Operation Cast Lead!]=
9. Y.L: Mostly Arabs.=
10. G.L: =Mostly Arabs.=
11. Y.L: =Because the Jewish ones were not charged.
12. G.L: =That's very true! The Jewish ones are now arrested now in Sheikh Jarrah.
13. Y.L: Yes.
14. G.L: That by the way you can't compare the violence: they didn't throw any oi:l, they didn't throw any aci:d, they didn't hurl tra:sh, nothing, but they have no "father" behind them. That determined handful has no "father", not in the Knesset, not in the public, they are absolute orphans. And with all due respect to Meretz, you know, I realize they don't have much power, and that's too bad, but we have memories of <u>a few lone</u> MK that have wreaked havoc in the party. Ye:s, we need only mention Shulamit Aloni, Uri Avnery, and- and Yossi Sarid. It's all disappeared, they're busy with rates for writers. I think that- eh=
15. Y.L: (to Gideon Levy): =How would you explain it? (0.2)[as a social observer?]=
16. G.L: [Look] Look, the left is dead=
16-28 turns omitted
29. Y.L: I'd like to understand the phenomenon, Gideon Levy has indicated a certain eh- historical development in which the left has diminished, till it's nearly gone, at least the radical left, and that's true. On the other hand, wouldn't it be correct to claim that the leftist activity has moved over to NGO? For example now they are attacking the New Israel Fund, eh- right wingers, and claim that the- they are doing <u>wonders</u>, they are setting the whole world against Israel's occupation policy!↑ And these are [leftists, leftists!]
30. Haim Oron: =[Yaron, Yaron…]

31. Y.L: =[It's just that they aren't acting within the political framework**] but outside of it!**↑
32. H.O: Dear God! The chairwoman of the New Fund, who was even shown on the posters today with a horn *horn and fund are homonyms in Hebrew*, is Neomi Hazan, former Meretz MK, chairwoman of the Meretz's presidium, I've just come from a meeting where we backed her up in everything she is doing, you are right about the essential thing, I don't want to go back to being on defensive. The left in the last few years received a new blow. A big part of that blow is because many people were certain that Kadima is the left. Gideon knows them, I am not even sure that that kind of writing doesn't lead even further left then Meretz, that kind of writing leads to total despair and to vote for Kadima. That's actually what people said "Look, if there is no difference, if they are all the same, then let's go for the big one, at least the big one is big", and then we will take Meretz down to three sits. I am not saying the struggle is easy, but I simply can't understan:d, by the way I do understand, I understand, because it's been going on all for years, that's always how it is with the left those <u>closest</u> to you <u>get hit</u> hardest. They don't catch those farthest from you,[it's a sure recipe-]=
33. Y.L: =[well,]Gideon Levy- your rhetoric- [sorry Moti]=
34. Moti Kirschenbaum: =[No, no, I'll let him-]
35. Y.L: Your rhetoric assumes, obviously, that your opinion is the righ:t. And that's you accuse, the left doesn't fight for that, look a few things happened here, you say just like that "the <u>heinous</u> Palestinian terrorism", Barak proposed a- certain plan at Camp David and the- plan was rejected because Arafat did not want a Palestinian state.↑
36. G.L: That's what you think.
37. Y.L: The- **heinous** terror is really heinous,↑ it is really heinous, it has claimed a thousand victims in the state of Israel, and that's why there is no left!↑ The left has stopped believing.
38. G.L: For that- Yaron, the lef:t that <u>is scared</u> by Palestinian terrorism and thinks that that's the moment to fold away the flags, well that's says something about what it was like before.=
39. Y.L: [No. No=
40. H.O: =[What flags were folded away? What flags were folded away?]
41. G.L: [It means- where, where is the left?] The square is empty=
42. M.K: [Friends]=
43. H.O: =[One moment], the square is empty because everybody- many people were convinced by what you tell to them that it's dead, so no one goes to funerals.
44. G.L: [I think it's dead, I wish it were]=
45. M.K: [Excuse me just a moment], here on the program we give our speakers airtime according to their political size, so we have to finish up.=
46. G.L:= [Then I shouldn't even get one second, going by that I shouldn't even get one second.]=
47. H.O: =[You have broken that rule]=
48. M.K: =[Then we have to finish.}=
49. Y.L: Real left is China, right?

Yaron London and Moti Kirschenbaum with Dov Khenin (Channel 10-04/11/08)

1. Yaron London: MK Dr.Dov Khenin is the *Ir Lekhulanu* ("City for All") party candidate for mayor. And this- this is an unusual candidacy, first because it seems, this is how we ourselves feel, that this isn't a hopeless candidacy, and there are som::e voices in town who say: "Look, he has got a chance↑ to ch-challenge Huldai, the long time mayor" ((waving his hands)). And second, Dov Khenin is an MK for Hadash and the traditional <u>communist</u> faction of Hadash, and <u>that's</u> something too. Welcome.
2. D.K: Good Evening.
3. Y.L: I-it first your opponents have of course attacked your politica::l affiliation and also claimed that you do not rise while the national hymn is being played and that you call for desertion from the army ↑=
4. D.K: =Yes.
5. Y.L: =And **such** an Anti-Zionist Candidate is not worthy of running ˚for mayor in this important city˚.
6. D.K: =So first of all this is an opportunity to say↑, why everybody knows↑, certainly I rise during the- singing of Hatikva↑, and- nobody really believes otherwise. Ah- obviously I stand ah- at attention for the singing of Hatikva, but it's totally obvious that this is an example of a spin by which they are trying to divert this campaign from the real matters that are being addressed. Look, in Tel Aviv-Jaffa there are real issues. Tel Aviv-Jaffa is a great city but it suffers from a lot of problems, it has-, it is a city dependant on private vehicles and scarcity of parking space::s, and air pollution and rent prices sky-high [and people can't live in-]=
7. Moti Kirschenbaum: =[Yes ah-], we will get to these matters, but still ah- we can't solve this by you rising for the- singing of Hatikva, you yourself have to admit that there is <u>something</u> weir::d (0.2)in a certain way that- a representative of a ah- communist party runs in- Tel Aviv, a very very capitalistic city, very very [materialistic]=
8. D.K:= [I],I will tell you. First of all, I run in Tel Aviv for ah- non-political party. Ir Lekulanu is a party that includes people with different stands. But I will immediately tell you, really Tel Aviv-Jaffa has become a turbo-capitalistic city, <u>that much is true</u>. And I think that <u>a little bit</u> of socialist values will definitely not hurt this city, <u>a little bit</u> of balance, a little more ah- concern for the social dimensions: kindergartens, schools, these young people who can't live in the city because rent prices are sky-high. A little more progressive environmental thinking, a little more public transportation replacing private vehicles. Listen, we live in the 21st century↑, It's about time, even in the great US they have already understood that turbo-capitalism is really not the deal here.
9. Y.L: Ah- let's- let's deal with a problem, with one issue. (0.1)Ah- the issue ah- of the rise in rent prices that really prevents young people, and not only young, but with les::s means, from living in this city, it happens <u>in all</u> big cities, in every metropolis all over the world, what kind of plan have you got [for lowering rent rates?]=
10. D.K: =[We- we have] a very detailed plan, I will give you just a few examples of what it includes. First of all, our claim is **not** that there are no market forces, there are market forces, and the municipality has not invented them↑, and the municipality alone cannot cancel them. The question is whether the municipality has any part to play <u>versus</u> market forces, in a reality where the public <u>suffers enormously↑,</u> in which the younger population cannot go on living in Tel Aviv unless they are very rich. The municipality has according to our approach many tools at its disposal, <u>for instance</u> to decide which apartments are being built in Tel Aviv-Jaffa. Many apartments are being built in Tel Aviv-Jaffa, but the apartments built in our city are luxury apartments and luxury towers. And there are so many luxury apartments that there are even more luxury apartments than luxury people in Israel.
11. Y.L: [I- if so then-] =

12. D.K:= [But] they **don't build** small and medium sized apartments for the people who need them.=

13. Y.L: = [But the market will do that.]=

14. D.K: = [No, no, the market-] =

15. Y.L: = [**When there is a greater] demand** for small and medium sized apartments, and there is less demand [for towers-] =

16. D.K: = [But here], but, <u>Yaron</u>, this is the precise example where- municipal policy in Tel Aviv <u>is a hindrance</u>. <u>Tel Aviv's municipal policy,</u> Tel Aviv's urban planning policy, is the policy of building luxury towers and luxury apartments. The small and medium sized apartments that the greater majority of the public in this city badly needs are not being built in our city↑. They are not being built=

17. Y.L:= How can the municipality influence the-? =

18. D.K:= Who is in charge of planning and building? The Local Planning and Construction Committee that is an extension of the <u>municipality</u>.

19. Y.L: So what you are going to tell- you are going to tell a developer who will come to you and say "I've purchased a plot of land and I want to build a high-rise on it"=

20. D.K: So the question is-=

21. Y.L: =And- ah- so you are going to tell him he can't do it?

22. D.K: No=

23. Y.L: You are going to tell him you will build six floors of apartments of sixty five meters each and I have the last say for [the interior of the apartments?]

24. D.K: = [No.] =

25. Y.L: =And **which kind of faucets to [use?]**

26. D.K: ((laughing)) [No,] No. I will not have the last say for the kind of faucets to use, but I will definitely tell him that I want and I will definitely say, we say that too, that future projects in Tel Aviv will include <u>small and medium sized apartments</u>.=

27. Y.L: [How w-?]

28. D.K: [By the way], I want to tell you, you know, I am not a great fan of contractors, and I am not known for representing their side, but I do not want them to suffer any injustice. It is not the contractors' interest to build large apartments necessarily. The contractors, I have talked to them, they are willing to build small apartments, because there is a **demand** for that. It is a municipal policy, a wrong one in my opinion, that assists the- richer sectors in the population and doesn't see the rest the way it should.

29. Y.L: So in order to make the city wealthier? [to collect more taxes? That's the idea?]

30. D.K: = [That's right. Could be. Could be.]

Appendix B: Questionnaire
<u>Personal Information:</u>
1. Age:
2. M/F
3. Party voted for in the last elections: _____
1. <u>Ilana Dayan and Ehud Barak</u>
<u>A.</u>
1) In your opinion, does Ilana Dayan believe that something makes Ehud Barak fail?
1. Yes.
2. No.
2) In your opinion, to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards Ehud Barak's stands?
Set A (see sub-section 3.3, Procedure and Materials, for the complete set of answers)
- Explain:
3) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Ilana Dayan is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism?
Set B (see sub-section 3.3, Procedure and Materials, for the complete set of answers)
- Explain:
4) In your opinion, does Ehud Barak believe that something makes him fail?
1. Yes.
2. No.
5) In your opinion, according to Ehud Barak's response to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards his stands?
Set A
- Explain:
6) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Ilana Dayan is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism in Ehud Barak's eyes?
Set B
Explain:
B.
1) In your opinion, does Ilana Dayan believe that Ehud Barak looks so successful without having to sweat?
1. Yes.
2. No.
2) In your opinion, to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards Ehud Barak's stands?
Set A
- **Explain:**
3) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Ilana Dayan is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism?
Set B
Explain:
4) In your opinion, does Ehud Barak believe that he looks so successful without having to sweat?
1. Yes.
2. No.

5) In your opinion, according to Ehud Barak's response to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards his stands?
Set A

- **Explain:**

6) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Ilana Dayan is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism in Ehud Barak's eyes?
Set B
Explain:

<u>C.</u>
1) In your opinion, does Ilana Dayan believe that the left does not forgive Ehud Barak?
1. Yes.
2. No.
2) In your opinion, to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards Ehud Barak's stands?
Set A

- Explain:

3) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Ilana Dayan is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism?
Set B

- Explain:

4) In your opinion, does Ehud Barak believe that the left does not forgive him?
1. Yes.
2. No.
5) In your opinion, according to Ehud Barak's response to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards his stands?
Set A

- Explain:

6) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Ilana Dayan is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism in Ehud Barak's eyes?
Set B

- Explain:

<u>D.</u>
1) In your opinion, does Ilana Dayan believe that Ehud Barak manages to fall into failure again and again?
1. Yes.
2. No.
2) In your opinion, to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards Ehud Barak's stands?
Set A

- Explain:

3) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Ilana Dayan is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism?
Set B

- Explain:

4) In your opinion, does Ehud Barak believe that he manages to fall into failure again and again?
1. Yes.
2. No.
5) In your opinion, according to Ehud Barak's response to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards his stands?
Set A

- Explain:

6) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Ilana Dayan is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism in Ehud Barak's eyes?
Set B
Explain_____
_____

<u>2. London and Kirschenbaum with Haim Oron and Gideon Levi</u>
<u>A.</u>
1) In your opinion, does Yaron London believe that Gideon Levi is attacking his people?
1. Yes.
2. No.
2) In your opinion, to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards Gideon Levy's stands?
Set A

- Explain:

3) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Yaron London is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism?
Set B

- Explain:

4) In your opinion, does Gideon Levi believe that he is attacking his people?
1. Yes.
2. No.
5) In your opinion, according to Gideon Levy's response to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards his stands?
Set A

- Explain:

6) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Yaron London is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism in Gideon Levy's eyes?
Set B

- Explain:

<u>B.</u>
1) In your opinion, does Yaron London believe that Gideon Levi can explain the phenomenon?
1. Yes.
2. No.
2) In your opinion, to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards Gideon Levy's stands?
Set A

- Explain:

3) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Yaron London is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism?
Set B

- Explain:

4) In your opinion, does Gideon Levi believe that he can explain the phenomenon?
1. Yes.
2. No.
5) In your opinion, according to Ehud Barak's response to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards his stands?
Set A

- Explain:

6) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Ilana Dayan is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism in Ehud Barak's eyes?
Set B

- Explain:

<u>C.</u>
1) In your opinion, does Yaron London believe that the leftist activity has moved over to NGO?
1. Yes.
2. No.
2) In your opinion, to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards Haim Oron's stands?
Set A

- Explain:

3) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Yaron London is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism?
Set B

- Explain:

4) In your opinion, does Haim Oron believe that the leftist activity has moved over to NGO?
1. Yes.
2. No.
5) In your opinion, according to Haim Oron's response to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards his stands?
Set A

- Explain:

6) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Yaron London is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism in Haim Oron's eyes?
Set B

- Explain:

<u>D.</u>
1) In your opinion, does Moti Kirschenbaum believe that on the program they give speakers airtime according to their political size?
1. Yes.
2. No.
2) In your opinion, to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards Gideon Levy and Haim Oron's stands?
Set A

- **Explain:**

3) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Moti Kirschenbaum is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism?
Set B

- **Explain:**

4) In your opinion, do Gideon Levi and Haim Oron believe that on the program they give speakers airtime according to their political size?
1. Yes.
2. No.
5) In your opinion, according to Gideon Levy and Haim Oron's response to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards their stands?
Set A

- **Explain:**

6) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Moti Kirschenbaum is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism in Gideon Levy and Haim Oron's eyes?
Set B

- **Explain:**

3. London and Kirschenbaum with Dov Khenin

A.

1) In your opinion, does Moti Kirschenbaum believe that that there is something weird in a certain way that a representative of a communist party runs in Tel Aviv?
1. Yes.
2. No.

2) In your opinion, to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards Dov Khenin's stands?
Set A

- Explain:

3) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Moti Kirschenbaum is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism?
Set B

- **Explain:**

4) In your opinion, does Dov Khenin believe that there is something weird in a certain way that a representative of a communist party runs in Tel Aviv?
1. Yes.
2. No.

5) In your opinion, according to Dov Khenin's response to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards his stands?
Set A

- Explain:

6) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Moti Kirschenbaum is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism in Dov Khenin's eyes?
Set B

- Explain:

B.

1) In your opinion, does Yaron London believe that Dov Khenin has got a plan or lowering rent rates?
1. Yes.
2. No.

2) In your opinion, to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards Dov Khenin's stands?
Set A

- Explain:

3) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Yaron London is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism?
Set B

- Explain:

4) In your opinion, does Dov Khenin believe there is a plan or lowering rent rates?
1. Yes.
2. No.

5) In your opinion, according to Dov Khenin's response to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards his stands?
Set A

- Explain:

6) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Yaron London is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism in Dov Khenin's eyes?
Set B

- Explain:

C.

1) In your opinion, does Yaron London believe that Dov Khenin will decide for a developer planning to build a high-rise in Tel Aviv the interior of the apartments and the kind of faucets to use?
1. Yes.
2. No.

2) In your opinion, to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards Dov Khenin's stands?
Set A

- **Explain:**

3) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Yaron London is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism?
Set B

- **Explain:**

4) In your opinion, does Dov Khenin believe he will decide for a developer planning to build a high-rise in Tel Aviv the interior of the apartments and the kind of faucets to use?
1. Yes.
2. No.

5) In your opinion, according to Dov Khenin's response to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards his stands?
Set A

- **Explain:**

6) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Yaron London is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism in Dov Khenin's eyes?
Set B

- **Explain:**

<u>D.</u>
1) In your opinion, does Yaron London believe the city encourages the construction of bigger apartments in order to make the city wealthier and to collect more taxes?
1. Yes.
2. No.
2) In your opinion, to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards Dov Khenin's stands?
Set A

- Explain:

3) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Yaron London is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism?
Set B

- Explain:

4) In your opinion, does Dov Khenin believe the city encourages the construction of bigger apartments in order to make the city wealthier and to collect more taxes?
1. Yes.
2. No.

5) In your opinion, according to Dov Khenin's response to what extent does the question express support or hostility towards his stands?
Set A

- Explain:

6) In your opinion, to what extent does the way the question is formulated by Yaron London is appropriate according to the ethics of journalism in Dov Khenin's eyes?
Set B

- Explain: