
UNIT 2 RADIO INTERVIEWS AND DISCUSSIONS

Structure

- 2.0 Aims and Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Approaches for the Oral Writer
- 2.3 The **Interview**
 - 2.3.1 Types of Interviews and Approach
 - 2.3.2 Preparation before the Interview
 - 2.3.3 Asking Questions in an Interview
 - 2.3.4 The Personality Interview
- 2.4 The Radio Discussion
- 2.5 Summing Up
- 2.6 Aids to Answers

2.0 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

At the end of your study of this unit, you **will** be able to:

- state the basic **approach** to an interview
- **describe** the different **types of** interview and how to conduct them
- **describe** the basic preparations before recording an **interview, and**
- stimulate and plan a Radio Discussion.-

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The **previous** unit in Block 2 **discussed** the techniques of producing Radio **Documentary** and Feature. We **discussed** the importance of research and **significance** of narration in a documentary and how to script for both features and documentaries. **Yet** another major programme on the radio is interview. In this unit we will study the **basic** guidelines of conducting Radio **Interviews**. We **also** take up one other **important** radio programme—Radio Discussion and how to script and prepare for it.

In the early days of broadcasting, the host (interviewer) and the interviewees would **often** meet before the broadcast **and** write down the complete interview. The **host/hostess** would write down the questions and the interviewee would write down **the** answers. At the time of broadcast they would read out their papers word by word. As broadcasting became more and more common and both interviewers and **interviewees** became more relaxed in front of the microphone, **interviews** became increasingly **spontaneous**. Ad-libbing came to replace the scripted interview. Today, **most** interviews **are** ad-libbed and unrehearsed.

With the transition from verbatim reading to ad-libbed conversation came a different set of **demands** on the interviewer. A good interviewer prepares **his/her** material **thoroughly** but gives the interview (that is, the questions and comments) its final form **only when** the interview is actually in progress. In wording **questions** and comments **on** the air, the interviewer actually performs a writing function. **He/she** is **also** a **performer**, so sometimes, it is **difficult** to decide where writing ends and performing **begins**. In effect, the interviewer is an oral writer.

Although the focus in **this course** is on writing, it is inevitable that in discussing the **preparation** and presentation of interviews in **this** unit we shall deal with functions **and** qualities that some may **call performance** aspects. It is **also** important to **discuss** the **preparation** that **precedes** the broadcast. This function, which belongs to the writing area, can be done either by the interviewer or by research assistants who have

gathered information **about** the subjects. Contemporary interviews are **potentially** more exciting than **the** formal exchanges they replaced. In the **following** sections, we shall explore the **major** implications of the altered attitude towards interviews.

2.2 APPROACHES FOR THE ORAL WRITER

The shift from the scripted to the unscripted interview **has** actually been a shift **from** an examination of an **individual's** knowledge and *opinion* to encouraging a conversation that would engage the audience. One must make a distinction here about mere (talk) **conversation** and **meaningful** conversation. The art of meaningful conversation should **not** be **confused** with idle chatter.

Good conversationalists are first and foremost good listeners. They are people who are interested in the views and feelings of others. **Successful** interviewers put their *guests* at **ease** in order to shape information **with** them (that they may not have shared elsewhere). If you **listen** to good interviewers, you **will** find that they are attentive; they respond to the **confidence** reposed in them and thereby encourage the disclosure. **They** are **also** flexible in that they are willing to lay aside **prepared** questions, if more **interesting** information **begins** to surface.

Yet good interviewers always remain in control of the interview. They are firm enough to direct the **course** of the interview and redirect the **evasive guest** to those issues **she/he** had **agreed** to **discuss**. **Good** interviewers are aware of their responsibility of **raising** questions that the **listeners** would like to raise (**ask**). Even when they are **thorough** researchers, they take special care not to overlook the obvious, yet often **necessary** questions, that **seem** important to their **listeners**. 'Mr. Jean Rouch, I should **like** to start by asking a basic question. **As** the founder of the cinema verite **movement**, what is your opinion on **traditional** documentary methods?'

Before **asking** this **question**, the interviewer must make sure that the term "cinema verite" is **explained** to the audience. If not, then the obvious has been overlooked.

Exercise 1

Listen to **interviews over** the radio. You will come across **both** good and bad interviews. What are the functions of an interviewer? Can you **list** them out? Some aids given in Sec. 2.6 **might** help you.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2.3 THE INTERVIEW

The aim of an interview is to provide, in the **interviewee's** own words, **facts**, reasons, or opinions on a **particular** topic **so** that the listener **can** form a conclusion as to the validity of what **she/he** is saying. It follows from **this definition** that the **opinions** of the interviewer are **not** to be counted here and that he should **not** **get** drawn into answering the question **himself/herself**. Within the present **definition** it is the **interviewee** who **must** come through in the performance and **not** the interviewer.

2.3.1 Types of Interviews and Approach

Generally, there are three **types** of interviews—spot interviews, field **interviews** and studio interviews. **Spot** interviews are brief and usually limited in **scope**.

"Who will you vote for?"
 "Are you happy with the new **tax** policies?"
 "As a passenger, how do you rate the service?"

Field interviews can be **either** long or brief. You may interview a **farmer** on his farm; a pilot at the airport or a sailor on the ship. The pilot can be asked about his training, his experience and his psychological make-up to fly different models of aircraft. The roaring sound of planes taking-off or landing can be recorded and this **gives** authenticity to the interview. Studio interviews are usually formal. Again, these may **either** be long or short. Attention has to be given to correctness and propriety while addressing the interviewee.

For the sake of simplicity, three approaches to interviews can be identified, although **any** one situation may involve all three categories to a greater or a lesser extent. **These** are the informational, interpretative and emotional interviews.

Obviously the function of the informational interview is to provide information to the **listener**. The sequence in which this is done becomes important if the details **are** to **remain** clear. This type of an interview demands thorough preparation. There **should** be considerable research and discussion done about what should be included or excluded. Facts and statistics should be checked and cross-checked. **If**, for instance, one plans to produce an interview on global warming, one must look thoroughly into the phenomena, causes, effects and consequences of global warming. The objective here is to be informative and descriptive not prescriptive or **interpretative**.

Can you explain the phenomenon of global warming?

Can you tell the reasons that have **brought** about this **phenomenon**?

What are the effects and consequences of global warming!

The interpretative interview has the interviewer supplying the facts and asking the **interviewee** to either comment on them or **explain** them. **The aim** is to bring into the open the reasoning of the interviewee and allow the listener to make a judgement on **his/her** sense of values or priorities. Replies to questions will almost certainly contain **statements** in justification of (or allegations **against**) a particular courses of action; **these** may themselves also be **further** questioned. An example of this kind **of interview** would be, for instance, an education minister giving his reasons for an already **formulated** or proposed education policy. The essential point is that the interviewer is **not** asking for facts of the matter, these will be generally known; rather he is interviewing the interviewee's reaction to the facts.

What kind of response do you expect to this education policy?

How do you respond to the charge that your education **policy** is elitist?

A good interviewer will always know that a situation of **this** kind is generally reactive **and** would therefore, never **rehearse** it in detail.

The aim of the emotional interview is to give an insight into the interviewee's mind so that the listener may understand what is involved in human terms. Specific examples would be the feelings of the relatives of, say, victims of a train accident or **the feeling** of achievement for an athlete who has won an Olympic gold medal. In these **situations**, it is the strength of feelings present, and not rationality, that is important. For instance:

'It's been a year since your wife died. What difference has her absence made?'

'You have finally won the National Award. How does it feel?'

Needless to say, emotional interviews need sensitive handling. It is very easy to slip into sensational voyeurism when one is handling human emotions. An interviewer must consciously stop **him/herself** from exploiting vulnerable situations **and** intruding **into** private grief. (**Interviewers** who ask questions like "how does it feel to have all your children killed?", **should** be bodily lifted and thrown out).

not **the** producer, s/he must have a thorough briefing, with the producer and research team. Even if the interviewer is working with a research team s/he should be absolutely thorough with the background material. There should be **no** confusion with names, dates, figures or facts. Even a minor error can sound embarrassing, for **example**:

"Why did you choose to hold the conference in 1977?"

"Well, actually we held it in 1973." or

"As Chancellor of the University, how do you see the future?"

"No I am the Chairman...."

At **this** point, it makes no difference to the validity of the question. But a lack of care **undermines** the **questioner's credibility** in the eyes of the **interviewee** and, more **importantly**, in the ears of the listener. **Once** basic **information** is gathered, the **interviewer should** concentrate on structuring the questions. There **is** no ideal way of **structuring** the questions nor is there any need to have a rigid structure to follow.

To **summarize**, an **interviewer's** normal starting point will be:

- i) To possess **sufficient briefing** and background information on the subject and the **interviewee**;
- ii) To have **detailed** knowledge about what the interview should be able to achieve;
- iii) To know what the key questions are.

The next stage, after the preparatory work, is to discuss the interview with the **interviewee**. The first few minutes are crucial as it **determines** how the interview will **proceed**. The interviewer **can never** fully know how the **interviewee** will respond. **S/he** may **be brisk** and **professional**, sympathetic, friendly, inhibited, whatever. In an article titled *Updating The Talking Head Technique*, Walt **Robson** groups difficult **interviewees** into **three** categories: The Clam, Sham and the Ham.

The Clam, claims **Robson**, **'clams up'** like the sea-water fish it's named after. In other **words**, the **guest** is so **nervous** that s/he gives one-line answers and no more. The **Sham**, on the other hand, is a Mr. Know-all who **actually** doesn't know very much. **The Ham** is **even worse** because he takes over and **assumes** control. Have you ever **seen** a **Clam**, **Ham** or **Sham**? 'How did the interviewer handle the problem?' **Robson** gives us a **few answers**. **The Clam**, if **s/he** is to open up, has to be put on the right foot. **What interests/provokes/inspires/bothers him/her** most? Find that area and **get him/her** to talk. **The Sham** is likely to get **him/herself** into a corner by being **overconfident**.

Sham clearly by the end of 1995, four out of every five candidates **will** get a job.

Interviewer: **That's amazing?** On what do you base this figure?

Sham (Panic) well.....that's my personal estimate. The way things are going.....

(The Guest has to be saved) Interviewer: **"It** seems to me that this **depends** on how we define employment and unemployment. If we establish newer **definitions**, it's easy to **see** four out of every **five** getting a job. Do you agree?"

The interviewer has provided the Sham an **escape** route: Of course, that depends on whether the interviewer **wants** to provide an escape route. If the **purpose** of the **interview** is to 'corner' **someone** then it is a different matter.

Finally, we have the **Ham**, who could be malicious, **precocious** or simply hysterical. Whatever the event, he's out of control. It's most important **for** the interviewer at this point to remain absolutely cool. Resist the temptation to hurl fatal barbs. The key to handling this difficult **guest** lies in playing straight, with sincerity and good humour.

Warning: Playing the perfect **host/ess** by laughing or smiling will only make it worse. Walking the line between tolerance and intolerance is safest in this case.

Unless the situation is exceptional (like **saving** the Ham) the interviewer must be

reconciled to the **fact** that it is **not s/he** but the **interviewee who** is required to talk. The interviewer, **therefore**, must be careful about not getting drawn into discussion or adopting a judgemental attitude. Hostility is not just bad manners, it is bad strategy. Because the **interviewee** will either **be** equally rude or just shut up!

The interviewer's **main** job at this point is to **clarify** what the interview is **all** about and strike a rapport that would produce appropriate **information** in a logical sequence. **The interviewer** should gain **the** confidence of the interviewee and at the same time be **in control** of the situation.

It is common **practice** to say beforehand what the first question is going to be. **This** can help avoid a **complete "freeze"** once the tape **starts recording**. Specialist and technical jargon is **always** better avoided. **Though** the interviewee may be a specialist, the listeners are **not**. **Short** and **articulate** introductions are always preferable to long and rambling ones.

Conclusions need **careful** handling. The last note is probably what the listeners **will** carry home. It may be useful to precede the last question with signals to the **interviewee** about **time** running out: **This** could be indicated with questions such as:

'Briefly, why..?'

'In a word, how..?'

'At it's simplest, what..?'

An important point. **Dress** carefully for an interview. Smart or 'hip' clothes may not fit into **semi-urban** or **rural** situations. You may just end up alienating yourself from your **interviewees**.

Finally, a last word of advice. The word '**finally**' should **be used** only once!

233 Asking Questions in an Interview

An interview is a **conversation** with an aim. On the one hand, the interviewer knows what the aim is and **knows** something of the subject. On the other **hand**, he is placing himself where the **listener** is and is asking questions in order to discover more. **This balance between knowledge and ignorance** has been called "informed naivete".

An interviewer must list questions very carefully. Very often, we hear and **see** interviews that don't **seem** to work well. Next time, when you **come across** one such interview, ask **yourself why** it doesn't work. A **common** mistake is to **ask for** a one-word **response**:

"Does it feel good to **have** won the Olympic Gold Medal?"

"Yes"

And **that's** the end of the interview. **Generally, asking** questions based on the 'reversed verb' are **discouraged** because they evoke one-word **responses**.

Are you....?

Is it....?

Will they....?

Do you....?

However, questions like **this** also have a role to play—when the interviewer is asking for either a confirmation or a denial.

"Mr. Chief Minister, a **controversial** legislation has been passed during your tenure. Do you support it?"

A question of this nature **compels** the **interviewee** to take a position one **way** or another. If this is what the **interviewer's** objective is then the technique is legitimate but not if the intention is to draw the interviewee into conversation. No **questions** **should** be asked with the 'hope' that the **interviewee** will **continue to** say something

after 'yes' or 'no'. This could also lead the interviewer to lose all control over the interview. The 'reversed verb' question, therefore, should only be used when a **yes/no answer** is required.

'Will the price of sugar go up this year?'

'Are you **going** to stand for the next elections?'

This brings us to the question of how specifically the question is designed and what the room for **manoeuvre** is. **Clearly**, when a **yes/no** answer is sought, the **interviewee** is being **tied** down and given very little room for manoeuvre. In other words, the **scope** of **the question** (in terms of response) is narrow, though the implications of the **response** may be vast. On the other hand, it is possible to ask a question that is so **enormously** wide that **nobody** knows what to do with it.

"You have **just finished** editing your new film. Tell us about it," Firstly, this is not a **question**; it's an **order** and the **interviewee** is not obliged to follow it. But more importantly, the **validity** of the question itself is suspect.

If, for instance, the **famous** theatre director Peter Brooke had to be interviewed, one **could ask**:

"You have recently directed the **Mahabharata**. Could you tell us why, of **all** the epics, **you chose this one**?" or, "What is it about the **Mahabharata** that inspired you to adapt it for the **stage**?"

Another trap that confronts inexperienced interviewers is that of the multiple **question**. This means that more than one question is being asked:

"**Why did the train meet with an accident and how would you prevent this in future?**"

In **such** a situation the **interviewee** may answer one half and genuinely forget the next or **just choose** to answer whatever is preferable. Questions should be kept short and **simple**. **Long** and **circumlocutory** questions rarely get conversation going. Stimulus determines **response**. If the **interview has** to be conversational, the interviewer **has** to **set the tone** for that. **Following** are some of the don'ts of the business:

- Don't **ask** leading **questions**. **Lazy**, inexperienced or malicious questioning **can** put **the interviewee** in a **particular position** even before he begins:

"**Why did you start** your **business** with such **shaky** finances?"

"**What made you** write such a racist and sexist book?"

"**How do you explain** such a high-handed policy?"

It is **not** up to the interviewer to **suggest** whether finances are shaky or the book is **racist** and **sexist** or the **policy** is high-handed unless it's based on a quote from the **interviewee** him/herself. It's a much better idea to ask neutral questions:

"**How much did you start** your **business** with?" (fact)

"At the **time** did you regard this **as enough**?" (yes/no)

"How do you **see** this now?" (judgement)

- Don't **ask non-questions**. **Some** interviewers make statements instead of asking questions. **For instance**, the interviewer might follow up an answer with, "But this **generally** does happen", instead of asking: "Would this have **normally** happened?"

- Don't be redundant.

'**Could I ask you if....?**'

'**I wonder whether you could say....?**'

This advance billing is unnecessary.

Activity 2

You have to **interview** a famous tennis player. Your job is to prepare a list of **six** questions that have a **mix** of informational, interpretative and emotional questions. Having prepared **your** list, you **can** check with aids-to-answers at the end of the unit (section 2.6).

2.3.4 The Personality Interview

Many interviews with figures from the world of entertainment, sports, **politics**, etc. are designed to **illuminate** their **personality** and background. For this, the interviewers need to **know** something about the guest's background, so they **can** direct their questions toward bringing out the information that is of the greatest interest to the **audience**. It is important to consider what the celebrity would like to be asked. A movie **star** would perhaps like to discuss **his/her** latest release. It is also important to know what the guest would not like to **discuss**. Writers **can** direct interviewers to **ask pertinent** questions and not embarrassing ones. To spring the embarrassing **question** on the guest could be construed **as** hostile or deceptive. "**Your** last play **was** on marital fidelity but last month you mamed for **the** third time. Some people call you a **hypocrite**. How do you react?" (This brand of interviewing is common of film glossies).

On the other hand, the sensitive and enterprising interviewer may **find** a way to interject a delicate or a controversial question without committing a breach of ethics.

"In your plays you **have** dealt with the issue of marital fidelity. Does your own life in anyway influence **your** writing?"

Interviewers, **particularly** inexperienced ones, sometimes allow themselves to be overawed by **celebrities** who are recipients of enthusiastic hero-worship. Extensive adulation does not **produce** good interviews.

"Mr. **Rangeen Kumar**, you are **the** best actor in India and a most handsome man. What kind of women **do** you like?" Needless to say, excessive adulation makes one seem silly as well.

It's always useful to **remember** that questions that probe experiences common to most human beings **reduce** the distance between the guest and the host. Questions about family, **background**, education are obvious unifiers, but even more relevant are those that relate to **common** human factors of experience.

"What effect has **popularity** (**fame**, money, success) had upon those who were closest to you before you **became a star**?"

All interviews, are, **of course**, not with film celebrities. They are often with scientists, writers, playwrights, **artists**, sculptors, so on **and so forth**. **In fact**, personality interviews of lesser **known** personalities (and ones whose contributions are equally constructive) should be made more popular.

It is important to **remember** that personality interviews **DO NOT** only just **mean** eliciting information **about** personal life.

"Mr. **Satyajit Ray**, **have** you ever lived in a village?"

It should be on **personal life as it** relates to **his/her** work and philosophy.

"Mr. Ray, your film **Paather Panchali** beautifully captures village life. What helped you capture it with **such authenticity**?"

Pointless questions dealing with personal likes and dislikes should be avoided.

"What brand of soap **do** you use?"

What colour is your **favourite**?"

"If you are sick, who **would** you like to nurse you?"

Activity 3

This is a practical assignment. Choose a personality that you find interesting. Prepare a complete interview 'script' (introduction, conclusion and questions) and discuss with your counsellor.

2.4 THE RADIO DISCUSSION

The radio discussion usually involves several participants and a moderator. The discussions are usually over issues and events that are of some importance to the **common** man. Radio **discussions** could be on any subject: Politics, Medicine, Science, Sports, Literature, Polymer-engineering or any other topic. More **specifically**, it could be on:

"Introducing new fertilizers"

"The contemporary relevance of **Jazz**"

"Public apathy to **eve-teasing**"

"Big money in Cricket"

"Relevance of Media Autonomy", **etc.**

Having taken up a specific subject, radio discussions **can** debate, interpret, explain or even investigate a certain issue or event.

A **radio** discussion cannot and should not be fully scripted. **This**, of course, does not **mean** that the programme should proceed any old way. It has to be very carefully structured by the moderator.

First, the participants have to be chosen with great care. They should be well informed on whatever subject they are to discuss and they should be willing to be **disciplined** in their own presentation under the **direction** of the moderator. **Indisciplined** participants can ruin the whole discussion by projecting their pint-of-view at the expense of others. This is a common phenomenon when **politicians** are asked to speak. **Some** party loyalists **look** upon a discussion as an **opportunity** to 'give the party line' and 'floor the opponents'. Usually these people **end** up cutting a very sorry figure. A good participant listens, awaits his turn and **chooses** to debate instead of argue.

Similarly, a moderator should be non-partisan. **S/he** should not be partisan (at least in **his/her** role as a moderator) and ensure that every one has an **equal** chance to speak. **S/he** should refrain from weighing heavily **onto** any one side. "Well I must say I **agree** with you..." or I **disagree** with you completely..." are not the **kind** of statements that should figure at all. Nobody is interested in knowing whether the moderator agrees or not. Like the interviewer in the interview, a moderator is only a catalyst. It's the participants of the discussion who are more important. A good moderator should:

- introduce the **topic** briefly and comprehensively
- clarify the focus of the discussion
- introduce the participants **and** clarify why they are eligible to speak on the-issue
- present a question or statement
- choose a **participant** to respond to it
- go round the table to make **sure** that everybody gets a **chance** to speak
- bring together differing **points** of view in **interesting** juxtapositions
- (silently) **encourage** the **participants** to speak by being interested—and showing it!
- **tactfully** control a **meandering** speaker
- persuade an evasive **speaker** to **make** a point
- ensure that **everyone** has a **chance** to speak

– conclude by summing up the main points of the discussion and thanking the participants.

Research plays an **important** role in **organizing** a discussion. The producer of a discussion has ~~not~~ **only** to study the **subject** being discussed but make an intelligent choice of participants. **The participants** need not be 'experts' in the formal sense of the word but **should** have some reason for being on the panel. Some students of **mine** once did a **programme** on the impact of advertising where they interviewed a famous painter. It was evident in the programme that the painter did not have **anything special** to say on the **subject**. When asked why they chose to have the painter, they replied: "Because he ~~is~~ famous." There is no rule that says that famous people **know** everything about everything.

If the discussion has to have credibility, the participants must be chosen with great care.

Activity 4

You have been assigned to organize a discussion on "Religion should be distinguished from Communalism." You have to prepare a list of participants. Who would you **choose**? In order to prepare this list, you will need to do some research. After completing this **list**, check with aids-to-answers given in section 2.6.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Activity 5

Listen to discussions **over** the radio. Which ones do you like? What role did the moderator play? **Write down** your points and discuss with the counsellor and fellow students.

2.5 SUMMING UP

- An interview is a **conversation** with an aim. In earlier days this conversation ~~was~~ completely written **out**. Nowadays, an interview is more spontaneous and therefore more interesting.
- Good **interviewers** ~~are first~~ and foremost **good** listeners.
- They ~~direct the course~~ of the interview, **raise questions** and ~~are thorough with their~~ research.
- For the sake of **simplicity**, we can say that **questions** are of three types: informational, **emotional** and **interpretative**.
- An **interviewer must know** how to handle **difficult** or nervous **interviewees**.
- **Asking questions** is **an art** that needs to be **mastered**. Don't ~~ask questions~~ that are **narrow** in their scope or too **broad** to handle. Don't ask leading **questions** or **non-questions**.

2.6 AIDS TO ANSWERS

Exercise 1

The interviewer's function is to draw out responses from the **interviewee**. **She/he** asks questions and encourages **responses**. **She/he** raises questions of interest, **directs** the **course** of the **interview** and re-directs the evasive speaker. Most

importantly, **she/he** clarifies **the** issues being talked of and makes sure that the **obvious** is not overlooked. If you still feel uncertain read section 2.1 again.

Exercise 2

Read section 2.3 again and try to identify the characteristics of a good interviewer. Ask yourself:

- Did she manage to draw the person out?
- Did **she/he** seem interested?
- Was **she/he** interesting?
- Was **she/he** in control of the interview? Was **she/he** able to direct it?
- How did **she/he** manage difficult situations? Was **she/he** polite while being firm and persuasive?
 - Did **she/he** ask questions of interest?
 - Were **his/her** comments insightful?
 - Had **she/he** done any homework?
 - Did **she/he** tackle controversial issues? How did **she/he** balance between complete evasion and sensationalism?

These are just a few indicators. You may have come up with many more. Keep listening and picking up little tips each time.

Activity 1

- a) informational
- b) emotional
- c) informational
- d) interpretative
- e) interpretative
- f) informational
- g) emotional
- h) interpretative
- i) emotional
- j) interpretative
- k) informational/interpretative

- It is possible for a question to be a mix of both. We can assume that the question "Can you tell us about the Marxist Theory of the State?" is being asked of someone who has studied Marxist theory. If you are familiar with Marxist or any other theory, you will know that there are various interpretations. So you may have information as well as interpretation.

Activity 4

The following list of questions is only one way of going about the work and is not the only way to go about it.

- 1) You have just won the Australian Open Tennis Tournament. How does it make you feel? (emotional)
- 2) How many major tournaments **have** you won in the International Circuit? (informational)
- 3) You have played almost all the top-seeded players in the International Circuit. How do you rate yourself in comparison? (interpretative)
- 4) Last year your computer rating went down rapidly. What was **the reason**? (informational/interpretative)
- 5) What concrete measures can we take to promote youngsters? (informational)

- 6) Next month you will complete 15 years of **playing** tennis. How do you feel about it? (emotional)

Activity 4

You may have **come up** with quite a different list of names. Here's my choice:

- 1) Asghar Ali Engineer: Director of **Institute** for Islamic **Studies**, Bombay.
- 2) **P.C. Chatterjee**: **Scholar** and **Philosopher**. Former **Secretary** of Information and Broadcasting **Ministry**. **Author** of *Secular Values for **Secular India***.
- 3) Romila Thapar: Historian **and** Scholar. Currently **Professor** of **Ancient Indian** History at **Jawaharlal Nehru** University.
- 4) **Upendra** Baxi: Vice-Chancellor, Delhi University, **Professor** of **Law**, **Honorary** Director of **Indian Law Research Institute**.
- 5) Veena Mazumdar: Director, **Centre** for **Womens'** Development **Studies**.

All these people **named** above have been **concerned** over the **rising** wave of **communalism** and have **expounded** well on the issue through books, papers and lectures.