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In conversational studies, various authors have noticed that simultaneous talk does not only occur as the result of an unintentional overlapping transition but also as the result of intentional cutting-in while the current speaker has not yet reached the proximity of the end of their turn. Following this perspective, the nature of the roles of interviewer and interviewee are explored in two types of broadcast discourse. Focusing on excerpts taken from a political interview (Hardtalk) and a talk show (The Oprah Winfrey show) this study intends to account for the attitudinal processes that embody these two speech events by comparing the management of turn taking as seen in the phenomenon of overlapping. The main objectives are to observe and describe how collaborative or non-collaborative the interviewer and interviewee’s attitudes are as reflected in the negotiation of turns and how this may be influenced by the type of TV genre. It is proposed that the political interview with its conflicting character differs in the management of turn-taking behaviour from non-conflictive interviews such as talk shows, where overlaps, being collaborative in nature, display positive attitudes such as agreement, willingness to give detail, and acknowledgement from both the interviewer and interviewee.
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Un análisis descriptivo en términos actitudinales de dos tipos de entrevista visto desde el fenómeno del traslapo

En los estudios de análisis conversacional, varios autores han notado que el habla simultánea no solo ocurre como el resultado de un traslapo no intencional sino también como el resultado intencional de cortar al interlocutor cuando éste aún no ha llegado a la proximidad del término de su turno. En esta perspectiva, se explora la naturaleza de los roles de entrevistador y entrevistado en dos tipos de discurso de medios de comunicación. Centrándose en pasajes sacados de una entrevista política (Hardtalk) y de un programa de conversación (The Oprah Winfrey show) este estudio trata de dar cuenta de los procesos actitudinales que manifiestan ambos eventos de habla, por medio de la comparación del manejo de los intercambios de turno vistos desde el fenómeno del traslapo. Los objetivos principales son observar y describir cuán colaborativas, o no, son las actitudes reflejadas en la negociación de turnos.
1. INTRODUCTION

Conversation Analysis is a field of study concerned with the norms, practices and competences underlying the organisation of social interaction (Drew and Heritage 2006). It deals with all forms of spoken interaction including not only everyday conversations between friends and acquaintances, but also interactions in medical, educational, socio-legal and mass media contexts, among others.

As Drew and Heritage (1992) point out, most of the early work in conversation analysis focused on ordinary conversation, i.e. forms of interaction which are not confined to specialised settings or to the execution of particular tasks. In contrast, the studies of institutional talk, which began to emerge in the late 1970s, focused on more restricted environments in which (i) the goals of the participants are more limited and institution-specific, (ii) restrictions on the nature of interactional contributions are often in force, and (iii) institution- and activity-specific inferential frameworks are common.

As a type of institutional talk, the interview, as a broadcasting technique, falls within the domain of mass media communication and it differs radically from everyday conversation in that it is organised into exchanges of interviewer’s questions and interviewee’s answers. What is more, as understood in Conversation Analysis, the institutional roles of an interviewer and interviewee are not pre-assigned but rather actively co-constructed by the participants themselves (Hutchby 2006).

In order to see how the roles of the interviewer and interviewee are displayed in this type of institutional talk, the present study will focus on two types of interview, namely the political and the talk show interview. The former being a formal face-to-face encounter between a journalist and a personality who deals in great detail with political affairs, and the latter understood as a personality-type interview between a famous person and a host, which adopts the format of an informal conversation where transgression of the formal interviewing conventions is allowed (Rama Martínez 2000). Based on this, the present paper attempts to account for the attitudinal processes that embody these two speech events by comparing the management of turn taking as seen in the phenomenon of overlapping.

This paper has been structured into the following sections:
i. The first part presents some notions used as a theoretical basis.

ii. The second part presents the study itself, which comprises the objectives of the paper, the methodology used, the presentation of the analysis, and the discussion of results.

iii. Finally, the third part consists of a set of concise conclusions of the study as a whole, plus its limitations and some suggested further research.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Turn-taking organisation in the interview as a type of Institutional Interaction

In conversation, topics can emerge in a variety of ways; the participants are free to make diverse contributions to the subject at hand and anyone can initiate a new line of departure. In interview interaction, by contrast, the participants are fundamentally constrained. Interviewers (IR) restrict themselves to questioning and interviewees (IE) restrict themselves to answering IR questions, or at least responding to them (Heritage, 1998). This procedure shows two implications which refer to order and type of turn. Firstly, turn order is strict regardless of the number of participants in the encounter: the IR speaks first and then the IE, and so on successively. Secondly, the type of turn is also strict, since the alternation of turns should form a question-answer pair.

Moreover, according to Rama Martínez (2000), IRs and IEs should refrain from initiating actions other than questioning and answering, respectively, as it is not proper for any of the two parties to engage in actions other than those provided for them in advance. In short, turn types are pre-allocated to the participants in accordance with their institutional identities of IR and IE correspondingly. However, depending on the type of interview available some of the mentioned characteristics may vary.

2.2. The Political and the Talk Show interview and the roles of IR and IE

These two types of interviews constitute purposive encounters, occurring in the same institutional context –television– between, at least, one interviewer and one interviewee. The main differences lie in the goals of the events, the relationships between the participants, including the audience, and the degree of formality of the occasions (ibid.).

In the political interview, the roles of interviewer and interviewee are played by a journalist and a public figure appearing in his/her professional political role. The encounter is staged for the benefit of the general public, who is absent and passive, and is constructed as a mass audience. The ultimate addressee of the communicative event is, therefore, not the interviewer but the audience. Greatbatch (1992) notes that the interviewer’s unmasking task results very often in moments of conflict due to the clash between the interviewer’s suggestions of what the implications of a policy or a statement are, and the interviewee’s version of it, which will always be aimed at saving his/her reputation. For the achievement of the interviewer’s purpose, and to cross-examine the IE, the IR usually adopts a tough inquisitorial tone.
Unlike the political interview, where the informative function is overriding, the function of the talk show interview, according to Tolson (1991), is constantly shifting between information and entertainment. The information-seeking purpose of the interviewer is approached from within the format of an informal conversation or chat whose content frequently centres on the personal and private, sometimes resembling the form of gossip, and which is often characterised by its humorous and witty tone.

2.3. Overlapping talk

Sacks et al. (1974) observed that one of the rules governing everyday conversation is that one party talks at a time. Although participants orient themselves to this rule, very often two or more participants speak at the same time. If participants try to see to it that speaker change occurs in a smooth, non-disruptive manner, then simultaneous talk should be the result of misprojection of the end of the current speaker’s turn. However, simultaneous talk does not only occur as the result of an unintentional overlapping transition, but very often, is the result of intentional, abrupt cutting-in while the current speaker has not yet reached what might be considered the proximity of the end of his/her turn.

The above has led some researchers to use the term overlap as a synonym of unintentional simultaneous speech (Meltzer 1971), and others to distinguish it from the term interruption. Zimmerman and West (1975), for example, state that the latter is a deliberate violation of the turn-taking system, whereas the former is considered as a misfire in it.

This view that the non-operation of ‘not more than one party talks at a time’ constitutes a violation of the turn-taking system does not hold for all researchers. In fact, as Tannen (1994) argues, not all intentional overlaps must necessarily be interpreted as obstructive. Simultaneous speech in this sense can also be cooperative overlapping, that is, supportive rather than obstructive. This simultaneous talking is not considered interruptive, as it shows understanding, participation, and solidarity.

In this study the term overlap will be used as a synonym of simultaneous speech between the IR’s and IE’s turns, and no overt difference will be made between overlap and the term interruption. Nevertheless, overlaps will be distinguished in terms of collaborative and non-collaborative tones so as to reflect the attitudinal tendencies in the two types of interviews under study.

Considering this and before going into more detail, some essential notions will be explained:

a) Collaborative versus non-collaborative: This distinction is not based on the

---

3 Ibid.
notions of cooperative or non-cooperative in Gricean’s terms nor on the notion of politeness but on attitudinal ones. Collaborative are considered all those instances where there is encouragement for the other speaker to participate, expand, agree and express himself in a non-confrontational manner. Non-collaborative cases, on the other hand, are those cases where the speaker interacts in a confrontational manner, e.g. challenges, ignores, negates, etc. something the interlocutor has said.

b) Backchannel: backchannel talk comprises here supports (e.g. ‘mm’, ‘yes’, ‘I know’, etc.), exclamations, exclamatory questions (e.g. ‘what’, ‘really’, etc.) and sentence completions. Despite the fact that, according to Oreström4 (1983), they do not constitute a turn from a functional and referential perspective due to their low informational content, they are considered as turns in this paper as they carry attitudinal meaning in the interaction.

3. The study

3.1. General Objective

To explore some of the most prominent characteristics in terms of attitude in two instances of institutional talk focusing on turn-taking as the speakers negotiate the floor.

3.2. Specific Objectives

3.2.1. To observe how collaborative or non-collaborative the interviewer and interviewee’s attitudes are as reflected in the negotiation of turns specifically in the phenomenon of overlapping talk and how this may be influenced by the type of TV genre.

3.2.2. To describe in functional terms how collaborative and non-collaborative overlaps are displayed in the two interviews under study.

3.3. Methodology

The corpus of this paper consists of two interviews, namely “Hardtalk” and “The Oprah Winfrey Show”, broadcast by BBC World and CTV correspondingly. “Hardtalk5” is an in depth one-to-one interview launched in 1997 with Tim Sebastian as its presenter until 2006. The programme gets behind the stories that make the news interviewing prominent individuals, international political leaders and entertainers.

---


“The Oprah Winfrey Show” is a United States syndicated talk show hosted and produced by Oprah Winfrey. It has run since 1986 and it is the longest-running daytime television programme as well as the highest rated talk show in American television history. Credited with creating a more intimate confessional form of media communication, Winfrey, in front of a studio audience, interviews political, public figures, and also ordinary people who have been involved in important current issues.

The selection of the sample speech events was made on a random basis, the only ruling criterion being the representativeness of the broadcast genres under investigation. The same interviewee was chosen in order to cancel the variable of individual differences that could have affected attitudinal markers due to idiosyncratic reasons.

The two interviews correspond to the 47-year-old English singer George Michael. The two programmes were downloaded and fully analysed. The transcript corresponding to “Hardtalk” was taken from the BBC web site whereas the talk show was transcribed in full by the present researcher. The corpus was edited and corrected personally to suit the purpose of the present analysis as the interviews were repeatedly viewed.

Both interviews were identified by the name and date of the corresponding programme and contain a brief description including the names of the interviewer and the interviewee, the main topic under discussion, and the duration of the speech encounters. The time devoted to commercials and videos was not considered as part of the analysis, taking into account only those instances where interviewer and interviewee had to manage the taking of turns within their conversation. In the talk show’s case the presence of the audience was also mentioned despite the fact that it was not incorporated in the scope of analysis. The same happened, mainly due to time constraints, with paralinguistic factors and suprasegmental features.

Once the interviews were edited, the turns corresponding to overlaps were selected and described to see if they stood for collaborative or non-collaborative ones. Then, the overlaps were divided into IR or IE initiated, and further classified into the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Overlap</th>
<th>Collaborative</th>
<th>Non-collaborative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Ignoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for Clarification/ Expansion</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving Detail/Expanding</td>
<td>Insisting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for Confirmation</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 In broadcasting, syndication is the sale of the right to broadcast radio shows and television shows to multiple individual stations, without going through a broadcast network.

7 See: http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/430287/The-Oprah-Winfrey-Show
It is worth noting that more than one of the categories mentioned above may occur in one instance of overlap.

The conventions used in the transcripts are:

1. = : equal signs indicate that one sound followed the other with no intervening silence.
2. [ ] : brackets mark the onset and termination of simultaneous speech.
3. - : a hyphen represents a prior cut-off of an immediate prior word or syllable.
4. (unintelli.) : indicates that part of the utterance was unintelligible.
5. {} : indicate backchannel talk which comprises here all types of supports, exclamations, exclamatory questions, sentence completions.
6. (++) : intra-turn pause.
7. [laughter] : items in italics and square brackets provide non-verbal information.
8. " " : inverted commas indicate direct speech.
9. CAPITALS : capital letters signal an increase in volume.
10. IR : interviewer.
11. IE : interviewee.
12. AUD : audience (as a whole).
13. AUD 1,2 : each anonymous member of the audience that takes the floor is assigned a number.

3.4. Analysis

3.4.1. Presentation of findings

The information about the analysed instances can be found in the transcripts and tables attached in the Appendix. The following pie and bar charts present the data related to the phenomena found in each interview.

In the case of the findings for the Political interview Hardtalk, the numbers are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Challenging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticipating</td>
<td>Negating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Out of the total number of 73 non-collaborative overlaps, the highest percentage corresponds to interviewer initiated with a 62%, whereas interviewee initiated overlaps account for a 38%.

Regarding the classification of non-collaborative overlaps per subject, the numbers are the following:

The highest number in the IR’s case corresponds to Challenging with 24 occurrences followed by Ignoring 14, Expanding 11, Comment 7, Insisting 6, and finally Negating with 2 cases. On the other hand, the highest number in the IE’s case corresponds to Negating 12, followed by Expanding 11, Ignoring and Insisting 4, and finally Comment and Challenging with 1 occurrence. No collaborative overlaps were found in this interview.
In turn, in the case of the findings for the Talk Show interview *The Oprah Winfrey Show*, the numbers are:

Out of the total of 46 collaborative overlaps, interviewer initiated and interviewee initiated account for a 50% each.

As regards the classification of collaborative overlaps per subject, the numbers are the following:

The highest number in the IR’s case corresponds to Asking for Clarification/Expansion with 11 occurrences followed by Giving Detail/Expanding 7, Agreement 5, Comment 4, Asking for Confirmation 4, and finally, Anticipating Answer and Emphasising with no occurrences. On the other hand, the highest number in the IE’s case corresponds
to Giving Detail/Expanding 13, followed by Agreement 11, Anticipating Answer 2, Comment and Emphasising 1, and finally Asking for Clarification and Asking for Confirmation with no occurrences. Non-collaborative overlaps were not found in this interview.

4. Conclusions

4.1. Discussion of the results and statement of conclusions

As observed in the previous findings, depending on the type of interview under study, the roles of the IR and IE display clear and different patterns in terms of attitude. Firstly, the fact that in the political interview there were no instances of collaborative overlaps reflects its conflicting and confrontational nature. On the one hand, the challenging function adopted by the IR motivates his high degree of self-initiated non-collaborative overlaps, which exceeded in great number the IE’s ones. On the other hand, the IE’s desire to defend himself from the accusations produced by the IR accounts for the high number of the Negating category on the latter’s part. In the interview this is illustrated by actions of counter-argument to the IR’s statements, or opinions expressed through corrections of the information uttered by the IR considered incorrect or, at least, misleading.

This challenging task clashes with the IE’s goal of transmitting a favourable image regarding the ideas he stands for, which produces moments of great tension due to disagreement over the views held by the two participants. This is also reflected in the category Ignoring, which was the second highest on the IR’s part and the second lowest in the IE’s case. In this sense, the pre-established turn type assigned to the IR as the only one who asks questions leads him to ignore and reject the IE’s attempts to question him, challenge him and expand his turn more than usual. The IE, on the contrary, is not allowed to ignore the IR’s questions. Therefore, it seems that the turn order and turn type in political interviews is strict and participants stick to their institutional identities of IR and IE correspondingly.

As regards the talk show interview, IR and IE generate the same number of overlaps. This equality might be a consequence of the symmetrical relation between the participants and the informal character of this type of interview, which makes it more akin to a casual conversation than to a formal interview. As in a casual conversation, in a talk show interview, participants pretend to enter the interview on equal terms, resembling a conversation between friends. Thus, the talk show can be regarded as a less institutionalised discourse type than the political interview, because it appears to be less constrained by institutional role-distribution and turn pre-allocation. In fact, unlike the political interview, the IR and IE’s identities are constructed and reconstructed so as to involve new and sometimes unpredictable forms of interaction.

The information-seeking function of this type of interview is shown in the high number of Asking for Clarification/Expansion on the IR’s side and Giving Detail/Expanding on the IE’s part. Moreover, interest in the life of the guest orients the interaction primarily towards the narration of personal episodes, so that their exchanges
display a high degree of collaboration and non-conflict. This is signalled in the category Agreement having the second highest number of occurrences on the IE’s part; since the IR’s overlaps are not taken as threatening, the IE is willing to abandon his turn in favour of a response to the IR’s demands for detail.

Consequently, non-collaborative attitudes in the form of challenging remarks, ignoring one of the participants, and negating the interlocutor’ statements, among others, increase in situations of challenge or confrontation. Therefore, the political interview with its conflicting nature differs in the management of turn-taking behaviour of their participants from non-confictive interviews such as talk shows, where overlaps, being collaborative in nature, display positive attitudes such as agreement, willingness to give detail, and acknowledgement from both the IR and IE.

4.2. Limitations of the study

One limitation concerns the length of the corpus. The analysis was based on no more than 200 turns per interview. Therefore, variables whose occurrence did not show a very clear tendency might change if the corpus were more extensive.

In addition, prosodic features such as variations in stress, intonation, rhythm and length of pauses that were not analysed, due to time constraints, could have provided further insights into the attitudinal characteristics of both IR and IE.

4.3. Further Investigation

i. An interesting point for further investigation may be in the line of analysing interviewees’ treatment of interviewer’s prior turns and to what extent the interviewee reacts to a prior challenge from the interviewer. It has been suggested8 that typically IEs refrain from developing them in personalised terms and that they orientate to disagreement due to different preference structures to those found in everyday talk.

ii. It is also to be hoped that future research will continue to analyse the discursive and most distinguishing features of the talk-show and compare it on the one hand to casual conversation and institutional interaction on the other.
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APPENDIX

THE CORPUS DATA

Political Interview
Programme: Hardtalk.
Interviewer: Tim Sebastian.
Interviewee: George Michael (British Pop Singer).
Topic: Stances from the Entertainment World objecting to war in Iraq. Is it fashion or conviction?
Date: 28 February 2003.
Duration: 23 min. 55 sec.

IR: Tim Sebastian.
IE: George Michael.

1. **IR**: George Michael, a very warm welcome to the programme.
2. **IE**: Thank you. Nice to [meet you]
3. **IR**: [ what ] why Iraq? ‘Cos it’s fashionable?
4. **IE**: Oh God, no. Er (+++) I have absolutely no desire to be here today. I’ve got absolutely I’m really (+++) reluctant t- to be here er
5. **IR**: Why?
6. **IE**: =Simply because (+++) In all honesty, I was kind of first out of the trenches in terms of entertainers that were going to (+++) get behind something which would divide, which at the time was so divisive that, if you’re approaching a subject as divisive as Iraq was six or eight months ago, then you’re taking a big risk as an entertainer. Because you’re going to er alienate a lot of people, and I did very, very quickly. And I was completely mm er pilloried really for having the audacity to be a pop star who’s in the mainstream, as opposed to a rock star or, you know, ehh some kind of protest er singer [But I- (unintelli.) ]
7. **IR**: [But there’s no such] thing as bad publicity, is there?
8. **IE**: There is [(unintelli.) ] [DID YOU SEE my publicity? ]
9. **IR**: [particularly ] [particularly particularly ] if your record sales are falling in some [(unintelli.)]?]
10. **IE**: [ Did ] you see mine though? DID YOU SEE my pop publicity? Did you see any of it? It was absolutely dire. And I’d like to to add er (+++) I have absolutely no mm (+++) my record sales are not falling. I released two singles six years after my last album. And my my fans are now 35, on average, right? There was there was a piece on mm Channel 4 about three or four months ago where an artist was challenging Woolworth’s because they were not stocking their records, and they so they had a representative of Woolworth’s on, and this woman
said, “well we’ve done our market research for Woolworth’s and we know that the singles er market of 2002 is teenage girls between the ages of 12” and, no 11 and 12, that was as wide as it got, 11 and 12. The only reason I have to release singles, er as someone with er an audience of 35 plus, is that if you don’t release them as a single in Britain, you can’t get them on the radio. I don’t want to compete with, you know, Pop Idol and er the various various young people in the charts that are roughly half my age right now. I’d rather just release my albums [and]

11. **IR:** [But] you say you’re happier to have a big debate than a hit single. Really?

12. **IE:** =Absolutely [tely ]

13. **IR:** [You] must be the only one in the business then=

14. **IE:** =I think I probably am. I think I probably am by now. I’ve had 20 years of this business. I’m NEVER on the television never. I never do TV, I’m phobic about cameras. I have no interest in promoting my music beyond making videos =

15. **IR:** =But you never protested at the height of your fame, did you?

16. **IE:** Well, of course I didn’t. I was nineteen, twenty, twenty-one. What were you doing when you were [nineteen or twenty twen-?] a lot of people at nineteen, twenty and twenty- one were on the streets marching, weren’t they?

17. **IE:** for WH[AT? ]

18. **IR:** [again]st against Vietnam [for instance. There have been other wars since, haven’t there? ]

19. **IE:** [Yes, I KNOW but I was too young for THAT but this is my time this is ] my time I do understand what you’re trying to say. But the fact is mm I really have no concern about er being er accused of needing publicity. I’ve been supposedly over four times now. I I broke up Wham so it was over. And then I: took on Sony and took two and a half years out of my career over principle, by the way, er which was a useless principle because now nobody wants to pay artists, let alone the record companies. Er (++) I then was over and so I was over because of that because it was two, three years out of my career. Then I was over because I got arrested. And now apparently I’m over because I took on politics. And I’m I’m not in any trouble [ I’ve got -]

20. **IR:** [So you ar]en’t looking for the publicity then. What are you scared of [about the confrontation with Iraq?]=

21. **IE:** [ We’ve got Well if I’m – (unintelli. ) ]

22. **IR:** =What what scares you so much?=

23. **IE:** =Well, I [think before we move on to that]

24. **IE:** [ (unintelli. ) ]

25. **IE:** before we move on to that, as you did accuse me of using and I know it’s it’s [part of this programme ]

26. **IR:** [I didn’t accuse you, I as]ked you

27. **IE:** Okay, you asked me. Okay, as you sa- implied, we’ll change the wording, as you implied that I needed publicity, I have to tell you (++) why on earth would I be here today after what happened to me? I I did release the single against the er
mm against the advice of the record company that was releasing the single, very reluctant. Against the advice of my manager, my lawyers. Er everyone told me radio will not play it. These days the control that the government has over radio and television is phenomenal. They won’t play it. I didn’t believe [them]  

29. IR: [All right, so you took a risk [(unintelligible)]]  
30. IE: [AND I lost] AND I lost, so why am I here? I LOST [(unintelligible)]  
31. IR: [So tell] me what you’re SO SCARED about in Iraq.  
32. IE: I’m not scared about Iraq; I’m scared about Mr. Blair and his attitude to the future (+) I think we’re at a watershed moment. Twel- oh I’m sorry, September 11th was the first part of this watershed moment, and this is the the tail end of it (+) September 11th was so obviously directed at America to provoke (+) a response, and the response was supposed to be revenge. We’ve spent something close to (+) what is it now, something close to 18 months trying to prevent that knee-jerk reaction. And if all it’s been is delay, then what was the point=  
33. IR: =But there wasn’t a knee-jerk reaction, was there? =  
34. IE: =No there wasn’t, but you don’t think [this is this is]  
35. IR: =So there has ] been a properly considered reaction, consultation around the world, hasn’t there?  
36. IE: HAS THERE?  
37. IR: HASN’T THERE?  
38. IE: I don’t see [any consultation ]  
39. IR: [AMERICAN POLITICIANS?]  
40. IE: I see a lot of bu[llying ]  
41. IR: [TREKK]ING AROUND THE [WORLD?]  
42. IE: [ YES ]but do you see them actually saying anything but but terrorists, it’s either the terrorists or us?  
43. IR: Your complaint is that there hasn’t been a debate, but the news[papers ]  
44. IE: [NO, no], no, no. My complaint was in- it was about eight months ago that there was no debate=  
45. IR: =So you’ve had plenty of debate since then?  
46. IE: Oh yeah, all of which is being ignored. THAT’S my point. I’m here because I [(unintelligible).]  
47. IR: [ Ignored ] by whom?  
48. IE: By the Prime Minister.  
49. IR: No, he-he’s seen the need to go out and make the case for what he believes in.  
50. IE: Yes, [ absolutely ]  
51. IR: [And the res]ponse to it (unintelligible.) isn’t it?=  
52. IE: =ABSolutely. And do you not think that his voters have told him they’re not convinced by that?  
53. IR: Some have. Some have [the ones who said that the country is not united]
IE: [ No, ninety - one percent. Yesterday. ]
Ninety-one percent said without the UN, they didn’t want to go in. Do you think that’s close to unanimous?

IR: You were so much aligned with Blair and Cool [Britannia] weren’t you? [At]

IE: [ {uhm} ] [NO], NO, no, I wasn’t. No I wasn- I never turned up at that bloody party. EXCUSE ME. I was NEVER going to be used that way. When I saw Tony Blair, I saw him in Islington before he got into Downing Street, right, when he needed people like me. I saw him personally. I went and had a meal with him, discussed it, because my lawyer is a member of the Labour Par[ty]

IR: [But] you supported it, didn’t you?

IE: When?

IR: Then. The [Cool the C- the ] Cool Britannia?

IE: [ supported what?] [unintelli.]

IR: [(unintelligible)]


IR: [no ] (++) no?

IE: I’ve never believed in Cool Britannia.

IR: You said,

IE: [Well, if I’m ] really honest, I’ve lost faith in the last five days.

IR: You said this three days ago=

IE: =Mm. But I was trying to be actually on Sunday I was trying to be (++) I was trying not to come across as too wound up, in all honesty. And what happened was I was quite polite and nobody reported anything, which is not what I’m here for. So today I’m kind of speaking my mind a little more than I did at nine o’clock on Sunday morning=

IR: =Why? What’s changed in the last five days as far as you’re concerned? I mean, you’ve you’ve said he’s a decent man=

IE: =Well, it was on Friday actually that I decided it was I’ll be honest, I’ve been very distressed by Mr. Blair’s behaviour for for several years in terms of the way I think he’s re-mo:ved the idealism from politics, by taking a left a a supposedly left of centre party and calling (++) it Labour, or New Labour (++) and then basically saying there is wh- we have to be pragmatic. The left is really, in these overly consumerist times, [the left is actually ]

IR: [He also says you h]ave to have an ethical foreign policy, didn’t he?=

IE: =Absolutely and y- and and absolutely. This is not ethical, is it? We-This is a Christian country with supposedly a Christian leader who somehow think that the answer to the future is pre-emptive action. Now to me pre-emptive action is every
bit as dangerous a concept as the initial concept of creating the atomic bomb. And by the way, that was created for the same for the same kind of deterrent purposes, by the same nation. And I do not believe that this is any more safe than th[at ]

73. **IR:** [So] you’ve lost faith in him, have you?

74. **IE:** Well, because until [ until last ]=

75. **IR:** [Is that a yes?]=

76. **IE:** =week, I thought it was bluff. I really did. I thought he’s trying to keep the pressure up until the last moment. But he’s damaging, he’s making so many damaging statements, and [he’s (unintelli.) UN]

77. **IR:** [So you have lost ] faith? You have lost faith? Let me bully you a little. You [have lost faith?]=

78. **IE:** [I don’t know ] How can I say? you know, to lo- lose belief you have to=  

79. **IR:** =ARE YOU WRITING HIM OFF or are you saying y- y-[ you still trust him? ]

80. **IE:** [No, if I was writing ] him off, I wouldn’t be HERE. If I thought that man was not listening to anybody, I wouldn’t be here [I (unintelli.)]

81. **IR:** [You’d still ] vote for him?=

82. **IE:** =No. I wouldn’t vote for him. I would never vote for him again. Never vote for him again. Because he’s gone beyond the bluff. He’s now bullying the UN on behalf of ehh [Mr. Bush. ]

83. **IR:** [Bullying? ] he’s persuading, he would say.

84. **IE:** Uff what, letting- well, I’d say bullying. You have to be ehh you cannot ignore statements like (++) the UN (++) needs to prove its relevance. You CANNOT ignore the fact that America could sit there and say, you either agree with us or you’re irrelevant=

85. **IR:** =15 members of the Security Council[ unan ]imou[s, si]gned up to Resolution 1[441=  

86. **IE:** [ {uhm} ](++) [ {uhm} ](++) [Yeah=

**IR:** = calling on Iraq to di]sarm  
**IE:** = and it’s obvious why]

87. **IE:** A- [and it’s for the sa]me reason

88. **IR:** [Is that bullying? ]

89. **IE:** er LISTEN, [it’s for the (++) it’s the same reason ]

90. **IR:** [ Even SYRIA, against all expecta]tions=

91. **IE:** =It’s the SAME reason, right, that i- if they pass this new res- resolution, which seems a lot more unlikely considering that France and Germany are completely saying there’s no need for it. If they pass the new resolution, it will be for the same reason they passed the first one because they’re afraid of extinction. And to ME that is bullying=

92. **IR:** =What kind of prime minister do you want?

93. **IE:** [I want one]

94. **IR:** [If you don’]t want a man who leads on his convictions= 
IE: =I WANT SOMEBODY WHO LEADS ON HIS CONVICTIONS until the point that their pu[blic says ]

IR: [Until the ]point that [you disagree with him ]

IE: [absolutely (unintelli.) no] no, until the point that 90% of the public disagrees with [him]

IR: [That]’s the hard times. That’s what he’s paid for, Isn’t it? [Take the tough decisions. Not to be a populist]

IE: [ NO you’re not (++) you’re not paid ] you’re not paid to put people’s lives in danger and ignore their opinion on that very subject. No one is paid to do that.

IR: He says, “failure to act would lead not to peace but to a bloodier conflict in the future”. That’s what he says=

IE: =Well, I will I will take the future compared to right now, because failure to act may mean absolutely we know the dangers of Saddam Hussein. We know absolutely we can’t afford to leave him alone. Why have we left him alone for 12 years, right, why did we leave him there ten years ago, and now at the point when Sharon is bombing the West Bank we’re going to decide to take on Saddam?=

IR: = So they gave diplomacy a chance for 12 years? Even you have to admit 12 years [is long enough isn’t it?]

IE: [ Absolutely I’m not ] I’ve no sympathy with Saddam Hussein. I have no sympathy with him. He he should be gone. We need him gone in order to to stabilise the region. But you CANNOT do this at the moment when the entire er er fundamentalist terrorist network around the world is waiting for this to legitimise what they want to do.

IR: How do you think you’ve contributed to the debate over Iraq?

IE: Well=

IR: = I mean if you say shoot the dog, which make Blair and Bush out to be fools and [being] describ [ed as rather vicious (unintelli.) ]=

IE: =[{uhm}] (++) [ It’s called satire. It’s called satire actually]=

IR: =described as rather a vicious attack by some people=

IE: =Well, it’s not, is it? It’s satire. And BY THE WAY, it’s satire from the same people that show exactly the same stuff with exactly the same animation, exactly the same character references, EVERY Saturday on ITV at 10.30=

IR: =But you wanted a serious debate. How does that [kind of thing contribute? (unintelli.) ]

IE: [You DO not- I’ll tell you what that’s what that’s what I’m ] here for now. Eight, nine months ago no one wanted to and believe me, we’re talking a- a- about a generation which has so little or desire for politics in its music, that I knew that if I was going to be ahead of the game and try and get people to discuss this, I had to do it with some humour. And sure enough, even the humour at that stage in time, it was something people did not want to hear about. NOW that they’re deluged with it (++) it’s okay. I can come out here and I’m relatively safe. At that point in time I wanted to write it, make the the the statements as as broadly and as funny as I could in the video, to make sure that before people were too freaked out to talk, they laughed their way into thinking= 
IR: =But things like, “So Cherie my dear, could you leave the way clear for sex tonight. Tony, Tony, Tony, I know that you’re horny, but there’s something about that Bush that ain’t right”=

IE: =so tell me [(unintelli.)]

IR: [What does] what does THAT contribute? [Do you (unintelli) ]

IE: [Okay I’ll tell you what it is ]

Okay Can I read my own lyrics for a second excuse me (++) I’ll tell you what it contributes. The idea=

IR: =Right at the top

IE: The idea is not anything to do. Now Americans turned this into that they were having a homosexual affair. Because of that’s kind of a joke that was in (++) the video

IR: uhm=

IE: =right? But actually what it means is (++) “Tony, Tony, Tony”, the idea is that she’s saying she’s going to withHOLD sex because there’s something about that Bush ain’t right. Do you get the little joke in there? Bush (++) American [term for bush ]

IR: =Right at the top

IE: The idea is not anything to do. Now Americans turned this into that they were having a homosexual affair. Because of that’s kind of a joke that was in (++) the video

IE: =right? But actually what it means is (++) “Tony, Tony, Tony”, the idea is that she’s saying she’s going to withHOLD sex because there’s something about that Bush ain’t right. Do you get the little joke in there? Bush (++) American [term for bush ]

IR: [But what does] it contribute to the debate?

IE: (++) It was to bring it to people’s attention. And do you NOT think, by any chance, by any ‘cos you’re still not giving me any break here. Do you not think –I don’t know what– how closely you were watching popular culture at that time, but I think that I dragged that argument into the mainstream, out of the political er chattering classes, or whatever you would all them. I dragged that out of the the political classes into the mainstream two or three weeks before it was going to get there. And I would say, at this point in time, when we’re supposedly in such a bloody rush (++) that those two, three weeks were actually - it was worth what I put up with, it was worth losing the record, no one playing the record, no one playing the video. It was worth it because when I was attacked for doing it, it came into the mainstream. And that’s exactly why I’m here again today [EXACTLY ]

IR: [People say ]i-i- it’s an easy subject, ANTI-WAR [ protest (unitelli.) PLENTY OF ]

IE: =I don’t think it’s an easy subject. It’s not an ANTI]-WAR

IR: Plenty of precedents for that. Anti-war, anti this war in particular=

IE: =and whe- sorry, what were the precedents for this? (++)In entertainment?=

IR: =Plenty of people i- in the past=

IE: = Who talked before me?

IR: About this particular-

IE: {uhm}

IR: I’m not talking about this particular w[ar ] in previo[w]ars

IE: [So] (++) [so w]hat was the thing that I was contributing when I first talked about this?

IR: You tell me.

IE: I brought it into the mainstream because I’m a – I’m a pop singer and there’s almost no way of bringing politics into the mainstream these days unless you’re
not a politician(++) So I’m ABSOLUTELY convinced that I was one of the first people screaming that we needed to have this chat, and that brought it forward. I’m very convinced that the actual date that they wanted the debate to start was September 11th. I saw that that er the speech that er Bush made from Capitol Hill on the night of September 11th, when nothing had gone off, and everyone was thanking God that nothing had gone off. And I saw that speech, and it made me absolutely aware I couldn’t understand around the time of the World Cup and the Jubilee why no one was talking about this=

134. IR: =You’ve taken a lot of criticism, as you say=

135. IE: {uhm} [and I’ll take a lot more]

136. IR: [ (unintelli.) ] Noel Gallagher says, George is now trying to make social comment. This is the guy who his who he actually was from the public for 20 years. Now all of a sudden he’s going to say something about the world. I find it laughable. That’s before you get [to the song which is diabolical (unintelli.)]

137: IE: [ no (++) I mean I think Well, I think that’s] the laughable statement. What, the fact that I did not want to share my sexuality with the world, in this in this current media er media atmosphere, the fact that I didn’t want to share my sexuality with the world means that I have no right to talk about politics. This is not an intelligent man. He’s not someone you should throw quotes at me from really. If you’re going to find criticism, find it from Mr. Murdoch, you know. Mr. Murdoch attacked me solidly on Sky News, in the New York Post, and in the Sun. And what he would do would be he would print these slurs in the New York Post in such a way that when they re-printed them in The Sun, its sister newspaper, I could only sue on the basis of it being re-printed from the American source. And the American source would have been much harder to sue. So I - there was a campaign=

138. IR: =What worries you about the New York Post?

139. IE: What shouldn’t worry me about the New York Post?

It’s a fascist news[paper]

140. IR: [A wa]shed up pervert=

141. IE: =Well that was - why should I worry about that? Apart from the fact. I mean, really it’s no - why would I worry about that? I don’t worry about the Daily Star, I don’t worry about the Daily, you know, the the Sport. I don’t worry about The Sun or The Mirror. Why would I worry about that? I wou- I do find it absolutely unbelievable they’re able to call a homosexual man a pervert for having been caught cruising. I do find that quite a- laughable that that is not sue-able.

142. IR: You feel a responsibility to speak out

143. IE: [Absolutely]

144. IR: [But people] are saying now that you’re speaking about a- on this issue, why not about others? Why not against DRUGS?

[Why not against- that would SIT UP and make people take notice,) wouldn’t it?

145. IE: [BECAUSE MY FAMILY IS (++) no, no, no. ] (++) okay yeah well, why would it? Those are the kind [of things (unintelli.) ]
146. **IR:** [Because it would be unexpected?] =
147. **IE:** =No it wouldn’t. What it would be unexpected for me to do, JUST SAY NO. Excuse me? [(unintelligible. )]
148. **IR:** [(unintelligible.)] HAVE YOU DONE IT?
149. **IE:** OF COURSE NOT. Because I’ve taken drugs; I’m not a hypocrite. (++) You know I’m not going to that kind of rubbish. I’m not going to that kind of thing. This is something that threatens the lives and the and the lifestyle of myself and the people I love. This is a lot more important than trying to discourage people from taking drugs or telling them that they really should pay for their CDs.
150. **IR:** Do you think so? On [a long term basis?] 
151. **IE:** [(What this? (++) ] Well this this altercation? Well, I – I’m afraid I really do, and I think if if you don’t, then y- I’m I’m jealous because you must be sleeping a lot better than me [laughter]
152. **IR:** What do you want Saddam to do? What should be done with Saddam?
153. **IE:** Mm.=
154. **IR:** =If he doesn’t – he’s made it clear now he isn’t going to disarm. He [won’t get rid of the missiles]
155. **IE:** [I think I’ve already made th] at point. I think I’ve already made that [point]
156. **IR:** [ Just ] talk to him?
157. **IE:** NO, not to Saddam. Saddam has to be dealt with in the way that Saddam has to be dealt with, but not now. Not until there’s some effort shown in Palestine. Otherwise =
158. **IR:** =Why are you linking the two together?
159. **IE:** Because – THEY’RE NOT LINKED, but every terrorist in the world who is an Islamic fundamentalist terrorist links those two things. Would you agree with that?
160. **IR:** A lot do.
161. **IE:** [A LOT]
162. **IR:** [bu- bu- ] But that doesn’t make it right, DOES it?= 
163. **IE:** =OF COURSE IT DOESN’T. But this is not about right and wrong. This is this is what’s dangerous about this situation. What this is about is the Pandora’s box that was opened by the Americans, you know, in the fifties or sixties with the invention of the atomic bomb. That Pandora’s box was opened then, and little bits from it are now internationally placed. [ Right?]
164. **IR:** [ Make ] you feel better if the UN had a second resolution authorising force?
165. **IE:** SLIGHTLY, but I don’t think beca - I think that most people who have voted against Mr. Blair on this iss- issue are not voting o- really on the issue of whether it’s right for us to kill innocent people in Iraq (++) right. I don’t really think they’re voting on that. I think they’re voting on that as normal, but this time they’re saying, we do not want this war in our backyard. We did not do anything to deserve it. Our administration, as far as we know, did not really do anything to deserve it. I do not think Americans have the same point of view. I think that they are- they have been
attacked, they feel frightened, they understandably want a strong leader, they’re not anywhere near as informed by their media as we are. And er I honestly think that the majority of British people have no idea what we’re doing here. On our own. With the Americans.

166. **IR**: Is George Michael disillusioned with the music industry?

167. **IE**: [laughter]

168. **IR**: Had enough?

169. **IE**: Er {uhm} [ laughter ]

170. **IR**: something from your album, Older, “star people counting your money until your soul turns green. Star people counting the cost of your desire to be seen”

171. **IE**: {Uhm}

172. **IR**: Can’t help but hope there’s a difference between you and me.

173. **IE**: {Uhm}

174. **IR**: Is that what you hope?

175. **IE**: Well, I don’t hope it. A- a- as I said, I have barely promoted myself in er when was since Faith, which was 1988, I have barely promoted myself. I’ve been on television maximum a couple of times a year, if that. Right? I stepped back from needing this a long time ago. I like to i-i- i-i- important things in my life are my family, including my partner, and my music. And I’m not complete with either one of them er being absent. I need [(unintelli. )] 

176. **IR**: [Fed up with] the record industry, though? [You=

177. **IE**: [Oh by – absolutely (unintelli.)]

**IR**: = the bosses and the corporate guys who’ve done their best to relieve artists of their art.

178. **IE**: Oh, they have. Would you honestly say you hear much art on the radio? Which is why I think it’s kind of (+++) you know, I’m begging, I’m hoping that there will not be Band Aid 2 because the reality is very, very few people in the industry now that you’re hearing on the radio make their money from their own hearts and minds. They make their money from singing the words of others. And so therefore the weight of something, you now, called Band Aid 2 or 3 or whatever, would be incredibly slight, because those people involved would be extremely young and extremely lacking in knowledge about any type of politics. It’s not the same as making a record to try and send money to Ethiopia. This is different and I really hope the pop music, the industry, the current industry, the current generation stays away from it, because I really don’t think it’s er it would be a very genuine move=

179. **IR**: =Too much violence in music? (+++) Rapping lyrics?

180. **IE**: Well, American music has been very nihilistic for a long time, and I find that - I actually, to be honest with you, even though our music industry is is dying on its feet, I would much rather er have no youth culture - which is basically what we’re coming to. We had youth culture which is now almost it’s been assimilated and there’s nothing left of it. I’d rather have no youth culture than a nihilistic youth culture, which is what America is having to deal with
181. **IR**: What were the lessons for you from this protest? (unintelli) protest. Is this a one-off as far as you’re [concerned? Iraq]

182. **IE**: [Oh, absolutely]

183. **IR**: That’s [it? ]

184. **IE**: [The] only other thing that I would ever er put my neck on the line for [(unintelli. )]

185. **IR**: George Mi[chael’s going to stop caring and go back to the business?]

186. **IE**: Well, no. I think (+++) the only thing that I can see myself putting myself this far out on a limb for again (+++) is er probably Clause 28. I would go that far for Clause 28.

187. **IR**: On homosexuals

188. **IE**: {Uhm}

189. **IR**: Teaching?

190. **IE**: Mm. Well, it’s not just the teaching, it’s all kinds of things. But as it stands, I can still be arrested walking down the street holding my boyfriend’s hand(++) As it stands. I mean, it would never happen. But it’s one of the ridiculous things that’s in there. And I think it’s time for gay couples I have no I have no real view on on marriage because it’s never been something- I’ve no desire to ape heterosexual relationships. But I think it’s absolutely time that people who live together their entire lives have the right of spouses, as opposed to the person - you know, the idea that if anything happened to myself or Kenny, that our our families would be er would have all the rights and that we would have none it is just ridiculous=

191. **IR**: = Okay, George Michael. It’s good to have you on the programme. Thanks very much indeed.

192. **IE**: Thank you. Cheers.

193. **IR**: Thanks.
Talk Show Interview
Programme: The Oprah Winfrey Show.
Host/ Interviewer: Oprah Winfrey.
Guest/ Interviewee: George Michael (British Pop Singer).
Topic: George Michael’s scandal for lewd acts, his arrest, declarations regarding his homosexuality and the release of his new album.
Date: 26 May 2004.
Duration: 42 min. 22 sec.

IR: Oprah Winfrey.
IE: George Michael.
AUD 1: Kenny Goss (George Michael’s partner who is part of the audience)

1. **IR**: Okay, so: it’s been years since George Michael has performed or spoken out on American television his fall from fame was as sudden as his rise to the top. His long-awaited album Patience is receiving critical acclaim, many people say that this could be the come back of the year. Please welcome George Michael.
**AUD**: [roar and applause]

2. **IE**: Hi.

3. **IR**: How you doing?

4. **IE**: I’m good. I’m good. It’s great to meet you finally.

5. **IR**: Great to meet you finally.

6. **IE**: I’ve- I’ve been an- I’ve been an admirer for many years [many years yeah]

7. **IR**: [ Really, really? ]

8. **IE**: Many years absolutely

9. **IR**: How are you feeling about doing this interview? This is sort of a coming out of sorts=

10. **IE**: = well, it’s a kind of strange thing {yeah} because I haven’t been on American television for so long.

11. **IR**: {Uhm}

12. **IE**: It’s weird er being back here to promote because I’ve spent I’ve spent a lot of time here and mm- because my current partner of 8 years is er American

13. **IR**: {Uhm}

14. **IE**: I spend quite a bit of time in America. But none of it professionally you [know]

15. **IR**: [Okay] and so: will you take us back to the day of the arrest?

16. **IE**: {Uhm}

17. **IR**: Will you? [What was going on]?

18. **IE**: [Mm (++) ] Let me see: the day of the arrest

19. **AUD 1**: We went out to eat.

20. **IE**: We went to eat. Look Kenny is telling you. We went out for a meal

21. **IR**: {Uhm}
22. **IE**: In reality I think you know:

23. **IR**: ‘Cause you and Kenny were toge[ther at the time?]

24. **IE**: [Yeah, we’ve been] together at this time for about 2 and a half er years and (++) it’s a very strange thing really I mean when I look- when I looked back at it afterwards its was so obvious that it was deliberate on my part.

25. **IR**: {Uhm}

26. **IE**: Strange at it may seem mm:

27. **IR**: I do the Oprah Show so it’s not strange enough.

28. **AUD**: [laughter]

29. **IE**: And when I look back on it er I was just kind of (++) bursting to come out I [think].

30. **IR**: {Yeah}

31. **IE**: Okay so you are in a park? =

32. **IR**: =Very classy

33. **IR**: {Yeah}

34. **IE**: And when I look back on it er I was just kind of (++) bursting to come out I [think].

35. **IR**: =Okay so you are in a park? =

36. **IE**: Very classy

37. **IR**: {Yeah}

38. **IE**: =Okay so you are in a park? =

39. **IR**: =Very classy

40. **IR**: {Yeah}

41. **IE**: And er they don’t send Columbo in there. They send someone really nice looking =

42. **IR**: = {Yeah} [laughter]  

43. **AUD**: [laughter and applause]

44. **IR**: = Of course not=

45. **IR**: = “Of course not”

46. **AUD**: [laughter]

47. **IE**: And er they don’t send Columbo in there. They send someone really nice looking =

48. **IR**: = {Yeah} [laughter]  

49. **AUD**: [laughter and applause]

50. **IR**: = Of course not=

51. **IR**: = “Of course not”

52. **AUD**: [laughter]

53. **IE**: And er they don’t send Columbo in there. They send someone really nice looking =

54. **IR**: = {Yeah} [laughter]  

55. **AUD**: [laughter and applause]

56. **IR**: = Of course not=

57. **IR**: = “Of course not”

58. **AUD**: [laughter]

59. **IE**: And er they don’t send Columbo in there. They send someone really nice looking =

60. **IR**: = {Yeah} [laughter]  

61. **AUD**: [laughter and applause]

62. **IR**: = Of course not=

63. **IR**: = “Of course not”

64. **AUD**: [laughter]

65. **IE**: And er they don’t send Columbo in there. They send someone really nice looking =

66. **IR**: = {Yeah} [laughter]  

67. **AUD**: [laughter and applause]

68. **IR**: = Of course not=

69. **IR**: = “Of course not”

70. **AUD**: [laughter]

71. **IE**: And er they don’t send Columbo in there. They send someone really nice looking =

72. **IR**: = {Yeah} [laughter]  

73. **AUD**: [laughter and applause]

74. **IR**: = Of course not=

75. **IR**: = “Of course not”

76. **AUD**: [laughter]

77. **IE**: And er they don’t send Columbo in there. They send someone really nice looking =

78. **IR**: = {Yeah} [laughter]  

79. **AUD**: [laughter and applause]

80. **IR**: = Of course not=

81. **IR**: = “Of course not”

82. **AUD**: [laughter]
IE: [Yeah okay=]
IR: =B-but I’m just saying “you HAVE to” because when we hear a report like that “Arrested for lewd acts” =
IE: = yeah [you imagine something very lewd]
IR: = [ (unintelli. ) ] yes and in everybody’s mind it’s whatever “lewd” is to them. [And] {uhm} [pointing the audience] these are some people who can go all the way
AUD: [laughter and applause]
IE: So (++) you know (++) so I think is best if you say I think [this is what happened and this is wh-]
IR: =Okay this is (++) wh- okay so ] this is absolutely what happened then. So I went into the bathroom and er being my cautious self went over and was washing my hands. And the person whose job it was to er to be there er attracting my attention=
IR: ={Uhm}
IE: =was doing exactly that and you know as far as I was concerned, unless he could do something clever with his thumb, then er then there was a man there who was interested in my attention (++) [And this is-]
IR: =Am- am I follow-ing you?
AUD: =[laughter]
IR: =to the audience] Are you all following? Okay okay
IE: This is more difficult for women to imagine obviously but basically I I [felt (unintelli.)-]
IR: =Yeah I’m still at washing your [hands (++) okay]
IE: =I felt I felt (unintelli.) [laughter]
AUD: [laughter]
IR: You’re washing your hands and that =
IE: =Yes, I’m washing my [hands]
IR: =Okay]
IE: =And drying my hands=
IR: =you’re drying [your hands]
IE: = [and there] is a man in the cubicle staring at [me as-]
IR: =[staring] at you washing your hands? =
IE: =Yes, staring at me-
IR: Okay wait a minute. Is that a code? Or are you really just washing your hands
AUD: [laughter]
IE: Staring is a kind of code you know {Okay} washing your hands means you’re being really careful, right? And then he was staring at me and as far as I was concerned he was e:r =
IR: = Watching you like interested in you or something?
71. **IE:** Well no. He was doing rather more than that but er
    **AUD:** *laughter*

72. **IE:** but this is the point this is c- this is what I called entrapment is when
    someone is basically (++) even if they are not if they are pretending to let’s say
    pleasure themselves then your response- =

73. **IR:** = OH so he is pleasing himself

74. **IE:** Well this is the thing unless he can do something clever with his thumb. I
    thought I was watching someone pleasuring himself =

75. **IR:** = Okay I got you

76. **IE:** and staring at me.

77. **IR:** Okay

78. **IE:** And then what basically happened was er =

79. **IR:** = Oh I’m with you now!

80. **IE:** OKAY!
    **AUD:** *laughter and applause*

81. **IR:** I'M THERE! *applause*

82. **IE:** *laughter*
    **AUD:** *laughter and applause*

83. **IR:** Go ahead GO AHEAD!

84. **IE:** So I kind of responded in kind =

85. **IR:** = Okay

86. **IE:** Er and very briefly er very briefly actually er a:nd the guy then walked out
    of the er out of the bathroom. So I just gathered he wasn’t impressed and er
    **AUD:** *laughter*

87. **IE:** and er I left and I went back down to the street (++) and after I- as I
    reached the street, the cops swooped on my basically.

88. **IR:** Whoa

89. **IE:** Mm it’s pretty heavy stuff really I think.

90. **IR:** And so what did you think then?

91. **IE:** Well I stood on I stood on the pavement and I said, “I’m sorry but that was
    entrapment”

92. **IR:** you said [that]

93. **IE:** [Yes] I said it. Absolutely. (unintelli.) there was a nice little crowd
    gathering. And I have my hands behind my back on the pavement er and I I just
    said to them I said “this is outrageous that was entrapment”

94. **IR:** Were you scared?

95. **IE:** Er (++) part of me was very scared =

96. **IR:** = Embarrassed?

97. **IE:** Er yeah [but I mean ]

98. **IR:** [Were you ] thinking about your career?

99. **IE:** Er to be honest with you, I remember being- I remember sitting there
    thinking immediately as this stuff started happening I remember sitting there
    thinking “Well I just have to tell the truth about this”
IR: {Yeah}

IE: You know? {uhm} And I I was kind of- it was something I suppose part of me er (++) some part of my subconscious, must have been saying, “Well, this is kind of what I was looking for and now I have to deal with it”

IR: Well this is- well you could’ve thought of a better way

[unintelligible]

IE: [Oh, absolutely]

AUD: [laughter]

IR: You say the arrest was your outing? =

IE: = Yeah and and there is something about the fact it was opposite opposite the Beverly Hills Hotel which kind of indicated that I might have been trying to do it er in a show-bizz manner [laughter]

IR: [laughter]

AUD: [laughter and applause]

IE: Er and [mm: er and really]=

IR: [(so up until this)]

IE: = I think part of me was almost ready to deal with it, in whatever ever way it was going to happen.

IR: Okay. We’ll be right back.

AUD: [roar and applause]

[END OF PART ONE]

[VOICE-OVER: Next George tells us why he kept his sexuality a secret]

IR: Okay so let me- this is fascinating to me {uhm}. Because I can’t imagine (++) being o- of a certain sexuality {uhm} and hiding that {uhm uhm}. And what that would be like to hide that {uhm} to hide that so your whole life you are hiding [it?]?

IE: [Oh] not really because in reality mm as soon as I met Anselmo, my first partner {uhm}, which was when I was 27 =

IR: = but we the public don’t [know so- ]

IE: [Oh no no ]no

IR: So you are hiding it [from us?]?

IE: [Hiding it] from the public

IR: Yes =

IE: = Absolutely

IR: Weren’t you dating women? Didn’t we see lots [of (unintelligible.)]

IE: [There were on]ly really a couple of girlfriends that that people knew about anyway but [(unintelligible.)]

IR: [but ] were they real girlfriends [(or they were just)]
IE: [Yeah, absolutely] absolutely I mean that was the stage I was in my life. I was twenty-four, coming up to twenty-five, when I started thinking you know you’re not really bisexual you know you are not going to have a choice here

IR: {Yeah}

IE: You know=

IR: =And so when people would write about it and say what are you [uhm] and there’s a quote we read “Did you actually at one point say (++) er everyone er is already discussing my sexuality?” =

IE: =Yeah, every time I have dealt with interviews it would be (++) you know “Come on we (unintelli.) want to know”

IR: {Uhm}

IE: And I would always make some kind of comment that was slightly humorous that would leave it kind of up in the air but er in reality I was actually incredibly angry with the er the media (++) because my first partner er: was HIV positive f- for about 2 years before he died. We both knew he was HIV positive and even though I knew he could get the best treatment either in LA or or Britain. He insisted on going back to Brazil {uhm} er every time he needed to see a Dr. (++) And it was unspoken but I actually knew that he was trying to protect his family.

IR: {Really?}

IE: Er and his family being a Catholic/Brazilian family. I really truly believe that if he

had the the treatment er in either Britain or America, that he would have survived.

IR: {Wow}

IE: Erm so my feelings towards the press were so: horrendously er I was so indignant {uhm} that I think somehow that led to- (++) I mean My God Why didn’t I just sit with a journalist and say “I am gay”

IR: {Yeah} =

IE: = But it was so so beyond me (++) to do that. I felt so such [er]

IR: [Did] you feel that you will be rejected? =

IE: = I think to be honest America would probably always have more of a problem with it than Europe.

IR: {Yeah}

IE: Er because it’s a much more of a religious based question here. {uhm} And I respect that you know.

IR: {Yeah}

IE: Erm and I I truly: felt that I was you know dealing with it. Obviously I wasn’t. {yeah} Obviously I found that compromise massive. But it was a big problem to me in some way and I think at the point that it happened, which was about a year after my mother died. I think that at that point in time I was still very angry about her death. Er (++) very kind of down on myself. {uhm} I think I I choose to distract myself from the grief of loosing her {uhm} by doing
something where I would of have to fight for my life almost. {uhm} Er and (++) there- honestly
[it’s the (unintelli.)]
142. IR: [Yes, but] what were you doing out there anyway? =
143. IE: = Well [it’s got its upsides ]
144. IR: [You had Kenny ] at [ho:me (++) yeah yeah ]
145. IE: [Believe me I know I know]
AUD: [laughter]
146. IE: [I think-] 
147. IR: [Yeah and] so how do you make that phone call “Uh, hello?”
AUD: [laughter]
148. IE: Well that’s what kind of exactly what it was. I said
149. IR: [[laughter Uh, hello?]]
150. IE: [(++) I said er ]they were very- actually they were very kind to me. They let me have 2 or 3 attempts a-for a phone call [s (unitelli.) ]
151. IR: [Did they know who] you were? =
152. IE: =Oh yes. Oh listen to this. This is the best bit. [This is the best bit]
153. IR: [Did they say] “Oh can I have a CD, will you sign it?” [laughter]
AUD: [laughter]
154. IE: Oh I’m sure I signed a few autographs.
155. IR: [laughter]
156. IE: I’m sure I signed a few autographs but the funniest thing was I had to spend 3 hours in the Beverly Hills er (++) police station which one I was lucky there was no one in there in the afternoon. (It being) a very quiet afternoon. It is the most spotless police station you can imagine.
AUD: [laughter]
157. IE: It’s top class police station.
158. IR: Really?
159. IE: But when they showed me they left me- they put you in this room where er obviously there’s nothing sharp in there in case you decide to take your life for anything
AUD: [laughter]
160. IE: So there is a big stone er I don’t know if it’s a table or (unintelli.) it’s like a big stone slab with a blanket in case you feel tired at three in the afternoon. And a copy of the NATIONAL ENQUIRER [laughter]
AUD: [laughter]
161. IE: So you can imagine, I’m sitting there thinking this is got to be a joke. I know I’m going to be on the cover of this next week
162. IR: [laughter]
AUD: [laughter and applause]
163. IE: Someone someone is having a LAUGH you know!
164. IR: [to Kenny Goss] (unintelli.) So you guys you guys have been together 8 years now? Right?=
AUD 1: That’s right

IR: He calls you? And-

AUD 1: He called me and said “You are not going to believe what I’ve done” And I said “you’ve got a DUI? He goes, “If only”

IR: If only

AUD 1: [laughter] and then er (++) they didn’t tell me what I picked you up [to George] what you done remember?

IE: I know. Er th- they {yeah} were to (high). They they let me do that, {yeah yeah yeah} didn’t they?

AUD 1: Yeah

IE: Very nice of them. He picked me up from the station from the police station. We went to dinner-

IR: =From the Beverly HILLS [police station]

IE: [From the] Beverly HILLS. Yeah absolutely

AUD: [laughter]

IE: When we got to the restaurant and I told him (++) what had gone on he said to me “Well you never know, it might not get into the press” [laughter]

AUD: [laughter and applause]

IE: And I said er I said Kenny darling, I said they either they either will be there when we get home or they are going to be there wh- when we wake up in the morning. And I was kind of a- I was in between because the helicopters started about 2 o’clock in the morning.

IR: Did they really?

IE: {Yeah}

IR: {Yeah}

IE: Very nice of them. He picked me up from the station from the police station. We went to dinner-

IR: =From the Beverly HILLS [police station]

IE: [From the] Beverly HILLS. Yeah absolutely

AUD: [laughter]

IE: When we got to the restaurant and I told him (++) what had gone on he said to me “Well you never know, it might not get into the press” [laughter]

AUD: [laughter and applause]

IE: And I said er I said Kenny darling, I said they either they either will be there when we get home or they are going to be there wh- when we wake up in the morning. And I was kind of a- I was in between because the helicopters started about 2 o’clock in the morning.

IR: Did they really?

IE: At 2 o’clock in the morning er we started getting- we could hear helicopters and we were getting phone calls from London going, “what, what, what” and er, you know, it was all chaos.

IR: {Yeah}

IE: I mean, you know [ (unintelli.) ]

IR: [Did you ever ] feel badly about it?

IE: (++) Er: I felt more badly for myself that I was that screwed up. But what happened after that was, I just plummeted into a deep deep depression {okay} which was about my mother. {uhm} And er I have some: I have some: feeling that maybe everything that happened in in the year before that was my way of trying to avoid that {uhm} you know make my life about me not about missing her.

IR: {Yeah}

IE: You know

IR: Could because you didn’t allow yourself time to grieve.

IE: But I just hadn’t allowed myself to grieve properly. {properly} [ I I ]told myself that I had (unintelli.)

IR: Were you worried about or are you worried about American fans, now {uhm} even with this new album, {uhm} accepting you are a gay artist?
188. **IE:** I’m not worried about it. I think that people or I’m not (++) I have to be j- I have to be totally straightforward I’m not really interested in selling records to people who are homophobic (++) really.  
**AUD:** [Applause ]  
**AUD1:** [Kenny gives George a thumbs up]

189. **IE:** I’m very lucky I’m very lucky man. I’m forty years old I have- I live with er a man I love dearly. I mm have more love and er success and security in my life that I could ever have dreamed of you know {uhm} mm so really I don’t need the approval of people who don’t approve of me.  
**AUD:** [Applause]

190. **IR:** We’ll be right back with more of George Michael. We’ll be right back. (unintelli.)  
**AUD:** [roar and applause]  

[END OF PART II]

**AUD:** [roar and applause]

191. **IR:** [Applause] Oh oh oh (++) So it was er ten years ago that George Michael walked out of the spotlight and into seclusion and it has been rarely heard from since since his arrest for “LE:WD” behaviour in a public restroom er made international news and stunned a lot of fans that didn’t know at the time that he was gay. Today singer George Michael is giving his first American interview. I thank you for [to George] (letting him) be here.

192. **IE:** [laughs] My [pleasure]

193. **IR:** [(unintelli.)]  
**AUD:** [roar and applause]

194. **IR:** So the long awaited album Patience is getting rave reviews from critics. People Magazine just gave it a FOUR OUT OF [FOUR STARS]  
**IE:** [I know I know]

195. **AUD:** [roar and applause]  
**IR:** four out of four.  
**AUD:** [roar and applause]

196. **IR:** (unintelli.) and er they’re saying that you still possess one of the best - which I think so too but I’m not a critic- one of the best voices in the business Okay.  
**AUD:** [applause]

197. **IR:** And that makes you feel what?  
**IE:** I really just want to be here to tell people (++) that I know I’ve been away a long time. The honest truth is I needed to sort out my personal life. Then I felt I s- sorted out my personal life. Then I found out my partner was was ill. A:nd I knew that I was not going to be able to work. I knew I wasn’t going to be able to write or sing while I was as terrified as I was of losing my partner. {uhm} You know. Then alb- then of course he died. I spent two years really grieving over that mm three years after after Anselmo died I met Kenny {uhm} a:nd I called
my mother the day after I met Kenny to tell her I met this wonderful man you
know and er unfortunately it was the same call she had to tell me that she had
cancer.

200. IR: {Oh}
201. IE: A:nd-
202. IR: On the same [call?]
203. IE: [Well] she had- Yes- she felt- she had no- she kept it from me and of course
she was lying to me during the call saying that it was all fine now. {uhm}
“Everything is fine. They got rid of it. It’s all fine” you know so that I could go
on with me being happy er (+) and of course seven or eight months later she
died er. So the whole sequence of ev- events emotionally and that that period
after she died was just the blackest period of my life really. Er and really these
things in my personal life and the time it took me to write again after I I lost her
(++) are really the reasons what I’ve not been around. I just wanted to explain
to the people that have been absolutely loyal and why I haven’t been here. And
to er let them know that it wasn’t because I didn’t care it’s just because I didn’t
have the emotional energy to face what would’ve been an uphill struggle
here at the time. Er and that now that I feel great again and and my writing
ability has come back I really want to be I just want to touch base with them
again and say (+++) you know “I’m still here. I’m kind of- you know- fighting fit
now. And er if you’re interested, I’m here again”. (unintelli.)

AUD: [roar and applause]
204. IR: (unintelli.) Patience. PATIENCE.
205. IE: Patience.
206. IR: Patience patience my friend. We’ll be right back.
AUD: [roar and applause]

[END OF PART THREE]

[VOICE-OVER: Next George gives us a tour of his private London estate and later his
fans have waited years for this moment George Michael performs right here]

207. IR: So George George and Kenny share a charming country estate outside
London. And for the first time the ultra-private Mr. Michael [(unintelli.)]
208. IE: [Ultra] ultra-private.
AUD: [laughter]
209. IR: Ultra- private-
210. IE: You have NO idea how uncomfortable I was doing this.
AUD: [laughter]
211. IE: Actually you probably[ will have when you see it]
212. IR: [{Yeah} we will {yeah yeah}] He allowed our cameras inside. Thank you
very much. Let’s take a look.
IE: Hi Oprah. Good to see you. Who gave you my address?
AUD: [laughter]
IE: We are here about an hour from London. This is a 16th century house that I bought about 3 years ago and I did up myself. So come in and have a look. It not exactly spacious but it’s my dear beautiful house. (++) Of course it’s really low ceiling. Cause people were so short in those days. This is about as English and historic you can get. We kept all the original beams. This fireplace even this is the original fireplace. This is my favorite room. I tend to sit and work on the computer from here. This Piano is one of the favorite things in the house and covered in pictures of our life. (++) Er this is the library. Wasn’t here when we bought it. But I think every house should have a library. I’d love to tell you that all the books in this library were Shakespeare or Woodworth’s, but actually most of them are antique books that we bought in bulk.
AUD: [laughter]
IE: I just think that they are just beautiful so er they’re kind of furniture rather than cultural input. This is a piece of Russian art that Kenny and I saw and liked in London a couple of years back. I’m not into collecting art. Once you start collecting the art that you really love, then you really do have to lock the doors every night.
AUD: [laughter]
IE: The Kitchen is through this way. Now the kitchen is a kind of modern kitchen. This is an old fashioned Agar cooker. Which is an essential ingredient to any British old fashioned kitchen. And for people like me and Kenny who really are extremely absent minded, they great thing about this you can stick something in chicken or whatever and if you forget that it is there, you are not gonna burn the house down, you just get a lump of coal for dinner.
AUD: [laughter]
IE: Now Oprah. I have heard that when he appeared in your show Mr. Tom Cruise cooked a bowl of spaghetti for your pleasure. And not wanting to let the British down, I’ve asked (Nu) my housekeeper to prepare all the ingredients [laughter] of a typical George Michael meal. And this is about the extent of it really.
AUD: [laughter]
IE: This is where Kenny and I like to have our breakfast. We built this part onto the house to get a great view of the gardens.
AUD: [roar and applause]

[BACK IN THE STUDIO]

AUD: [roar and applause]
213. IR: I love it. (++). I I understand you have four other homes? Is that true?
214. IE: I’ve just sold two of them. (unintelli.) two of them. ‘Cause then I thought I was being too extravagant. I don’t travel very much anymore=
215. IR: = {Uhm}
216. IE: I used to because [I’m]
217. IR: [I] think four is too many
218. **IE:** Four is way too many
219. **IR:** I think- I really do. ‘Cause you can’t get to four.
220. **IE:** Well the thing is also then you have [turns to Kenny]
221. **IR:** Don’t you think?
222. **AUD1:** That’s why we never use them.
223. **IR:** uhm (unintelli.) four is way too many {uhm}
224. **IE:** Well I I used to er actually use all of them. Er but these days I don’t travel much so I thought it was kind of extravagant so [so I s- sold] (++) a few.
225. **IR:** [you sold them?]
226. **IE:** {Yeah}
227. **IR:** Okay. We’ll be right back.
**AUD:** [roar and applause]

[VOICE-OVER: Next George gives us a tour of his enchanted English garden]

228. **IR:** George says that the reason he bought the 16th Century house is because of the surrounding Gardens. And he says they are the most beautiful gardens he has ever seen. So let’s and take a look. I LOVE THE G[ARDENS]
229. **IE:** [Oh yes and (unintelli.])

[VIDEO]

IE: We are right here on the Thames here. And I’ve always wanted to live on the river. And the actual garden itself backs on to a 10th Century Saxon church which I think is great and I’ve always loved the idea of living next to a church for some reason. A fountain that we bought recently these are apple apple trees and actually the apples are delicious. And here I have to tell you a little story now. I live next door to Baroness Buscombe who is a actually a member of the House of Lords. And she apparently thought I was going to have a lot of Rock and Roll parties and so she planted all these trees along here and I think er unfortunately they probably gonna rip up the half of the garden as they grow. But I suppose it is her prerogative.
**AUD:** [laughter]
IE: So the Pool house do you wanna have a look of the Pool house? Yeah. Here, Pool house which we have built a couple of years ago it’s actually lovely to come out in a summer evening when it is still light at about 10 o’clock. I just sit here with all of the doors open. It’s wonderful.
I love these trees, and this is where actually believe it or not part of the Thames it joins the Thames back ground there. On my 40th Birthday, I got a- this is a present a sundial which kind of acts as some sort of compass and this is the man that bought it for me [holding Kenny]
So really the one thing that you haven’t seen so far is our Children. [calls out the “children”] “Meg” “Abby” [two Labradors come running]
**AUD:** [sigh]
Kenny and George throw items in the pool for the dogs to fetch. One dives in; the other uses the stairs.
IE: [to one of the dogs] You didn’t dive! Showing us up showing us up you didn’t dive.
(++)
So Oprah this is my home. This is where I live. And I don’t know when you are gonna next be in Britain but if you fancy popping by and seen what it’s like staying in a 16th Century British home feel free. See you then. Bye!

[BACK IN THE STUDIO]

AUD: [roar and applause]
230. IR: (Actually) (+++) Actually your home for the summer I might stop by [for some crumpets]
231. IE: [Absolutely (+++) ] Crumpets? {yeah} scones maybe.
232. IR: {Yeah} scones scones. Fantastic though it looks like that you really enjoy being there. You didn’t look uncomfortable at all doing that.
233. IE: Oh really?
234. IR: Yeah
235. IE: Oh er I’m a great actor [laughter]
AUD: [applause]
236. IR: So you are back and forth and how does that work you’re back and forth between there and Dallas? Did you say? There and-
237. AUD1: (unintelli.)
238. IE: We spend a lot of more time in London {yeah yeah}. But we recently bought a place in Dallas, because beforehand we were staying at Kenny’s er brothers. And I’m not very good at sleeping over in their in their children’s bedrooms no.
AUD: [laughter]
239. IR: You’re not good?=
240. IE: = No I’m not good at that=
241. IR: And how do the people in Dallas handle your accent?
242. IE: Er (+++) Well I don’t know. It is me handling theirs, isn’t it?
243. IR: [laughter]
AUD: [laughter and applause]
244. IE: Actually people I’ve found- I think Dallas I mean of of of the three places that I kind of now in America it’s New York and LA obviously in my in my position and Dallas now but er and I’d say Dallas probably the warmest of the three.
245. IR: Really?
246. IE: Yeah, absolutely
AUD: [roar and applause]
247. IR: Great. Okay. O’right before the people from Dallas (unintelli.). When we come back George’s fans have waited it with Patience for years=
AUD: [roar]

248. **IR:** = with Patience [*alluding to his homonymous new album*] =

AUD: [roar and applause]

249. **IR:** = and he’s going to SING. We’ll be right back.

[END OF PART FOUR AND THE INTERVIEW]

[VOICE-OVER: Next George Michael steps into the spotlight for what some critics say it is the come back of the year]
### Table 1 Political Interview: “Hardtalk”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TURN</th>
<th>COMMENTS ON OVERLAPPING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>The IR abruptly breaks into the IE’s turn to ask a question ignoring the IE’s greeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to ask a challenging question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to expand on the previous question in an aggressive manner ignoring the IE’s question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR’s turn to, for the third time, asks him what he has been trying to ask from turn 8 and ignores the IR’s question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE’s turn to ask a sarcastic question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE’s turn to make a derisive comment on the IE’s viewpoint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>The IR ignores the IE’s question and cuts the IE’s turn to give a further reason to support his argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE’s turn to finish what the IR was saying in his previous turn ignoring the IE’s question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>The IE ignores the IR’s reasons and cuts his turn in order to gain the floor and expand on his answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>The IR abruptly cuts the IE’s turn to ask a challenging question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>The IE tries to cut the IR’s turn to answer the question made at the previous turn but the IR ignores this and continues asking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>The IR tries to break into the IE’s turn but he is not able to gain the floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-27</td>
<td>The IR abruptly cuts the IE’s turn to refute the IE’s previous statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to comment on turn 28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-30</td>
<td>While the IR is making his comment the IE gets upset and breaks into his turn to answer hastily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-31</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to ask a challenging question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-35</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to challenge him and elaborate further on what the IE implied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-39</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to continue with his question ignoring the IE’s comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-41</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to make a comment ignoring the IE’s comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-42</td>
<td>The IE breaks into the IR’s turn in order to respond quickly and defend his viewpoint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-44</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR’s turn to negate what the IR previously implied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-47</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to ask him a challenging question in order to make him clarify what he said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-51</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE’s turn ignoring that he agrees with what he is saying and continues with his turn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-54</td>
<td>The IE tries to cut the IR’s turn by refuting his comment until he finally gains the floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-56</td>
<td>At first, the IE agrees with the IR’s statement but soon afterwards he realises that he doesn’t and so he refutes his comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-57</td>
<td>The IE breaks into the IE’s turn to negate the IR’s previous assertion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-57</td>
<td>The IR’s breaks into the IE’s turn to ask him a challenging question regarding turn 56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-60</td>
<td>The IE tries to cut the IR’s turn to ask him a question in order to clarify the IR’s previous point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Political Interview: “Hardtalk”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TURN</th>
<th>COMMENTS ON OVERLAPPING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61-62</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR’s turn to negate the IR’s statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-63</td>
<td>The IR tries to cut the IE’s turn in an aggressive manner in order to refute his answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-66</td>
<td>The IE abruptly breaks into the IE’s turn to answer his question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-71</td>
<td>The IR abruptly cuts the IE’s turn in order to expand on his previous point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-73</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE’s turn to ask him a challenging question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74-75</td>
<td>The IR abruptly breaks into the IE’s turn to ask him a challenging question which is then ignored by the IE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-77</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to ask him the same challenging question he’s been trying to ask from turn 73 but that the IE has ignored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-78</td>
<td>The IE hastily breaks into the IR’s turn to finally answer his question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-80</td>
<td>The IE breaks into the IR’s turn to negate what the IR implied in turn 79.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-81</td>
<td>The IR abruptly breaks into the IE’s turn in order to ask a different question but which finally implies the same as question in turn 79.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-83</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE’s turn to rephrase what the IE said and expand on this in order to correct what the IE stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-86</td>
<td>At first the IE acknowledges and comments on the IR’s information but only to give his own point of view on the same issue later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-88</td>
<td>The IR abruptly cuts the IE’s turn to insist on the question asked in turn 83.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-90</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to insist on his arguments ignoring the IE’s explicit request to listen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>Both the IE and IR start at the same time but finally the IR takes the floor and continues with a challenging comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-96</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE’s turn to ask a challenging question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96-97</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR’s turn to refute the IR’s comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IE’s turn to formulate a challenging question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-99</td>
<td>The IE tries twice to cut the IR’s turn in order to refute his comment until he finally succeeds and gains the floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102-103</td>
<td>The IE successfully breaks into the IR’s turn to negate his assertion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106-107</td>
<td>The IE acknowledges the IR’s comments at first but then he corrects these in a satirical manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110-111</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR’s turn in order to gain the floor and expand on his answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113-114</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE’s turn to ask a challenging question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114-115</td>
<td>The IE abruptly cuts the IR’s turn to answer the question asked in turn 114.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119-120</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to challenge the IE and insist on the question asked in turn 114.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-122</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to make a challenging remark on the IE’s previous turn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122-123</td>
<td>The IE breaks into the IR’s turn to refute what he stated in turn 122.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-131</td>
<td>The IE tries to cut the IR’s turn once before he finally succeeds in doing it and asks the IR the question he has been insisting on since turn 115.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Political Interview: “Hardtalk”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TURN</th>
<th>COMMENTS ON OVERLAPPING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135-136</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to expand on turn 134 ignoring the IE’s answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-137</td>
<td>The IR abruptly breaks into the IE’s turn to make a derisive comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139-140</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to comment on something that the IE has said before in a sarcastic manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143-144</td>
<td>Both speakers take the floor at the same time but finally the IR gains the floor to expand on his previous point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144-145</td>
<td>The IE abruptly breaks into the IR’s turn to react and negate the IR’s question in turn 144.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145-146</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to ask a challenging question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147-148</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to ask a challenging question ignoring the IE’s question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-151</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR’s turn ignoring the IR’s question in order to ask him a question as a way of defending himself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154-155</td>
<td>The IE breaks into the IR’s turn to directly negate his desire to refer to something that has already been discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155-156</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to ask a sarcastic question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161-162</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE’s turn to ask a challenging question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163-164</td>
<td>The IR abruptly breaks into the IE’s turn to ask a challenging question ignoring the IE’s question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175-176</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE’s turn to ask a challenging question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176-177</td>
<td>The IE tries to cut the IE’s turn but this ignores the IE’s desire to speak and continues with his turn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181-182</td>
<td>The IE abruptly cuts the IR’s turn to expand on his answer to the question asked in turn 181.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183-184</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR’s turn to continue answering the question asked in turn 181 ignoring the IR’s last question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184-185</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE’s turn to ask a challenging question ignoring that the IE was in the middle of answering the question asked in turn 181.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IR: Tim Sebastian
IE: George Michael
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TURN</th>
<th>CASES IR</th>
<th>CASES IE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Collaborative Ignoring</td>
<td>Non-Collaborative Exaggerating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Political Interview: "Hardtalk"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CASES IR</th>
<th></th>
<th>CASES IE</th>
<th></th>
<th>CASES IE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>Ignoring</td>
<td>Non-</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74-75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Political Interview: "Hardtalk"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASES IE</th>
<th>Negativistic Collaborative Non-Collaborative</th>
<th>Challenging Collaborative Non-Collaborative</th>
<th>Expansive Collaborative Non-Collaborative</th>
<th>Insisting Collaborative Non-Collaborative</th>
<th>Comment Collaborative Non-Collaborative</th>
<th>Negotiating Collaborative Non-Collaborative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87-88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102-103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104-105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106-107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108-109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110-111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112-113</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114-115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116-117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118-119</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-121</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122-123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124-125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128-129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132-133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134-135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-137</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138-139</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-141</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142-143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144-145</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146-147</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASES IR</th>
<th>Negativistic Collaborative Non-Collaborative</th>
<th>Challenging Collaborative Non-Collaborative</th>
<th>Expansive Collaborative Non-Collaborative</th>
<th>Insisting Collaborative Non-Collaborative</th>
<th>Comment Collaborative Non-Collaborative</th>
<th>Negotiating Collaborative Non-Collaborative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100-101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102-103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104-105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106-107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108-109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110-111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112-113</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114-115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116-117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118-119</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-121</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122-123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124-125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128-129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132-133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134-135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-137</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138-139</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-141</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142-143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144-145</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Political Interview: "Hardtalk"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TURN</th>
<th>CASES IR</th>
<th>CASES IE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Collaborative Ignoring</td>
<td>Non-Collaborative Expanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144-145</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145-146</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147-148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-151</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154-155</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155-156</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161-162</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163-164</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175-176</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176-177</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181-182</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183-184</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184-185</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IR:** Tim Sebastian  
**IE:** George Michael  
* In this interview no Collaborative instances were found.
Table 3  Talk Show Interview: "The Oprah Winfrey Show"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TURN</th>
<th>COMMENTS ON OVERLAPPING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>At the end of the IE's turn the IR simultaneously comments on his remarks encouraging him to confirm these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>At the end of the IE's turn the IR simultaneously acknowledges the IE's answer and asks him a further question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>The IE starts his turn to answer the IR's question simultaneously as the IR expands on the same question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>The IE starts answering the IR's question in a collaborative manner before the IR is able to finish her turn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>The IR acknowledges the IE's comments before his turn is finished in order to ask him to expand on the last piece of information he gives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-35</td>
<td>The IE confirms the IR's understanding of his last turn and continues giving details at the same time that the IR finishes her turn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-37</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-45</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE's turn in order to make him explain further what he has been trying to explain, but very indirectly, from turn 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-47</td>
<td>The IE accepts the IR's insistence on detail and cuts the IR's turn to willingly expand on details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-50</td>
<td>While the IE is making a comment on the IR's remarks in turn 48, the IR continues her previous turn expanding on what she was saying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-52</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR's turn to accept her suggestion and say what she and the audience want to know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-55</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE's turn to express her misunderstanding of the IE's explanations given in turn 54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-58</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE's turn to expand on turn 56 in a humorous tone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-59</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR's turn to continue with turn 57 but finally he starts laughing and is not able to finish what he was saying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-62</td>
<td>The IR shows understanding of the IE's information before he finishes his turn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-65</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR's turn to continue with turn 63 since the IR is repeating the last words he says as a way of showing comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-66</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE's turn to comment on turn 65 encouraging him to confirm the last piece of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93</td>
<td>The IE non-violently cuts the IR's turn to answer her question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>The IR's breaks into the IE's turn to ask him more questions in order to make him give more details about his feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102-103</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR's turn to agree on her last remark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107-108</td>
<td>The IR unsuccessfully tries to make a comment on the IE's last piece of information but this one continues with his turn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-112</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR's turn to willingly answer her question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113-114</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR's turn to agree with her statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115-116</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR's turn to clarify what she is saying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119-120</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IR's turn to expand on what she started saying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-121</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE's turn to make him clarify the last piece of information he gives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-122</td>
<td>The IE breaks into the IR's turn accepting and answering the IR's query.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135-136</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE's turn to expand on turn 135 by asking him about his feelings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Talk Show Interview: "The Oprah Winfrey Show"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TURN</th>
<th>COMMENTS ON OVERLAPPING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>141-142</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE's turn to ask him clarify the reasons of the arrest mentioned in turn 87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143-144</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE's answer and continues expanding turn 142.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144-145</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR's turn to agree with the IR's comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146-147</td>
<td>The IR and IE start at the same time. Finally the IR gains the floor and formulates a question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149-150</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR's turn to answer the question asked in turn 147.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-151</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE's turn to ask him a question in order to seek further detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152-153</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE's turn to continue with turn 151 asking him for further detail in a humorous tone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173-174</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR's turn by repeating the IR's last words in a way of affirming what she was saying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-181</td>
<td>The IR cuts the IE's turn to ask him about his feelings in relation to what he has been saying from turn 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192-193</td>
<td>The IR tries to take the floor to give information as the IE is finishing his turn but the roaring of the audience is louder so she finally quits her turn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194-195</td>
<td>At the end of the IR's turn the IE agrees with a comment on her remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202-203</td>
<td>The IE in a cooperative manner cuts the IR's turn to answer her question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207-208</td>
<td>The IE cuts the IR's turn to highlight in a humorous tone the last piece of information she gives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211-212</td>
<td>At the end of the IE's turn the IR starts to acknowledge his remarks and continues further to present the next section of the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216-217</td>
<td>The IR breaks into the IE's turn to make a comment on turn 213.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224-225</td>
<td>The IR asks a question regarding the last piece of information the IE gives as he is finishing his turn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228-229</td>
<td>At the end of the IR's turn the IE starts to make a comment on what follows next in the video.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230-231</td>
<td>At the end of the IR's turn the IE happily accepts the IR's idea of visiting him in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IR:** Oprah Winfrey  
**IE:** George Michael
Table 4  Talk Show Interview: "The Oprah Winfrey Show"

| CASES 1R | CASES 1E |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                | Collaborative Agreement | Collaborative Asking for Clarification/Expansion | Collaborative Giving Detail/Expanding | Collaborative Asking for Confirmation | Collaborative Comment | Collaborative Anticipating Answer | Collaborative Emphasising | Collaborative Agreement | Collaborative Asking for Clarification/Expansion | Collaborative Giving Detail/Expanding | Collaborative Asking for Confirmation | Collaborative Comment | Collaborative Anticipating Answer | Collaborative Emphasising | Collaborative Agreement | Collaborative Asking for Clarification/Expansion | Collaborative Giving Detail/Expanding | Collaborative Asking for Confirmation | Collaborative Comment | Collaborative Anticipating Answer | Collaborative Emphasising |
| TURN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6-7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17-18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23-24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28-29 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 34-35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 36-37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 44-45 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 46-47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 49-50 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 51-52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 54-55 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 57-58 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 58-59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 61-62 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 64-65 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 65-66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 92-93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 97-98 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 102-103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
### CASES IR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TURN</th>
<th>Collaborative Agreement</th>
<th>Collaborative Asking for Clarification / Expansion</th>
<th>Collaborative Giving Detail / Expanding</th>
<th>Collaborative Asking for Confirmation</th>
<th>Collaborative Comment</th>
<th>Collaborative Anticipating Answer</th>
<th>Collaborative Emphasizing</th>
<th>Collaborative Agreement</th>
<th>Collaborative Asking for Clarification / Expansion</th>
<th>Collaborative Giving Detail / Expanding</th>
<th>Collaborative Asking for Confirmation</th>
<th>Collaborative Comment</th>
<th>Collaborative Anticipating Answer</th>
<th>Collaborative Emphasizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107-108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-112</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113-114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115-116</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119-120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-121</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135-136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141-142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143-144</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144-145</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146-147</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149-150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-151</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152-153</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173-174</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-181</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192-193</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194-195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Talk Show Interview: "The Oprah Winfrey Show*

The table below presents the distribution of collaborative instances in "The Oprah Winfrey Show" and "George Michael" based on the categories of Collaborative Agreement, Collaborative Asking for Clarification/Expansion, Collaborative Giving Detail/Expanding, Collaborative Asking for Confirmation, Collaborative Anticipating Answer, Collaborative Emphasizing, Collaborative Giving Agreement, Collaborative Asking for Clarification/Expansion, Collaborative Giving Detail/Expanding, Collaborative Asking for Confirmation, Collaborative Comment, Collaborative Anticipating Answer, and Collaborative Emphasizing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TURN</th>
<th>IR: Oprah Winfrey</th>
<th>CASES IR</th>
<th>CASES IE</th>
<th>IR: George Michael</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>202-203</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207-208</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211-212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216-217</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224-225</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228-229</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230-231</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL | 5 | 11 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |

* In this interview non-collaborative instances were not found.

---

**IR:** Oprah Winfrey  
**IE:** George Michael