



**HAL**  
open science

# The linguistic evolution of political journalists: a comparison between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s in the United States of America

Mélissa Raynaud

► **To cite this version:**

Mélissa Raynaud. The linguistic evolution of political journalists: a comparison between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s in the United States of America. Humanities and Social Sciences. 2016. dumas-01858375

**HAL Id: dumas-01858375**

**<https://dumas.ccsd.cnrs.fr/dumas-01858375>**

Submitted on 20 Aug 2018

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

Université Toulouse Jean Jaurès  
UFR de Lettres, Langues et Civilisations Étrangères  
Département d'Études du Monde Anglophone

The linguistic evolution of political journalists: a comparison  
between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s in the  
United States of America

Mémoire de Master 2 réalisé par Mélissa RAYNAUD  
Sous la direction de M. Henri Le Priault  
Juin 2016

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Mr. Le Priault for all his help throughout the year. He taught me how to be precise and meticulous in my work, and he was always available whenever I needed to clarify some points or when I required help in the construction of my research project.

Additionally, I wish to address warm thanks to Mr. Michael Seeney, for his advice and patience all along the year. Thank you for the outside view which allowed me to think about different axes of research.

Finally, I am grateful to Mrs Traci Walker, illustrious Professor at the University of York of Conversation Analysis (CA) and Interactional Linguistics, who gave me the taste for the study of interaction between participants and encouraged me to follow my studies in this direction.

## Table of content

<u>Introduction</u>	1
<u>I] Turn-taking system</u>	6
1) How does a dyadic conversation work?	
1.1 <i>Adjacency pairs</i>	6
1.2 <i>Increments</i>	8
1.3 <i>Specific types of expansions</i>	11
1.4 <i>“Unmarked next position” and latched talks</i>	14
2) Overlaps	
2.1 <i>Overlaps: a case of interruption in conversations</i>	16
2.2 <i>Overlaps at a transition relevance place (TRP)</i>	17
2.3 <i>Overlaps at a post-transition onset</i>	20
2.4 <i>Overlaps in “interjacent” onset</i>	23
3) Delays in the discourse	
3.1 <i>Intra-turn silences</i>	24
3.2 <i>Gaps</i>	28
3.3 <i>Attributable silences</i>	30
3.4 <i>Repairs, hesitations and vocalizations</i>	31
<u>II] A comparison between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s</u>	37
1) Historical part	
1.1 <i>How did journalism emerge and develop in the United States?</i>	37
1.2 <i>What does it mean to be a journalist?</i>	42
1.3 <i>Contexts of the studied periods: the 1960s-1970s in comparison with the 2000s-2010s</i>	46
2) Commonalities between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s	
2.1 <i>The political interview model</i>	48
2.2 <i>Overlaps and delays in the 1960s-1970s and in the 2000s-2010s: points of commonalities</i>	50
2.3 <i>Questions and answers in political interviews in the 1960s-1970s and in the 2000s-2010s</i>	54
3) Significant differences between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s	
3.1 <i>Extra-linguistic evolution over the decades: how political interviews evolved?</i>	57
3.2 <i>Overlaps and delays in the 1960s-1970s and in the 2000s-2010s: notable differences</i>	58
3.3 <i>The evolution of questions and answers in the 1960s-1970s and in the 2000s-2010s</i>	66
3.4 <i>The case of two specific videos</i>	70
<u>Conclusion</u>	75
<u>Bibliography</u>	78

<u>Transcription of symbols</u>	82
<u>Appendix 1</u>	83
<u>Appendix 2</u>	85
<u>Appendix 3</u>	88
<u>Appendix 4</u>	91
<u>Appendix 5</u>	94
<u>Appendix 6</u>	97
<u>Appendix 7</u>	99
<u>Appendix 8</u>	104
<u>Appendix 9</u>	107
<u>Appendix 10</u>	110

## Introduction

During my Master 1, I studied a year abroad in England, at the University of York, and I decided to lead a research project entitled “Exploring the grammar of dialogues in modern English-speaking media”. I focused my attention on a single video between the political journalist Jeremy Paxman, and the former Mayor of London, Boris Johnson (from 2008 to 2016). This political interview was investigated in terms of Conversation Analysis (CA), so that the interaction between the two participants was the main point of focus. In fact, one of my modules there was entitled “The Language of Turn and Sequence” and was led by Mrs Traci Walker, Professor of Conversation Analysis and Interactional Linguistics. Thanks to these courses, I have been able to familiarize myself with this field of study, whether learning how to transcribe and decipher scripts or to understand how the turn-taking system in dyadic conversations works. With these basic tools, I was able to investigate several phenomena, such as some of the discourse markers (*so*, *well* and *oh*), pauses in the discourse and overlaps (or simultaneous talks). Additionally, non verbal communication was also an important part of this research project since the notion of proxemics was pointed out as a relevant element of political interviews: both the political figure and the journalist often resorted to body language to reinforce the validity of their words. Finally, both the use of gestures and sound production were analyzed, in order to see whether these constituents were mastered by speakers or if, on the contrary, they were used involuntarily.

In order to keep a logical continuity in regard to my previous investigations, I chose to select ten extracts of political interviews from two different periods in the United States of America. Usually, scholars from the CA branch tend to use recordings instead of videos to analyze the turn-taking system because they do not take into account the non verbal part of communication and only study how the conversation works between several participants. However, the choice of videos instead of recordings for my research project is explained by the fact that the gaze and different gestures might be important in the final results, especially when there are occurrences of overlaps and delays in the discourse. Moreover, the birth of presidential news conferences as well as the practice of interviewing politicians emerged around the 1950s, which is why it was necessary to resort to videos and not to other medias in order to observe the evolution of this new means of communication.

The first period studied concentrates on the 1960s-1970s with political interviews of both President Kennedy and President Nixon, along with a video between the First Lady, Jacqueline Kennedy, and a journalist, while the videos chosen for the 2000s-2010s period show political interviews between a journalist and President George W. Bush or President Barack Obama, as well

as an interview of Michelle Obama. These four Presidents of the United States were chosen so as to respect a perfect equality in terms of political party of affiliation. Indeed, both President Kennedy and President Obama are affiliated with the Democratic Party while President Nixon and President Bush are affiliated with the Republican Party. The first period analyzed is important as it marked the beginning of a shift in the political journalism landscape. Indeed, Schudson (2008: 4) notes that the mid-twentieth century is characterized by a form of non-aggressiveness from journalists, stating that “media coverage of Congress in the 1950s and into the 1960s was, as one contemporary called it, “overcooperative” (Matthews, 1960: 207).” In other words, the 1950s in the United States of America are regarded as publicly exhibiting political figures on television, now accessible by a large audience. Through the practice of interviewing, journalists aimed at asking questions to the President as if their goal was to present the politician's legitimacy, without asking sensitive questions nor putting their guests in an embarrassing situation. However, the 1960s and even more the 1970s, are deeply marked by a shift in political journalism. The Vietnam War, President Kennedy's assassination and the Watergate scandal, which began in 1972 and finished two years later with President Richard Nixon's resignation from presidency, signaled a deep change both in the way journalists investigate politicians as well as a growing skepticism from the American population. Incidentally, Clayman et al. (2010: 229) claim that the late 1960s are to be seen as a turning point in the History of the United States, since “the scope and persistence of the trend suggests that journalistic norms underwent a fundamental change sometime in the post-1968 era.” Indeed, journalism tended to shift from a descriptive and interpretative<sup>1</sup> style to an analytical one, in order to denounce and fight the excesses of politicians.

The other extracts of political interviews are taken from a recent period since they deal with the 2000s-2010s. From the mid-twentieth century, the United States of America has seen both the development of some type of communication (radio, newspapers and television) as well as the emergence of new means of communication, especially thanks to the birth of Internet and the different social networks. The journalists' position has therefore changed over the decades since there was a need to adapt to the new technologies. Information is now released faster than it was in the 1960s-1970s because of the instantaneousness of news available online. Many scholars also note a more “aggressive questioning” (Clayman et al. 2010, 235) from journalists and a tendency to probe the politicians in order to obtain as much information as they can. From passive actors asking questions in the 1960s-1970s, journalists now have the desire to seek for truthfulness and reliability in the answers of their political guests.

---

<sup>1</sup> Barnhurst (1997: 28) recalls Schudson's thoughts in saying that “He argued that interpretive journalism reached an apotheosis in the 1960s as part of a larger move in America toward the culture of criticism.”

My research project therefore focuses on the comparison between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s, both investigating the political journalist's and the President of the United States' linguistics evolution. The main point was to observe whether there was a noticeable change in the way political interviews take place over the decades. In the first part of my dissertation, the turn-taking system, which is the common and basic model used in communication and studied by scholars from the Conversation Analysis field (CA), is going to be both discussed and analyzed. Indeed, participants of a conversation produce turns when they speak. The adjacency pairs which are composed of both an initiative first pair part (FPP) and a responsive second pair part (SPP) appear as the standard model when people talk to each other. In other words, participants of a conversation make actions while talking, whether they are starting an action or answering by an action. However, daily-life conversations – and even more dyadic political interviews – tend to be composed of more than the simple adjacency pair system. In fact, there is a need both for the political journalist and the interviewee to elaborate, justify and give more details in their turns. Journalists therefore tend to use pre-expansions to their FPP in order to re-contextualize the topic they want to discuss or because they thank and present their guest, while post-expansions are very much used by politicians insofar as they need to develop and justify their answers. As far as insert expansions are concerned, they correspond to added parts of talk found between the FPP and the SPP, equally used by both of the participants. Journalists as well as Presidents of the United States play an important role in political interviews since they both aim at a particular goal. Indeed, journalists want to investigate and probe their guests in order to obtain information released to a large audience while politicians wish to gather people around their ideas and convince them of the validity of their words. Because this specific type of interview shows a power relationship, it often involves the creation of simultaneous talks. In fact, the phenomenon of overlaps is very much part of political interviews because there is a struggle in keeping/taking the turn. When participants of a conversation create overlaps, it is meant to interrupt the smooth talk-in-process. However, some overlaps can be the result of an involuntary action to cut the current speaker off (i.e., the case of transition relevance place) while other overlaps are undoubtedly formed in order to intentionally regain the talk (i.e., overlaps found at post-transition onsets and in “interjacent” onsets). In other words, there are two kinds of overlaps: *cooperative overlaps* and *interruptive overlaps*<sup>2</sup>. Additionally to the case of simultaneous talks, there are frequently delays in the discourse, which can take many forms. Intra-turn silences, gaps and attributable silences are the three different types of delays commonly found in political interviews. Broadly speaking, pauses can have a great impact on the viewers: emphasizing what comes after the pauses, and conversely, showing discomfort

---

2 <http://grammar.about.com/od/c/g/cooperativeoverlapterm.htm>

either from the current speaker or from the recipient. Finally, repairs, hesitations and vocalizations are also part of the delays usually found in communication. It is indeed common for participants to recycle what has already been said, which can create a stuttering effect. Vocalizations correspond to the use of semantically empty word “uh” (and its derivations *uhm*, *huh*, *um*, *er*, and so on) which display that the current speaker is resorting to them in order to claim that even though he does not produce a whole turn construction unit, he still wants to talk. Incidentally, Gardner (2001: 15) suggests that these vocalizations express the idea that “I’m (still) here, I’m (still) talking, I’m (still) in my turn”.

Secondly, my research project focuses on the linguistic evolution between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s. We will see how journalism first emerged and then developed in the United States of America, as a cultural entity of the American society. Medias evolved throughout the decades and became more and more a social construct both gathering people around news and allowing a representation of the world surrounding them. The role of journalists is therefore important insofar as they are the bearers of information and they are therefore the ones who shed light on some information and put some of it aside. Because means of communication have largely developed from the very first broadcast news via radio in the 1920s to nowadays' new technologies (Internet and social networks), the status of the journalist seems to be more and more blurred because everybody in democratic societies is now able to deliver information instantaneously. Furthermore, information is released even faster online than it was some decades ago. Nowadays, it is easy to know what is happening on the other side of the world thanks to these new means of communication. All of this encourages people to share the news worldwide. In order to observe the similarities as well as the differences between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s, the context of each period is going to be explained in order to have a logical analysis of the linguistic evolution from these two periods. Finally, my dissertation is going to show that there are both noticeable commonalities and significant differences between the Kennedy/Nixon years and the recent years, whether in terms of overlaps and delays or in the way questions are asked by journalists. Two videos from the corpus are going to be analyzed on their own because they substantially differ from the others. Indeed, the video entitled *Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama* is undeniably marked by forms of aggressiveness from the political journalist towards his guest. The occurrence of overlaps is therefore prominent compared to the other videos, as well as the number of latched talks. The fact that there is only a small amount of space between the end of the current speaker's turn and the beginning of the next turn to come highlights a desire from both of the participants to talk. The second video mentioned and explained is entitled *Frost/Nixon (1977) Segments 1&2 - Watergate/Nixon and the World* and shows the journalist David Frost opposed to the former

President of the United States, Richard Nixon. Conversely to the first video, this political interview is marked by a higher number of long pauses which illustrates Nixon's discomfort in the revelation of his role in the Watergate scandal.

## I] The turn-taking system in communication

### **1) How does a dyadic conversation work?**

#### *1.1 Adjacency pairs*

In oral forms of communication – and as we will see in dyadic interviews – there is most of the time one person speaking while the other(s) is/are listening. When people talk to one another, both the action of listening and the action of talking take place insofar as communicating involves an exchange of ideas through the hearing and the speaking process. Communication is “a symbolic process whereby reality is produced, maintained, repaired and transformed” (Broersma 2012, 16 refers to Habermas 1990, 23).

It seems crucial for participants of a conversation to listen and to talk alternatively in order to be able to produce a logical continuity in the exchange of ideas. In conversations, the current speaker can talk as much as he wants as long as he is not interrupted by others; otherwise, a simultaneous talk between several participants is going to create disruptions in the smooth talk-in-process, producing overlaps. In standard transcripts, overlaps begin and finish with the square bracket symbol, so that simultaneous talks by different participants are found in between square brackets [...]. Scholars from the Conversation Analysis field point out three ways to see how turn-allocation is organized: the current speaker continues to speak, or he selects the next speaker, or the recipient self-selects himself and takes the turn. Lerner (2003: 177) recalls Sacks's, Schegloff's and Jefferson's claims about the turn-taking system, calling it “simplest systematics”. There are different possibilities to explain the occurrence of a changing speaker in conversations; the two most common occurrences of a speaker change are that either the current speaker selects the next speaker or the recipient takes the turn on his own without any pre-selection.

Conversation Analysis (CA) is a methodology which studies the language in use and shows how well-structured a conversation is; it is an approach to the social interaction between people. Linguists who belong to this field of research claim that talk-in-interaction is “the product of both position and composition—that is, not only what is said or done (composition), but also where it is said or done (position)” (Schegloff, 2010: 132) and that talk-in-interaction is always thoroughly organized. To begin with a prevailing and common rule in CA, Schegloff (1968: 350) suggests that the common rule for a comprehensible conversation is to have one speaker talking on his own with recipient(s) listening to him; what he sums up as “the basic rule for conversation: *one party at a time*” [italics added]. Indeed, this should be the norm to be respected by participants in a conversation. Jefferson (1986: 162) states that the most common model in conversations is what she calls “unmarked next position” where there is just enough time for the next speaker to take the turn, without delay nor rush; as she claims, this type of turn-taking “is not pushed up into or latched

immediately onto the prior utterance, but permits just a bit of space between the end of the prior and the start of the next. It is "simply next". This seems to be the basic and more commonly used model for a smooth conversation. In the transcripts used for the corpus, the way the "turn-taking" (Sacks et al. 1974, 700) is organized is simply marked by the abbreviation of the next person taking the turn and following a line break. As an example, the following extract is an illustration of the basic turn-taking model, displaying a form of greeting-greeting type of exchange:

*Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama before the Super Bowl*

1 Jo: mister president thank you for doing this

2 Pr: great to be with you

The journalist takes the first turn to thank his guest for being present for the interview which is about to take place (line 1). This is respectively followed by the President's turn who answers to the previous turn (line 2).

Communication between people is a process which is in fact part of a complex construction, especially because turns can be both embedded and delayed. When people communicate with one another, they are not only talking and aligning one word after another, but they are also doing actions while talking. In other words, their sequences of talk initiate an action which can take many forms. A turn construction unit (TCU) is a sequence of talk produced by one speaker and which is considered to be complete both in terms of grammar and pragmatics. Cutting (2002: 2) observes a direct link between pragmatics and discourse analysis, explaining that

Both pragmatics and discourse analysis study the meaning of words in context, analysing the parts of meaning that can be explained by knowledge of the physical and social world, and the socio-psychological factors influencing communication, as well as the knowledge of the time and place in which the words are uttered or written. (Stilwell Peccei 1999; Yule 1996).

Furthermore, the first pair part (FPP) and the second pair part (SPP) are the two compulsory constituents which give rise to what is known as an adjacency pair. Different specific components are required to form what Schegloff (2007: 13) claims to be the basic form of an adjacency pair: "basic unexpanded form of an adjacency pair". Indeed, both the FPP and the SPP have to be composed of two turns placed one after the other and produced by two different speakers. These two turns (the FPP and the SPP) are ordered so that the FPP is an action initiated by a speaker and the SPP is responsive to the first. In other words, an adjacency pair can take many forms in the exchanges between two different speakers, such as a greeting-greeting type, an offer-accept/decline type, a question-answer type, and so on. In the following political interviews, the question-answer

format prevails over other types of FPP/SPP since the journalist's aim is to investigate the President's actions. Clayman and Heritage (2002: 98) argue that both the role of the interviewer and that of the interviewee are set in advance since the journalist's task is to ask questions to the President of the United States: “This form of turn-taking involves what Atkinson and Drew (1979) have called “turn-type preallocation” in which the activities of asking and answering (or responding to) questions are pre-allocated to the roles of interviewer and interviewee.” However, it is important to note that not all adjacency pairs are only composed of an FPP and an SPP because it is common to find elaborated FPP and SPP, composed of expansions. Additionally, not every utterance is an FPP or an SPP; if the turn does not form a turn construction unit and is therefore not pragmatically and grammatically complete, it is not regarded as an FPP nor an SPP.

### 1.2 Increments

A first pair part does not always precede straight away a second pair part, and conversely an SPP does not regularly follow an FPP, because speakers tend to elaborate their sequences of talk. This phenomenon is referred to as “pair-type related; that is, not every second pair part can properly follow any first pair part” Schegloff (2007: 14). Increments – also known as *insert expansions* – are commonly used by speakers to develop and argument their ideas. These expansions are the product of added parts of talk from the current speaker. They have to be regarded as non-main clause continuations after a possible point of turn completion in order to continue the previous turn or to change the current topic. This means that the current speaker's turn is generally both followed by a pause in the discourse and then by the expansion of his previous turn. Increments can be either extensions continuing the prior turn or free constituents (also known as free unattached noun phrases) which, in this case, do not continue the same action and are therefore not constituents of the prior turn. In other words, extensions add something else to the prior turn thanks to the uptake of the current speaker who provides another transition relevance place (TRP) while continuing the same action, whereas free constituents add something but do not continue the topic which is currently being discussed. Extensions are constituents of the prior turn and can appear through noun phrase (NP), adverb, adverb phrase (AdvP), prepositional phrase (PP), or clause. As an example, the following extract highlights two different extensions from the President's part, on lines 73 and 75.

#### *Bush's final days*

68 Jo: what **DON**'t the american people know about being president↓ (.)  
 69 what would surpr:se them (.) the mo:st↑  
 70 Pr: i think people look at the white house 'n say oh man what a

71 miserable experience it is  
 72 (>0.2)  
 73 Pr: → to be **PRE**sident  
 74 (>0.2)  
 75 → >yihknow< there's a lot of noise  
 76 a lot of criticism a lot of name calling >a lot of this a lot of that< (.)  
 77 but some days we're not so happy some days happy (.) every day's  
 78 been pretty joyous so

In the example above, the journalist produces an FPP in the form of a question, beginning by the interrogative pronoun “what” on lines 68-69. The question is followed by the President's SPP responsive action who answers on line 70-71. It seems at first sight that the current speaker has ended his turn because he has both produced a TCU as well as a noticeable fall in pitch ↓ . That is why the long pause occurs (line 72) right after the end of his turn since this is a case of a transition relevance place (TRP); in other words, both the journalist and the President are expected to take the turn or to keep it. The President finally chooses to uptake the turn and gives a precision of his previous turn, adding the clause “to be President” as he sees that the journalist does not come in. Another long pause occurs after his increment hence the new uptake by the President who expands his turn giving more details about what life looks like in the White House (lines 75 to 78). When the President increments his previous turn in both of the cases, the extensions are seen as continuing the prior turn.

The example below highlights an increment produced this time by the journalist.

*Richard Nixon interview – Vietnam (Merv Griffin Show 1966)*

19 or (.) [ in western europe or any place else ]  
 20 Jo: [well let's stop with vietnam for a minute] we hear a  
 21 a great deal nowadays mister nixon (.) uh people are  
 22 beginning to say: (.) that (.) shouldn't this war be  
 23 discussed in congress  
 24 (>0.2)  
 25 Jo: → with our commitment over there of men (.)  
 26 and as much money as we are spending in fighting  
 27 the war (.) isn't this something that should be  
 28 (>0.2) debated **AND** discussed in the congress of  
 29 the united states

The overlap found on lines 19-20 shows that it is the journalist who finally takes the turn. The yes/no question is expressed with the negation “shouldn't” and therefore creates the journalist's FPP which provides space for the recipient to take the turn. But the President does not come in, which forms a long pause (line 24). The journalist uptakes the turn and increments it from line 25 to 29, in order to give further information to the listener. He recycles the very same structure of his

previous question on lines 27-28 since his yes/no question is negatively formulated “isn't this something that should be”.

It seems more common to find a pause in-between the turn construction unit and the extension insofar as the increment is seen as optional in the current speaker's talk. Indeed, pauses often precede the extension of the turn since the current speaker may wait to see whether the recipient takes the turn or not. If he does not take it, the current speaker may add extra information. But this is not always the case to find pauses before the extension of the previous turn. For instance, the next extract shows how the two long expansions produced by the President are not occurring through pauses in his discourse, but rather follows the current talk-in-process without any delay.

*CBS TV interview with President John Fitzgerald Kennedy on Sept. 2, 1963*

9           (.) do you think that that this has HURt thi spirit that  
 10           prevailed in getting this treaty in the first place ↓  
 11 Pr:     NO: if thi- (s) if thi treaty is so- is not substantial  
 12           enough to stand discussion and debate (.) then of  
 13     →     course it isn't a very good treaty so i don't- uh (.) i  
 14           think what would be most desirable is after all this  
 15           discussion and debate then to get a very strong vote  
 16     →     in the senate ↓ i think the reservation'd be a great  
 17           mistake (.) i don't think president eisenhower (>0.2)  
 18           used the reservation in the formal sense that he  
 19           wanted the senate of the united states (.) to put a  
 20           reservation on the treaty because that would mean  
 21           that the treaty would have to be renegotiate (.) he  
 22           was concerned that uh we would uh make it very  
 23           clear that uh we have the right to use nuclear

The journalist begins his initiative action taking the form of a question “do you think” (lines 9-10) and reaches completion both because his turn is complete and because there is a noteworthy fall in pitch at the very end of his turn. The President takes the turn on line 11 and answers directly the question with the negation “no:” along with a sustained sound [o]. The “dispreferred answer” is followed by his explanation and the turn seems to come to a point of completion when he says “then of course it isn't a very good treaty”. However, he decides to expand his turn with the particle “so” (line 13) which implies that he has more to say and he wants to give more details on this topic. He therefore increments his turn and produces a fall in pitch in what occurs to be a new turn construction unit. This is not however the end of his turn since he adds another extension giving his own point of view on the subject-matter, beginning by “I think”, on line 16.

As we have seen, insert expansions are used to add complementary information in regards to the previous turn. Additionally, two other kinds of expansions, known as *pre-expansions* and *post-*

*expansions*, are going to be discussed and analyzed.

### 1.3 Specific types of expansions

Schegloff (2010: 141) suggests a specific terminology for the three different types of expansions commonly found in conversations and argues that expansions can be produced at three different locations in the turn: “These two-turn sequences can get expanded in all the logically possible places – before the FPP (“pre-expansion”), between the FPP and the SPP (“insert expansion”), and after the SPP (“post expansion”).”

The question-answer format of political and dyadic interviews aims at examining the President's main actions for his country. However, starting the interview, the journalist needs both to present his guest and to thank him for his presence. Clayman and Heritage's (2002: 74) findings coincide with the formal introduction of political interviews. Indeed, they claim that “it is also common for the interviewer to state the interviewee's name, and sometimes his or her full name and title, in the course of expressing thanks.” In the following examples, we are going to see where and when do “pre-expansions” occur.

*March 24, 1961 : New First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy interviewed by Sander Vanocur*

- 1 Jo: → you mentioned before: theodore roosevelt (.) bringing  
 2 → an architect who was it uhm (.) [°Stanford Way°] (.)  
 3 Fr: → St[anford Way ]  
 4 Jo: → uhmm (>0.2) that was really the LA:st first family  
 5 → that had small children (>0.2) 'f its own in the white  
 6 house (>0.2) d'you find the white house is a very good  
 7 place to raise children ↑ how 's your LI:fe changed since  
 8 you've (.) [come he]re  
 9 Fr: [ well ] it is rather hard with children there's  
 10 so little privacy (.) i don't mind uhm (>0.2) for myself but-

The extract above shows an interview between the First Lady, Jacqueline Kennedy, and the journalist, Sander Vanocur. The latter begins to talk without engaging any first pair part on lines 1 and 2. He does not produce a question nor an offer but he rather states a fact, which is regarded as a “pre-expansion”. Schegloff (2007: 28) notes in this sense that “they [pre-sequences] are themselves *sequences*, and they come *before* sequences – they are recognizably “pre-”, that is, preliminary to something else.” Indeed, the pre-expansion he produces is a tool for him to actually set a re-contextualization of his question to come; that is to say, this is a kind of introduction to his FPP found on line 6 and beginning by “d'you find the White House”. The use of “pre-expansion” in political interviews commonly gives a hint to both the interviewee and the audience as to what the next topic is going to be. In this case, the journalist is referring to the twenty-sixth President of the

United States, Theodore Roosevelt, and then moves the conversation to the topic of the former President's children. Once the topic is established, he creates an FPP taking the form of two different questions of which the subject-matter focuses on how difficult it can be to live with children in the White House (lines 6 to 8).

In the following extract, the journalist initiates a pre-expansion before actually creating a first pair part.

*Barack Obama on Tavis Smiley (2007)*

1 Jo: → huhm let me- uh >lemme switch gears and jump right into  
 2 → it< i got you for the- for the full show and i'm glad you're  
 3 → [here ] on the west coast for a chang[e ]  
 4 Pr: [good] [good]  
 5 Jo: uhhm (>0.2) how do you respond a lot a lot- ov commentary

In this extract, the journalist Tavis Smiley takes the turn on line 1 in order to express his enjoyment of having the President of the United States on his show for an interview, by which the President answers “good” produced twice and overlapping the current speaker. The “pre-expansion” therefore extends from line 1 to 3 since the interviewer does not produce an FPP but he manifests his personal feeling. In fact, the initiative action taking the form of a question occurs only on line 5 and is directed to the interviewee “how do you respond”, even though he cuts himself and extends once more his turn, congratulating the President for his campaign and the money he has gathered.

The following example shows an occurrence of insert expansions, produced by the First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy on line 101. This is a case where she wants to be sure of what the journalist is asking her, that is why she produces a question in order to answer correctly.

*March 24, 1961 : New First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy interviewed by Sander Vanocur*

94 Fr: yes i think it doesn't matter what else you do if you don't do  
 95 that part well (.) if you fail your husband and your children  
 96 (.) uhm .hhh that really is the role which means the most to  
 97 me though obviously i have a (>0.2) deep sense of  
 98 obligation for the others but that's the one that comes first  
 99 Jo: an' has it been more difficult ((tel)) honestly (.) to fulfill this  
 100 role  
 101 Fr: → since we've been in the white h[ouse ↑ ]  
 102 Jo: [yes mam']  
 103 Fr: .hhhhh no my husband loves (.) a challenge and uhm  
 104 (.) i do to (.) he set me a good example (.) so (>0.2)  
 105 let's hope it works out

On lines 99 and 100, the journalist initiates a first pair part, taking the form of a closed question, since Jacqueline Kennedy's answer is orientated towards a yes/no response. But it seems

that the question is not sufficiently clear because she produces an insert expansion, which creates a delay of her actual second pair part. Indeed, she answers the journalist's question by another question, in order to be sure of what he is aiming at, on line 101 “since we've been in the White House?”. Her insert expansion on line 101 is overlapped at the very end of her turn by the journalist who answers positively to her question. Jacqueline Kennedy's second pair part actually occurs from lines 103 to 105, with the notable straightforward answer “no”, followed by an expansion. In this case, the insert expansion is used to verify the nature of the original question found on lines 99-100. Generally speaking, insert expansions occur between a first pair part and a second pair part, which often involves a delay between the current's speaker turn and the recipient answer.

The last specific type of increments concerns what is known as post-expansions. They are used to add more information on the current topic being discussed, occurring after both the FPP and the SPP. In other words, post-expansions are produced after adjacency pairs, when both the initiated FPP and the responsive SPP have been produced. Jacknick (2011: 40) refers to Schegloff (2007) who “argues that expansion is possible following all adjacency pairs, but notes that sequences involving preference structure (c.f., Pomerantz, 1984) are more likely to take post-expansion.” In fact, there is a tendency to elaborate the responsive SPP turn when it is affirmative rather than when it is negative. In the following example, President Kennedy produces both an SPP taking the form of an affirmative answer and a long post-expansion, justifying his “yes I do”.

*CBS TV interview with President John Fitzgerald Kennedy on Sept. 2, 1963*

102 Jo: do you think that uh (.) this government still has  
 103 time to uh t[o regain the support of t]he people ↑  
 104 Pr: [ ye::s (.) i do: ]  
 105 (>0.2)  
 106 → with changes uh in policy and uh perhaps with  
 107 → uh in personnel i think it **CA:N** (.) if it doesn't  
 108 → uh (.) make those changes (.) i would think that  
 109 → the chances of winning it would not be very good  
 110 Jo: hasn't every indication from uh saigon been that  
 111 uh (.) president diêm has no intention of  
 112 changing his pattern =

On lines 102-103, the journalist initiates a first pair part taking the form of a closed question and therefore involving a yes/no answer. President Kennedy comes in to take the turn, overlapping the journalist's question. He produces an SPP positive answer, followed by a long pause on line 105. He decides to add more information, precisising his thoughts from lines 106 to 109 through the use of a post-expansion, since both the FPP and the SPP have been produced earlier.

The following section focuses on the way the speaker change is organized, whether there is

space or not between the current speaker's turn and the recipient's turn to come.

#### 1.4 “Unmarked next position” and latched talks

When people communicate with each other, it is common to find both lapses and overlaps within turns as well as between the current speaker's turn and the recipient's turn. If we now focus on the location between two different turns produced by two different speakers, we can see that several cases occur: there can be a delay (either brief or long), a small amount of silence or even no silence between turns. Jefferson (1986: 162) notes that the “unmarked next position” is the most commonly found phenomenon when a speaker change occurs. This means that there is space in-between two different turns; in other words between the end of the current speaker's turn and the recipient's next turn.

It is also common, even though less familiar, to find what is known as an “absolute adjacency” (Jefferson, 1986: 154). Latched talks are regarded as linking the current turn with the one to come, without any delay nor overlap. In comparison with “unmarked next position”, they can be seen as close to an overlap, since the recipient may aim at taking the turn and therefore immediately takes it. In CA transcripts, this occurrence is marked with the = symbol both at the end of the turn concerned and at the beginning of the next one.

In the following example, the “absolute adjacency” appears between the end of President Barack Obama's turn and the next turn to come of Bill O'Reilly, on lines 94 and 95.

#### *Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama before the Super Bowl*

87 Jo: [ it's in the past but isn't th]at the biggest mistake ↑  
 88 Pr: well i- you know bill as i said (.) (wwe)  
 89 Jo: you gave your en[emies a lot of fodder for it]  
 90 Pr: [ you- you- you- ]you- you  
 91 were very generous in saying i look pretty good uhh  
 92 considering i've been in the presidency for five years  
 93 and (.) i think part of the reason is (.) i try to focus (.)  
 94 → not on (.) the fumbles but on the next plan =  
 95 Jo: → = alright .hhh libya (.) a harr- house arm services  
 96 testimony (.) .hhh general carter ham

In the interviews between President Obama and the journalist, Bill O'Reilly, numerous latched talks occur all along the political interview. Indeed, the journalist adopts a rather aggressive position, interrupting the guest often and insisting on some questions he wants the President to answer. On line 72, the journalist starts a first pair part, asking the President “was it the biggest mistake of your presidency to tell the nation over and over, if you like your insurance, you can keep your insurance?” From this question, the President tries to answer, mitigating his response notably

through the use of “well”. The journalist asks once again this question with the negative form on line 77 “wasn't that the biggest mistake?”. Because the President's answer might not be sufficient for the journalist, he asks for the third time the very same question, on line 87 “it's in the past, but isn't that the biggest mistake?”. Finally, President Obama's answer is pretty evasive since he does not answer to this closed question by a yes/no answer, but instead he resorts to the fillers “well” and “you know” (line 88). His discomfort is also observable through the numerous instances of repairs (lines 88 and 90). The “absolute adjacency” occurs when the President finishes his turn, answering evasively to the question. The journalist insisted several times on this specific topic and he does not seem to be happy with the answers he received, finally chooses to move on and changes the topic. The latched talks appear because the journalist might have realized that he will not be able to get the answer he wants from the President, and having lost this joust, decides to move on. The fact that he has to move on is reinforced by the minimal response “alright” on line 95, which shows that the topic is now closed.

This case highlights that latched talks can occur when there is a form of aggressiveness in order to obtain information from the guest. In the following extract, the latched talks appearing on lines 112 and 113, prove that the President takes the turn without any delay between his turn and the journalist's previous turn, because he has enough information to answer.

*CBS TV interview with President John Fitzgerald Kennedy on Sept. 2, 1963*

102 Jo: do you think that uh (.) this government still has  
 103 time to uh t[o regain the support of t]he people ↑  
 104 Pr: [ ye::s (.) i do: ]  
 105 (>0.2)  
 106 with changes uh in policy and uh perhaps with  
 107 uh in personnel i think it CA:N (.) if it doesn't  
 108 uh (.) make those changes (.) i would think that  
 109 the chances of winning it would not be very good  
 110 Jo: hasn't every indication from uh saigon been that  
 111 uh (.) president diêm has no intention of  
 112 → changing his pattern =  
 113 Pr: → = if he doesn't change it then of course that's (.)  
 114 his decision he's been there ten yea:rs n' as i say  
 115 he has carried this burden uh well he's been  
 116 counted out a number of occasions OUR best  
 117 judgment is that he can't be successful in this  
 118 basis (.) we hope that HE comes to see that but  
 119 in the final analysis it's the people and the  
 120 government themselves who have to win or lose

In this sample, the journalist initiates a first pair part on line 102, taking the form of a

closed question “do you think”, by which the journalist produces both a preferred answer “yes I do” and the expansion of his current turn (from line 106 to 109). The journalist takes the turn on lines 110 to 112, engaging the President towards the topic of President Diêm (even though he does not produce an FPP question). President Kennedy may aim at taking the turn right ahead since they have been talking about Vietnam for a long time and that he does not need time to think any further about what he wants to express; hence the latched talks on lines 112 and 113.

We have seen that the common model in the turn-taking system is “one speaker at a time” in order to be able to communicate. However, it is frequent in daily life – and even more in political interviews – that several participants talk at the same time, either because they choose to do it deliberately, or either because the place where the overlap occurs is a location where both the current speaker and the recipient could talk without disturbing the dialogue in process (i.e., transition relevance place).

## **2) Overlaps**

### *2.1 Overlaps: a case of interruption in conversations*

Overlaps can be defined as simultaneous utterances between two or more people. They are generally brief (even though they can sometimes last for quite a long time) and can occur in the beginning of a turn, as well as in the middle or at the end of it. This means that they produce an interruption by one or more speakers in the current speaker's turn. Overlaps can therefore interfere with the smooth talk-in-interaction taking place. In the context of political interviews, we will see that this phenomenon can be the result of different factors: a disagreement between speakers, a need for justification, or simply a desire to expand the current turn. Simultaneous talks are a frequent feature of oral communication, occurring especially in spontaneous conversation. Sacks et al. (1974: 700) insist on the utterance of simultaneous speakers talking at the same time and claim that “occurrences of more than one speaker at a time are common, but brief.” These simultaneous talks are usually brief because either the current speaker decides to keep the turn and expands it, or he chooses to drop it out and gives the other speaker the opportunity to take the next turn. It regularly appears that one of the participants is talking while another one speaks simultaneously which gives rise to an overlap. Duncan (1972: 283) suggests in this sense that even though speaking simultaneously is a recurrent phenomenon in conversation, it should be avoided that such event occurs too frequently otherwise the conversation would be abstruse:

Just as it is desirable to avoid bumping into people on the street, it is desirable to avoid in conversations an inordinate amount of simultaneous talking.

Beyond considerations of etiquette, it is difficult to maintain adequate mutual comprehensibility when participants in a conversation are talking at the same time.

However, the simple turn-taking model is not systematically respected. Indeed, there are moments where more than one person is speaking at the same time, creating overlaps.

Additionally, latched talks – even though not considered to belong to the overlaps phenomenon – are a particular type of speaker changing process. In fact, a latched talk corresponds to the end of a turn followed by the beginning of a new one with only a small amount of space between these turns. Moreover, a latched talk links two turns found in close temporal proximity and therefore contains more space of non-talk than an overlap (simultaneous talk) but less space than an “unmarked next position” (which is the succession of two turns with space in between them). Sacks et al. (1974: 700) argue that this is the most common pattern when a speaker change occurs in conversations: “Transitions (from one turn to a next) with no gap and no overlap are common.” In most of my transcript symbol, I adopt the common signs used by CA scholars, as in the case of latched talks, which are signaled with the = symbol; standard symbol of CA.

The phenomenon of overlaps can be redefined in three subcategories: transition relevance place (abbreviated TRP), “recognitional” onset, and “interjacent” onset. Each of these specific types of overlaps are going to be discussed and explained, especially thanks to the use of dyadic interviews between a journalist and the President of the United States of America.

## *2.2 Overlaps at a transition relevance place (TRP)*

The first case of overlaps commonly found in dyadic conversations focuses on overlaps occurring at a transition relevance place (TRP). The transition relevance place is produced at a time in conversations where a speaker change may occur eventually but not systematically. This means that the current speaker seems to have given enough information for the recipient in terms of grammar and content to take the turn. This leads to two different possibilities: either the speaker expands his turn and therefore keeps it or the listener decides to come in and to take the turn. In other words, overlaps found at a transition relevance place occur when both the current speaker and the recipient are “legitimate” to either keep the turn or to take it. Gardner (2001: 6) argues that a transition relevance place is found “around points in the talk of others that are potentially grammatically, intentionally and pragmatically complete.” A transition relevance place is therefore a specific location both for the current speaker and the recipient because this means that none of them seems to be responsible for the overlap in process.

In the following example, the overlap occurs close to a transition relevance place, when Mrs Kennedy produces her SPP while overlapped by the journalist, on lines 2 and 3.

*March 24, 1961 : New First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy interviewed by Sander Vanocur*

- 1 Jo: you mentioned before: theodore roosevelt (.) bringing  
 2 → an architect who was it uhm (.) [°Stanford Way°] (.)  
 3 Fr: → St[anford Way ]  
 4 Jo: uhhmm (>0.2) that was really the LA:st first family  
 5 that had small children (>0.2) 'f its own in the white

In this case, the journalist produces a pre-expansion of his first pair part, which takes the form of a closed question at the very beginning of the extract on lines 1 and 2. Indeed, he talks about an architect but does not seem to remember his name; hence the question “who was it”. This case of transition relevance place is not that simple since the overlap found on lines 2 and 3 can be the result of two different possibilities: either the journalist has really forgotten the architect's name he was looking for and asks a rhetorical question or this is an implicit way for him to engage the First Lady to answer. We could argue that the latter might be true because as a journalist, he should know the people he wants to mention. Moreover, this case of overlap is not strictly speaking a transition relevance place, but the simultaneous talks occurs “close to a transition relevance place”. In fact, the journalist's question creates Jacqueline Kennedy's answer, overlapped by Sander Vanocur himself. The fact that the First Lady only has time to produce the very beginning of the architect's name before actually being overlapped reinforces the idea that the journalist was aiming at engaging her in the conversation. The overlap is followed by the journalist's turn, since the First Lady only answered with the name he was looking for.

In the following example, the overlap occurs also at a TRP since line 74 signals the end of a TCU produced by the President and involves therefore an overlap between President Richard Nixon and the journalist, on lines 75-76.

*Richard Nixon interview – Vietnam (Merv Griffin Show 1966)*

- 68 **ALL** (.) uh responsible people uh should have a moratorium  
 69 on their discussion of what the us policy should BE (.) as far as  
 70 i'm concerned for example if you werta ask me (.) and it would  
 71 be a very appropriate question but would not be appropriate for  
 72 me to answer it (.) if you werta asked me what i think of the  
 73 president's policy and of the peace emissaries i would say (.) i  
 74 would have no comment ↓  
 75 Jo: → [what do you think of thi: uh]  
 76 Pr: → [ because at a TI::ME ]  
 77 Jo: oh (.) [ hehehehehe ]  
 78 Pr: [i would- i would- i wou]ld only suggest it at a time (.)

Indeed, the President's turn reaches completion on line 74, since his turn is both complete in terms of pragmatics and in terms of grammar. Additionally, the ↓ symbol shows a fall in pitch which reinforces the possible end of his turn with a prosodic feature reflecting closure. The President finally has more to say and keeps the turn thanks to an increasing volume of voice “TI::ME” (both marked in capital letters and with a duration on the [i] sound) which seems to surprise the interviewer who produces the interjection “oh” on line 77. In this case, the overlap occurring at a TRP displays a verbal struggle which is won by the President since he is able to expand his turn, even though he has been interrupted by the journalist.

This following example highlights another occurrence of overlap found at a TRP, at a location where both the current speaker can expand his turn and the recipient can come in, on lines 17 and 18.

*Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama*

13 Pr: well i think we all anticipated that there'd be glitches  
 14 cause any time you got technology a new program  
 15 rolling out there gonna be some glitches .hh i don't  
 16 think (.) uh i anticipated or anybody anticipated uhhh  
 17 → the degree of the problems with the website [an::d]  
 18 Jo: → [right] so  
 19 you just didn't know when it rolled out that this was  
 20 going to [be a (.) problem]

The President initiates his responsive SPP (lines 13 to 17) to the journalist's previous FPP, which took the form of a question. He gives to the recipient enough information to take the turn because his turn is both grammatically and pragmatically complete, which can suggest the end of his turn and therefore the end of the whole TCU (line 17). The overlap is found at a place where both the recipient decides to come in and take the turn (“right so you just didn't know”) and the current speaker expands his previous turn with the conjunction “and”. The journalist displays an alignment with what has previously been said by the President with the marker “right” and wants to lead the President to present the information in a manner the journalist would prefer whereas the President clearly wants to expand his turn in order to present it in a manner that he wishes. This overlap finally is in favor of the journalist since he is the one who takes the turn and keeps it.

The last example below shows another overlap found at a TRP, between the journalist Bill O'Reilly and President Barack Obama, on lines 40 and 41, followed by the guest's expansion of his previous turn.

*Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama*

36 Jo: = because i mean she had to know after all those years  
 37 and all that money that it wasn't gonna work  
 38 Pr: you know my main priority right now is making sure  
 39 that it delivers (.) for the american people  
 40 → [ an::d what we ' ve- ]  
 41 Jo: → [>you're not gonna answer that<]  
 42 Pr: what what we've ended up doing is we've got three  
 43 million people signed up (.) **SO FAR** (.) we're about  
 44 a month behind of where we anticipated we wanted to  
 45 be (.) we've got over six million people who've signed  
 46 up for medic aid

Even though this overlap is found at a TRP since the journalist could take the turn without disturbing the smooth talk-in-process just as well as the President could expand his turn, this case is an ambiguous one. Indeed, the journalist has enough information to take the turn and start a new turn without interrupting the dialogue's flow because the President's answer seems complete both in terms of grammar and content. However, his body language seems to indicate that he has more to say. The fact that he is looking for his words while looking down at the floor with his hand raised could be understood as a way to say “I'm not entirely done yet”. But even though he wants to expand and elaborate on the current topic, the journalist tries to cut in in order to obtain a clearer answer. In the recent years, political journalists tend to use more and more forms of aggressiveness in order to both investigate and destabilize their guests; in this case, this is a form of aggressiveness used by Bill O'Reilly to get straight answers from the President of the United States.

We have seen that overlaps found at a transition relevance place (TRP) involve simultaneous talks from several participants at the same time. Because the location in which overlaps occur is possible for both the recipient and the current speaker to talk without disturbing the smooth talk-in-process, they either take the turn or keep talking at this specific place. The second subcategory of overlap is known as “overlap at a post-transition onset” and occurs when the recipient cut the current speaker off, when he has enough information to interrupt him.

### *2.3 Overlaps at a post-transition onset*

This section includes overlaps found close to a transition relevance place and thus focuses on “last item” onsets overlaps and “recognitional” onsets. In fact, the recipient may aim at taking the turn because he has enough information to come in without causing troubles in the talk-in-interaction or he chooses to take the turn because he understands what is going on and he is able to interrupt the current speaker in order to answer or to add information or even to finish the speaker's own turn. Overlaps found at post-transition onsets can therefore be regarded in terms of a mutual

understanding between the overlappee and the overlapper. This type of overlap is generally brief and may or may not disturb the smooth process of communication. “Recognitional” onsets are probably the widest phenomenon of overlap found in political interviews. Indeed, they usually appear because the recipient knows what the topic of the conversation is as well as what is being discussed by the current speaker and that is why he decides to come in either to re-orientate the subject-matter or to justify his actions or re-establish the truth, and so on.

In the following example, President Bush overlaps twice the journalist while he initiates a closed question. Both overlaps occur at a post-transition onset since the President has enough information to come in and to take the turn.

*Bush's final days*

7 i'm **S**orry it's happening ov course obviously .hhh i don't like the  
 8 idea of people (>0.2) losing jobs or being worried about their four oh  
 9 one k's .hh **O**N the other hand the american people got to know that-  
 10 uh that we will safeguard the system (.) i mean we're **I**N and if we  
 11 need to be in more we **W**ILL  
 12 Jo: but was there an uh- uh oh moment °and I° could probably use stronger  
 13 → language than th[at when you thought thi]s really [(.) could be bad]  
 14 Pr: → [yeah hehehe (.) .hhh ] [ WELL ]  
 15 (.) when you have >the secretary 'f the treasury and the chairman of the  
 16 fed< (>0.2) say if we don't act bo:ldly (>0.2) we could be in a depression  
 17 >greater (than a beat) uhh< a great depression that's an uh oh moment but  
 18 (.) the question is ↑is it worth it to save the system to **S**A**F**Eguard the  
 19 system and i came to the conclusion along with other smart people  
 20 >that it is<

On lines 12-13, the journalist produces a first pair part asking the former President of the United States, George W. Bush, whether there was a moment in his presidency where things seemed to be getting out of hand. Since the guest let him produce most of his question, he has now enough information to take the turn without coming in and disturbing the conversation. Indeed, he overlaps the journalist's turn on line 14, aligning with him and therefore both producing a “yeah” and a laughter. The first overlap is rather brief but he finally uptakes the turn, overlapping once more the journalist and answering the question, beginning his turn by the mitigation “well”, produced loudly, which can be observed through the use of capital letters.

In the sample below, it is the journalist this time who overlaps the President's current turn, at a post-transition onset, on line 29.

*Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama*

22 Pr: [ well (.) i ] don't think- as i said i don't  
 23 think anybody anticipated the- the- the degree of uhh

24 problems that you'd had on healthcare.gov uh the good  
 25 news is is that right away we decided how we're gonna  
 26 fix it (.) it got fixed uh within a month and a half (.) uh  
 27 it was up and running and now it's working the way it's  
 28 → suppo[ sed to ] and we've signed up  
 29 Jo: → [((click of tongue)) .hhh ]  
 30 three million people  
 31 Jo: i don't know about that because uh last week there was  
 32 an associated press poll of people who actually went to  
 33 the website and only eight percent of them feel that it's  
 34 working .hh (.) well working (.) well (.) why didn't you  
 35 fire sebelius thi uh secretary in charge of this

In this case, the current speaker (the President of the United States) is answering the journalist's previous FPP by an expansion of his turn, from lines 22 to 28. The recipient is listening to what the guest says and produces a form of disagreement. Indeed, he does not align with President Obama since he expresses both a click of tongue and an in-breath, overlapping the President on line 29. This signals both a dispreferred sequence from the journalist and a way to show that if the President does not drop out the turn soon, he is going to be interrupted by the journalist. In fact, the journalist takes the turn quickly after having overlapped the President, since Barack Obama only finishes his turn with “and we've signed up three million people”, followed by Bill O'Reilly's new TCU on line 31.

The last example of overlaps found at a post-transition onset highlights a form of recognition from the journalist, because he comes in and takes the turn at the very end of George W. Bush's turn. Since the President's turn is almost produced entirely, it allows the journalist to ask a question (even though without any auxiliary and verb; construction only based on the verb “hurt”), overlapping the guest at a post-transition onset. This is a simple intrusion as the President answers his question and the overlap is therefore a short one. In fact, it is as if the journalist was waiting for the transition space to come in and the President extends his last word, trying to expand it. The fact that he uses the coordination “but” proves that George W. Bush has more to say.

*Bush's final days*

51 Pr: yeah well that's what happens when you're the incumbent during  
 52 → a tough economic time but [ .hhhh ]  
 53 Jo: → [HURT↑]  
 54 Pr: **NO::** not really i mean yea: i've been around politics a long ti:me i  
 55 remember i was the guy in two thousand who **CAM**paigned for chan:ge  
 56 (>0.2)

Finally, the last subcategory of overlaps focuses on those found in “interjacent” onsets,

which means that there is a disruption in the talk going on, because this type of overlap occurs not close to a transition relevance place but instead, at a place where the recipient intervenes and disturbs the smooth talk-in-process.

#### 2.4 Overlaps in “interjacent” onset

Following the overlaps found at a transition relevance place and those found at a post-transition onset, the last category of overlaps is the case of “interjacent” overlap or “interjacent onset” (according to Jefferson's classification, 1986: 159). This subcategory highlights overlaps not close to a transition place and instead focuses on overlaps occurring “in the middle of nowhere”, as it may seem. “Interjacent” overlaps have the particularity of appearing at unpredictable locations in the course of talk and can provoke many explanations. This type of overlap can last longer than those found at a TRP because they can display a conflict between the current speaker and the listener, to keep or take the turn; this is a power relationship. The result is that either the receiving speaker competes with the other speaker and raises his voice or the speaker drops out and lets the other speaker talk. Compared to overlaps at a transition relevance place, “interjacent” overlaps can create troubles in the talk-in-interaction.

The following example is taken from the Merv Griffin Show, which is considered to be one of the first talk shows in the United States of America. The fact that the overlap occurs, it seems, out of the blue, can be explained by the desire for the journalist to incite the President to answer.

#### *Richard Nixon interview – Vietnam (Merv Griffin Show 1966)*

1 Jo: how do we look around (.) the wor[ld ]  
 2 Pr: [(clearing his throat)]  
 3 (>0.2)  
 4 well naturally it depends  
 5 → on [what you're talking about]  
 6 Jo: → [it's a very (.) big question > isn't it<]  
 7 Pr: it's a complex (.) problem and a- and naturally a  
 8 complex world (.) uhh but having said that (.) uhh i  
 9 would- i would suggest that thi- (.) the RO:le of (.) a  
 10 leading nation (.) a powerful nation (.) uhhh which the  
 11 united states (.) uh has to play now (.) i(t) is (.) never  
 12 going to be one in which we are going to be loved (.) a:

On line 1, the journalist initiates an FPP open question to Richard Nixon. The guest overlaps the journalist's turn on line 2 because he clears his throat. This overlap does not disturb the talk-in-process since it occurs at the very end of the journalist's turn. Moreover, this is the time for the guest to speak because the journalist has produced a complete TCU. This is followed by a long attributable silence from Nixon's part on line 3 as well as the beginning of his turn, starting with the

mitigation “well”. He does not really have time to express his thoughts because the journalist interrupts him in the middle of his turn, even though he does not have a lot of information to take the turn, on line 6. This “interjacent” overlap is pretty long considering that the journalist takes the time to produce a full closed question: “it's a very big question, isn't it?”.

Now that the different types of overlaps have been discussed and explained, the next section concentrates on forms of delays commonly found in discourse.

### **3) Delays in the discourse**

#### *3.1 Intra-turn silences*

In daily-life conversations – and as we will observe, in political interviews – language appears to be both marked by overlaps and by delays in the release of information. These phenomena are, among others, what makes all the specificity of oral discourse, and in this sense, differentiate it from written language. In CA, linguists tend to make a distinction between several types of delays commonly found in discourse. Indeed, pauses in dialogues can be produced in-between two turns – that is, between the current speaker and the speaker to come also known as the recipient – as well as within the current speaker's turn itself. Additionally, pauses can be either long or brief, depending on the context in which they occur. Undoubtedly, in political interviews, both the guest and the host seemingly produce pauses in the flow of information which can have many explanations and significances. Delays can be produced for instance because speakers need to take a moment to breath (pauses frequently found within the turn) – or because they have reached completion (pauses produced in-between turns) – or because they use these forms of silences as a rhetorical device, such as emphasizing a specific moment in their discourse for instance. Indeed, it appears that delays in discourse are often exploited by speakers as a strategical tool in order to make a point; this device is deliberately used to highlight a part of the current speaker's speech, creating an emphasis and therefore drawing the viewers' attention to a particular part of their discourse. Moreover, speakers also need to take time to think of how and what exactly they wish to communicate, especially knowing that they are being watched by a large audience and that their discourse will be subjected to careful scrutiny; hence the need to select exactly the right words. In their article entitled *Pauses, Gaps And Overlaps In Conversations*, Heldner & Edlund (2010) both try to measure and to draw statistical patterns regarding the use of overlaps as well as gaps in conversations. To do so, they refer to Sacks et al. (1974) who made a distinction for three types of delays in discourse – pauses, gaps, and lapses – depending on what came before and what came after moments of silences, as well as the length of these forms of delays. They explain how the categories of silences were established, stating that “pauses, in this account, referred to silences

within turns; gaps referred to shorter silences between turns or at possible completion points (i.e. at *transition-relevance places* or *TRPs*); and lapses referred to longer (or extended) silences between turns” (2010: 556). However, even though they use this classification as the model for their research, they warn us about the lack of a completely systematic analysis mechanism, claiming that this categorization can raise some issues in certain contexts, especially when delays are found at a TRP: “For example, a silence followed by more speech by the same speaker would always be classified as a pause; also if it occurred at a TRP” (2010: 556). That is why my own research also highlights three different types of delays, focusing on intra-turn silences, gaps, and attributable silences, in order to discriminate the length of pauses within categories and not create a category on its own depending on the silences' duration.

As aforementioned, a certain type of pause in the discourse can reflect gaps within the conversation itself; this means that it is unlikely to wait for the other speaker to come in. Intra-turn silences is a category which includes both brief and long delays found in the current speaker's turn. In the corpus of interviews, this phenomenon appears both from the interviewee's and the interviewer's part and seems to be the most widely used of all the types of silences. Usually, linguists from the conversation analyst approach tend to use specific transcription symbols when they deal with silences: brief pauses found in conversation are highlighted with the (.) symbol while silences of more than 0.2 seconds are transcribed with the exact duration of the pause, so that if a speaker produces a pause of 0.7 seconds, this is going to be written (0.7). In order to only make a difference between brief and long pauses, I decided to simplify the transcription symbols so that I chose to keep the commonly used symbol (.) which stands for brief pauses whereas the (>0.2) symbol includes all the pauses that are equal to or longer than two seconds.

In the following extract, it seems that each brief pauses produced by President Barack Obama has been thoughtfully placed in order to create an emphasis on what comes right after the silence, producing an effect of great impact on his audience.

*Barack Obama on Tavis Smiley*

120 Pr:     uh that's a pretty good contrast of george w bush uhh  
 121     → to start with (.) somebody who's lived (.) in a foreign  
 122     → country (.) somebody who (.) know:s (.) uh what it's like  
 123     → to see family members in dire poverty (.) uh somebody  
 124     who has a grandmother who lives in a village in africa

To begin with the first occurrence of delay commonly found in the discourse, this extract between President Obama and Tavis Smiley presents numerous occurrences of brief intra-turn silences. The first one appearing on line 121 seems to be produced as a tool to create an

introduction to what the President has to say, synonymous of a colon in a written form of language (“to start with:”). Indeed, this silence is followed by a mimetic construction (lines 121 to 123) using a generic term and therefore merging the President himself with the community of American people: “somebody who”. The fact that his intra-turn silences are carefully placed right after the relative pronoun “who” enhances what comes next; in other words, the relative proposition is accentuated.

The extract below shows another example of intra-turn silences, once again produced by the guest.

*CBS TV interview with President John Fitzgerald Kennedy on Sept. 2, 1963*

16 Pr: in the Senate ↓ I think the reservation'd be a great  
 17 → mistake (.) I don't think President Eisenhower (>0.2)  
 18 used the reservation in the formal sense that he  
 19 wanted the Senate of the United States (.) to put a  
 20 reservation on the treaty because that would mean  
 21 that the treaty would have to be renegotiate (.) he

The second case mentioned previously concerns delays in the discourse which reflect that the current speaker needs time to think of the right words to present his information. In this type of pause, the notion of emphasis is no longer at stake, even though silences are once again used as a strategical device since they create space for the speaker to consider which words best express what he wants his audience to understand. In the extract above, President Kennedy's turn is composed of a long pause which seems to be produced in an unexpected location. In fact, the guest expresses a negative statement “I don't think” which is only followed by the subject of a nominal clause “President Eisenhower” (line 17). There is obviously information missing after the pause since we are well-aware that this turn is not fully complete in terms of pragmatics; an explanation to this delay could be that President Kennedy is looking for the appropriate words, hence the need to be careful in what he wants to say and how he wants to say it, since he is talking about his predecessor – President Eisenhower – and therefore dealing with an important political figure. Collins Dictionary Online offers a definition of what is precisely pragmatics, stating that it refers to “the branch of linguistics concerned with meaning in context, or the meanings of sentences in terms of the speaker's intentions in using them.”<sup>3</sup> In this example, we are dealing with an intra-turn silence because the pause is found within President Kennedy's turn completion unit (TCU).

We have observed that Presidents frequently resort to intra-turn silences as a strategical tool to deliver information as well as to put an emphasis on some aspects of their clauses or sentences. This is also the case for journalists, who, while asking questions to their guests, also adopt this device as an effective tool, which is shown through the following example.

---

3 <http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/american/pragmatics>

*Bush's final days*

- 1 Jo: → do you feel in any way responsible (>0.2) for what's happening =  
 2 Pr: = .hhh >yihknow< i'm in the president doing this period of time but  
 3 i think (.) uhh when the history of this period is written people'll  
 4 realize .hhh a lot of the decisions (.) uh that were made on wall  
 5 street (.) .hh took place over (>0.2) >yihknow< a- a- a decade or  
 6 so beFOre i arrived in president **D**URING i arrived in president (.)

At the very beginning of this extract, the interviewer produces a long pause, symbolized in the transcript (>0.2), while asking a question to President George W. Bush. It may seem odd at first sight that such a long delay in the question is produced, but this is actually a way for the journalist to create an impact in the deliverance of his question. The delay occurs at what might seem a possible transition relevance place (TRP); a place where both speakers are “legitimate” to speak, either taking the turn or continuing the current turn. The journalist has produced a complete turn since his question is both composed of the auxiliary do and the subject “you” as well as the predicate “feel in any way responsible”. He therefore could have stopped at this point, only asking President Bush “do you feel in any way responsible?” Nevertheless, the President does not take the turn because one may ask “what is he responsible for?” The journalist's turn has actually not reached a point of completion because, even though grammatically complete, his turn is not fully developed in terms of pragmatics. In this case, the President – and indirectly the audience – knows that a relevant piece of information is missing here and that the journalist should expand his turn so as to detail his question, which he does. There is no doubt that President Bush does not take the turn since he knows that he does not have enough information to answer and produce a convincing response to an incomplete question.

Finally, the last example proves that journalists tend to use intra-turn silences as much as Presidents, exploiting them as a structural tool.

*Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama before the Super Bowl*

- 1 Jo: mister president thank you for doing this  
 2 Pr: great to be with you  
 3 Jo: → really appreciate it (.) .hhh i wan(t) to get some  
 4 things on the record (.) hh. so let's beginning  
 5 with health care  
 6 Pr: yeah

In this instance, Bill O'Reilly thanks President Obama for attending the interview to come, which is succeeded by the President's turn, accepting his thanks (lines 1 and 2). The journalist regains the turn (line 3) and insists on thanking the guest once more of his presence “really appreciate it”. This is ensued by a brief intra-turn silence which serves as a pause in his dialogue

and therefore creates a break. It marks the end of the interview's thanking part and marks a transition to a new topic, discussing now President Obama's policy.

In addition to intra-turn silences which are undeniably used a lot in political interviews between a journalist and the President of the United States, two more categories of pauses are also of a great importance in discourse.

### 3.2 Gaps

Gaps can be referred to as another subcategory of delays in discourse. Heldner and Edlund (2010: 556) refers to Sacks et al. (1974) who distinguish gaps from lapses in the sense that the first type of silences is considered to be short in comparison with lapses which are produced with longer length, even though both are found between the current speaker's turn and the next speaker's turn or the extension of the current speaker's turn, claiming that “gaps referred to shorter silences between turns or at possible completion points (i.e. at *transition-relevance places* or *TRPs*); and lapses referred to longer (or extended) silences between turns.” In my research project, I decided against establishing a contrast between gaps and lapses so that this category of gaps includes both of them. Even though the length of silences is going to be mentioned and discussed – whether they are brief or long silences – I will try to explain why these gaps are produced at this time and how they are formed along with their consequences. The common CA principle of “why that now” will thus apply in order to give sense to the gaps' occurrences.

Gaps are therefore types of silences which occur after a possible turn construction unit (TCU) and which may reflect a pause between two different turns produced by two different speakers, but not only. Gaps are therefore one of the phenomena which possibly involves either a speaker change in the conversation or the expansion from the current speaker of his turn. We cannot allocate this type of delay to a particular speaker, but rather we can observe that gaps are created at a point where both the current speaker and the recipient could keep/take the turn without disturbing the smooth talk-in-interaction. Gaps frequently occur at a transition relevance place which means that the current speaker has given enough information for the recipient to come in, producing a complete turn construction unit (TCU); the listener can either decide to start speaking or he can choose to wait instead. The same kind of phenomenon also appears with overlaps at a TRP where both people are “legitimate” to speak. In CA, silences are considered to do actions but not so far as calling them a second pair part; it is possible to give them meanings but we cannot claim that an SPP is produced through the use of a delay only. The length of silences can vary depending on the context in which they occur. Heldner and Edlund (2010: 557) suggest different ways to explain why silences are short or long:

For gaps, it has been suggested that increased stress (induced in an interview situation designed to elicit information of an intimate and embarrassing nature) is associated with markedly shorter gaps (Jaffe & Feldstein, 1970). Similarly, competitive conversations, for example conversations involving arguments, have significantly shorter gaps than cooperative conversations, such as friendly chats (Trimboli & Walker, 1984). Several studies have furthermore observed longer gaps in dialogues where the participants have eye contact than in dialogues without eye contact (Beattie & Barnard, 1979; Bull & Aylett, 1998; Jaffe & Feldstein, 1970; ten Bosch, Oostdijk, & de Ruiter, 2004a).

In political interviews, the length of silences can be of a great importance, either for the host or for the guest. As an example, if the President waits too long to answer the journalist's question or if his turn is composed of too many delays, viewers can reassess his trustworthiness and suspect a hidden message. Conversely, if a speaker rushes into his answer, this may seem insincere. This is particularly true in political interviews because of the format and the time-limit, Presidents aim at delivering as much information as they can to convince the audience, but there is a fine line between rushing into it and waiting too long to do so. In their research, Heldner and Edlund (2010: 565) study the length of silences in order to notice possible patterns explaining why some are brief while others are longer, depending on the context of communication as well as the speakers :

From anecdotic data and introspection, we note that a reasonable gap duration in one situation can be awkward in another. It is perfectly normal to respond to a greeting after only a slight gap, but delaying the response for a second or two will alter its meaning. Conversely, a response to a complex question is going to sound disturbingly insincere if delivered too soon. It is likely that there are similar tendencies for overlaps. For example, overlapping the end of a highly predictable utterance may be entirely acceptable, whereas overlap into completely unpredictable content may be disturbing or rude.

In the following case, President George W. Bush produces a gap on line 40, which can be observed because he has expressed a full TCU.

*Bush's final days*

- 32 Jo: given the conditions (>0.2) and the economy (>0.2) is there any way  
 33 john mccain could have won↑  
 34 Pr: .hhh (i)t's hard to see it (>0.2) in REtrospect (.) i think the >thing intresting  
 35 thing 'bout<the way people analyze campaigns (is that) they always look  
 37 at the negative si:de (.) uhh the positive side (.) from- from barack obama's  
 38 perspective 's he had a really good campaign (.)  
 39 (i mean) this guy (>0.2) i'm told raised a hundred and fifty million dollars  
 40 → in **ONE MONth** (.) .hh uhh that meant a lot of people were **FOR** him for  
 41 president  
 42 Jo: was the election in any way (>0.2) a repudiation of the bush administration↓

In this example, the host initiates a yes/no question FPP on lines 32-33 to ask President Bush

if the elections' result could have been different regarding the country's situation. This question is important in the sense that it asks the President to look back in the past and predict whether or not the situation could have been different; that is why there are many pauses, brief and long, in this extract. Many natural silences are observable in this sample (lines 34 and 37). Even though the guest is evasive in his answer, his turn is fairly long (from lines 34 to 41). If we now focus on line 40, we can see that President Bush has produced a complete turn – a turn construction unit (TCU) – because his turn is perfectly understandable and fully structured in terms of grammar. The pause is rather short (.) but followed both by an in-breath and by the vocalization “uhh”. At this time, the journalist could have taken the turn but he does not do it which implies the President's expansion of his turn in order to precise his point. The fact that President Bush has produced a TCU is reinforced by the small extension of his turn before the journalist finally produces a new FPP on line 42.

### 3.3 *Attributable silences*

To conclude with the last type of delays in conversations, I am now going to discuss what is known as attributable silences. Different from intra-turn silences and from gaps, this particular kind of pause can be allocated to a particular person, either the current speaker or the recipient. In other words, the way turns are organized and displayed enable us to assign attributable silences to one single entity instead of a phenomenon created both by the guest and the host. This type of pause is mainly found when there is a delay between the FPP and the SPP. Most of the time in political interviews, attributable silences occur when the current speaker (the journalist) produces an FPP taking the form of a question and the recipient waits a moment before answering, hence the silence. Any silence before an SPP is indeed going to be interpreted as delay. Exactly as for the two other kinds of delays, these silences can be either brief or long and are showed in the transcripts with the same symbols. In order to better distinguish them, attributable silences are placed in-between two different turns, either when the current speaker keeps the turn and expands it or when the recipient comes in and takes it. Attributable silences are therefore produced at the same location as gaps but what differs is the fact that the TRP is no longer relevant here. Indeed, while delays in the form of gaps are produced at the end of a possible TCU, attributable silences point toward one person responsible for its occurrence. In the following example, the silence found in the dyadic conversation between President Nixon and the journalist would be attributed to the guest.

*Richard Nixon interview – Vietnam (Merv Griffin Show 1966)*

1 Jo: how do we look around (.) the wor[ld ]  
 2 Pr: [((clearing his throat))]  
 3 → (>0.2)

4 well naturally it depends  
 5 on [what you're talking about]  
 6 Jo: [it's a very (.) big question > isn't it<]

In this sample, the journalist initiates an FPP taking the form of an open question on line 1. The onset of his turn is indeed produced with the use of the interrogative pronoun “how”. The current speaker therefore expresses a complete FPP both in terms of pragmatics and grammar since it is directed towards the listener to answer and it engages an SPP. The fact that the President is both clearing his throat while overlapping the journalist and producing a long silence (>0.2) displays a discomfort from his part. The attributable silence is therefore assigned to him because he is the one supposed to talk and to answer the previous turn; the silence is part of his turn. It is reinforced by the marker “well” prefacing his turn, which emphasizes a hesitation while selecting the right words. Incidentally Clayman et al. (2010: 232) state that “Richard Nixon's awkwardness and dislike of the news media is believed to have hampered his relations with the press corps”. The sample below shows another attributable long silence from President Kennedy's part, on line 44.

*CBS TV interview with President John Fitzgerald Kennedy on Sept. 2, 1963*

41 Jo: uhh what **CAN** we do in this situation which uh  
 42 seems to parallel other (.) uh famous de**B**Acles of uh  
 43 dealing with unpopular governments in the pa(st)  
 44 → (>0.2)  
 45 Pr: well in the first place we oughta realize that vietnam  
 46 has been at war for twenty five years (.) and uhh the  
 47 japanese [...] (nese) i remember a good many uh  
 48 people who said that two years ago >thadi< wouldn't

In this case, the silence found on line 44 is clearly part of President Kennedy's turn. At the beginning of this sample, the journalist Walter Cronkite designs a complete turn which is actually seen as a wh-question FPP. He asks President Kennedy a question about the current situation in Vietnam and at the same time projects that he is going to have an answer back. However, the guest does not take the turn straightaway which causes a long pause. Because the journalist's turn has reached a point of completion, he expects the guest to come in and to take the turn. The silence is therefore attributable to President Kennedy.

### *3.4 Repairs, hesitations and vocalizations*

In addition to silences and pauses commonly found in dialogues, it occurs that other phenomena produce forms of delays in dyadic conversations. As an example, repairs are another

significant feature of oral discourse. Hayashi, Raymond and Sidnell (2013: 13) propose a definition of this oral phenomenon, stating that repairs occur

when the forward progress of an in-progress unit [eg., a TCU] comes to be momentarily suspended and ... the focal activity of interaction becomes removing whatever barrier to that unit's progress is the current source of trouble.

In a broader sense, these difficulties can occur in speaking but also in hearing or in understanding the talk-in-interaction. A misunderstanding or mishearing can be due to interference or a confusion in what the speaker has just said for instance. In the corpus of videos, speaking troubles are the most common and the ones on which I focused my attention. There are many reasons for this specific type of repair to occur: they can be provoked by a sort of stuttering effect when the speaker articulates a chain of production sounds too fast, a mistake or a confusion in what the speaker wants to express, or a missing word from the current speaker for example. In other words, speaking troubles appear within conversations and distort – or at least disturb – the smooth talk-in-process and therefore stop the process of communication. It involves that the current speaker can be, in the course of the talk-in-process, in the need of re-using his previous syllables, words, or clauses, but not only. Repairs can also be followed by a reformulation of what has previously been expressed in order to restore order and re-organize a coherent communication. In the following extract, President Obama expands his long previous turn (which begins on line 39) adding more information on what has been said, mispronouncing a word which implies a repair in order to be understood by both the journalist and the audience.

*Barack Obama on Tavis Smiley*

63 Jo: uhuh  
 64 Pr: and do well (.) then i think that (.) that would translate into the  
 65 national but we're not gonna see a change in the national polls  
 66 Jo: uhhm  
 67 Pr: → until the verst- first vote are cast in iowa i mean those are just-  
 68 (.) those are reflective of (.) uh the casual voter (.) the person who  
 69 doesn't know >you you know< isn't watchin' uh uhhh >yihknow<  
 70 the nightly news report all the time (.) who says yeah i sorta  
 71 like clinton and obama i like him too but i don't know that  
 72 nothing about him and that's our challenge we gotta close that gap

On line 67, we can observe that President Obama begins to produce an adjective following the article “the verst-”. He changes it right after into the right pronunciation “first” in order to re-establish order in his dialogue as quickly as possible. The fact that he answers Tavis Smiley's FPP on lines 36-38 with a long and detailed SPP can be a factor explaining why he mispronounces this

word.

In addition to the repair of a single word, people can repair a whole clause so as to re-organize a fluent talk-in-process.

*Bush's final days*

25 Pr: .hhh i thought- uhhh (.) i thought uh uh my candidate for president john  
 26 mccain had a **TOU**gh headwind (>0.2) .hh uhh (.) for two reasons one (.)  
 27 → .hh rarely does the american peopl- Do the american people give .hh **A**  
 28 political party three ter:ms (>0.2) and >that in itself was difficult for him<

In this example, President Bush produces a grammar mistake on line 27 which is followed by a repair and the right use of grammar. He talks about the American people which is supposedly considered to be the third person plural “they”. President Bush uses the wrong form of the auxiliary , saying “does” instead of “do”. To correct himself, he re-uses the clause beginning with the right form of auxiliary and keeps what he has previously expressed so that what follows his mistake is “do the American people”. It is interesting to note that he has enough time to produce the wrong auxiliary and keeps going but, he finally decides not to finish his turn and cuts himself before ending “peopl-”. In addition, when using the third person plural, he produces a louder sound (marked in capital letters) as if he was beginning his sentence and therefore emphasizes the right auxiliary “Do”.

The following example illustrates how Richard Nixon recycles his clause on line 13.

*Richard Nixon interview – Vietnam (Merv Griffin Show 1966)*

7 Pr: it's a complex (.) problem and a- and naturally a  
 8 complex world (.) uhh but having said that (.) uhh i  
 9 would- i would suggest that thi- (.) the RO:le of (.) a  
 10 leading nation (.) a powerful nation (.) uhhh which the  
 11 united states (.) uh has to play now (.) i(t) is (.) never  
 12 going to be one in which we are going to be loved (.) a:  
 13 → our major- (.) our major (.) **AIM** and **GOAL** must be to  
 14 be respected (.) uh this was the role that the british had to  
 15 play for- uh for many many years that's the role of  
 16 other great nations have played now the united states  
 17 (.) uh whether we want it or not have to play that (.)

This extract highlights a case of verbal repetition produced by President Nixon. On line 13, we can see that the guest duplicates the adjective phrase “our major”, punctuated by several short intra-turn silences.

Still in the same political interview, we can observe another kind of repair, once more produced by President Nixon. Different from the two previous cases explained, this example of

repair concerns a desire to ask for clearer explanation. On line 52, Richard Nixon asks a question to the journalist in order to be sure that he has understood what the host means exactly: “irresponsibly you mean”.

*Richard Nixon interview – Vietnam (Merv Griffin Show 1966)*

47 uhh to indicate that there was division in the united states  
 48 far greater than actually exist [uhh]  
 49 Jo: [are ] you af- are you afraid  
 50 that it might be discussed (.) uhh with  
 51 [ political ]  
 52 Pr: → [irresponsibly you mean ]  
 53 Jo: with political (.) overt[ones]  
 54 Pr: [uhhh]

Gardner (2001: 23) summarizes what has been mentioned earlier, referring to Schegloff et al. 1977 who point out that “repairs are a virtually unique phenomenon in talk in that they can occur at any point in a conversation to indicate some problem of articulation, understanding or hearing.”

Hesitation markers such as *uh* or *er* are to be regarded as possible ways for the current speaker to keep the turn while thinking of what to say next. Gardner (2001: 15) states that they tend to be used to explicitly show to the recipient that the current speaker has more to say and that even though he marks a moment of pause, hesitation markers display a desire to continue speaking:

A less lexis-like group is the hesitation markers, such as *Um* or *Er*, whose primary use appears to be as a turn-holding device, saying something like “I’m (still) here, I’m (still) talking, I’m (still) in my turn”, and they are typically used in the middle of a current speaker’s turn.

The two following cases exemplify occurrences where both President Nixon and the journalist begin with what seems to be a marker of hesitation. Schegloff (1996) refers to this type of vocalization as “pre-beginnings [*uhm, um, uh, er*]”

*Richard Nixon interview – Vietnam (Merv Griffin Show 1966)*

52 Pr: [irresponsibly you mean ]  
 53 Jo: with political (.) overt[ones]  
 54 Pr: → [uhhh]  
 55 (.) well interestingly and ironically uhhh not political or  
 56 partisan overtones because .hh uh as you will note and  
 57 as most uhh viewers will note uhh the republicans (.) for  
 58 the most part are supporting (.) thi:- uh the- the Johnson

In this extract, the President produces a long marker which displays the hesitation phenomenon, “uhhh”, in which the number of “h” refers to the vocalization’s duration. Szczepek (2010: 1049) refers to Schegloff (1996) who notes that the “pre-beginnings are typically lengthened,

and/or followed by a pause.” This is indeed the case here since President Nixon does not answer directly to the journalist's FPP; the vocalization he uses functions as a form of delay in this interview.

*Barack Obama on Tavis Smiley*

1 Jo: huhm let me uh >lemme switch gears and jump right into  
 2 it< i got you for the for the full show and i'm glad you're  
 3 [here ] on the west coast for a chang[e ]  
 4 Pr: [good] [good]  
 5 Jo: → uhhm (>0.2) how do you respond a lot a lot ov commentary  
 6 about it how do you respond (.) first of all i mean to say  
 7 congratulations i mean and i say this with all sincerity

In this instance, it is the journalist who builds a long moment of pause before initiating the question directed to President Obama. Once again, the vocalization is both extended and followed by a long intra-turn silence preceding the journalist's FPP on line 5. This device may be used in order to change the current topic discussed and serves as a transition in his dialogue.

Finally, delays are also composed of what Szczepek (2010: 1055) refers to as “articulatory activities such as perceptible in- and out-breaths, coughing, clicks, etc.” which can play the role of moments of pauses in the discourse. We can add to these “articulatory activities” laughter, whether produced while speaking or not. In the case of in-breaths and out-breaths, it seems that they most often occur when the current speaker, while talking, needs to take a breath in order to continue his turn and not collapse in the middle of it. This appears to be frequent in the accumulation of ideas, such as in the following example.

*President Obama talks ISIS, immigration, and midterm elections*

97 Jo: **ALL** the presidents i-in modern history who have been  
 98 (.) successful i mean uh in various ways uh lbj (.) fdr (.)  
 99 ronald reagan teddy roosevelt bill clinton (.) they **ALL**  
 100 seem to have a ZE::st for politics they- they liked the  
 101 give and take they liked thi twisting of arms they liked  
 102 → the cajoling .hh they liked all the things that presidents  
 103 do (.) but i don't sense (.) that you: have the same feeling  
 104 uhh that they did **AND IT** >MAkes me wond(er)< uh do  
 105 **YOU** like politicians do you like politic[s (.) do yo]u  
 106 Pr: [yihknow (.)]  
 107 like this job =

The journalist initiates a pre-expansion of his FPP, coming in on lines 104, 105 and 107, taking the form of three questions in a row “do you like politicians, do you like politics, do you like this job?”. Indeed, all that precedes the FPP functions as an introduction to his questions and it is

used to form an introduction, allowing both the President and the audience to understand where he is going. He begins a first accumulative clause listing a number of Presidents of the United States (lines 97-98) and adds what they appreciated when they were President. The duplication of the construction “they liked” and the predicate ensuing are long clauses which may explain the need for him to take an in-breath on line 102, in order to be able to continue, which he does “they liked all the things that presidents do”.

As far as out-breath is concerned, there are many different explanation for such occurrences in the discourse. Out-breaths can display discomfort, disalignment with what has been said and therefore disagreement, but also out-breaths can be added to laughter so that this combination creates a whole moment of pause. The following extract shows that two different explanations are plausible: either the out-breath betrays President Bush's discomfort at the moment of answering the journalist's question or this can be deliberately used by the guest to show that the question is an important one and that if he would have answered too fast, it would have sounded insincere to the audience.

*Bush's final days*

60 Jo: let's talk a little bit about (>0.2) eight years as being president (.)  
 61 what were you most **UN**prepared for↑  
 62 Pr: → .hhhhhh **WE**ll i think i was hh. unprepared for war  
 63 (>0.2)  
 64 Pr: >'notherwords< i didn't **CAM**paign and said (.) please vote for me  
 65 i'll be able to **HAN**dle (>0.2) **A**- uhh an atta::ck (.) >i 'notherwords<  
 66 i didn't an**TI**cipate war uhhh presidents (.) one of the thing about  
 67 the modern **PRE**sidency (.) is that (.) the unexpected will happen

On lines 60-61, the journalist produces an FPP taking the form of an open question, after which President Bush initiates an SPP, beginning his turn with quite a long out-breath (line 62). This is followed by the marker “well” which could possibly show that this is not an easy question for him, otherwise he would probably have marked a pause or answered faster than he actually did.

We have therefore seen in this part how the turn-taking is organized in conversation, especially focusing on communication in political interviews. From the basic model of adjacency pair which requires both an initiative first pair part and a responsive second pair part, we have observed that increments are frequently used both by journalists and Presidents of the United States. Furthermore, the overlaps phenomenon has been discussed and explained along with the specific types of simultaneous talks, through different examples: overlaps found at a transition relevance place, at a post-transition onset, and in “interjacent” onset. Additionally, several forms of delays

which occur in political interviews have been highlighted and defined, whether used as a strategical tool or not. Three different types of silences have been pointed out and discussed, through varied examples, taking each time cases where they have been produced both by the guest and the host. Finally, repairs, vocalization and hesitations have also been illustrated as phenomena of delays recurrently occurring in discourse. The second part of this research project concentrates on how political interviews evolved throughout the decades, comparing both the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010, in terms of commonalities and differences.

## II] A comparison between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s

### 1) Historical part

#### 1.1 *How did journalism emerge and develop in the United States?*

In the United States of America, journalism has always been a central part of the lives of the educated population. Whether listening to the radio, reading newspapers, or watching television, it is an integral part of the American culture to follow the news and to remain informed of what is happening in the world. Historians and sociologists still debate when exactly the first form of journalism emerged. Some of them date it back to the sixteenth century, with the appearance of the first journals in Europe, while others such as Chalaby (1996) argue that the invention of journalism is a much more recent phenomenon, emerging roughly in the second half of the nineteenth century, with the invention of the journalistic field itself. Nevertheless, the majority of intellectuals and scholars agree that journalism is an “Anglo-American invention” (Chalaby, 1996). As an example, radio emerged and evolved in the United States in the 1920s and marked the starting point of broadcast news. This appeared to be the first source of oral information broadcasted nationally where the audience could hear the news delivered by a speaker. In the early development of broadcast news in radio, the announcer's role resembled more that of a lecturer since his job consisted in simply reading the newspapers' content, voicing them in the exact same way they were printed. Additionally, Chalaby (1996: 303) credits American journalists for the phenomena of both reporting and interviewing:

It is claimed that American and British journalists invented the modern conception of news, that Anglo-American newspapers contained more news and information than any contemporary French paper and that they had much better organized news-gathering services. Proper journalistic discursive practices, such as reporting and interviewing, were also invented and developed by American journalists.

To allocate such practices to Anglo-American people, we need to look back at the social and historical contexts as well as the different factors which explain why journalism was created and

developed in these countries, and later exported elsewhere, especially in democratic societies.

One of the most prominent parameters is defined by Chalaby (1996) who suggests that the parliamentary “bipartism” along with the emancipation of the press from the literary field are of a great importance in the conception of the Anglo-American culture of journalism. In both the United States of America and the United Kingdom, media and government were two distinct institutions and remained separated. In other words, institutions such as the House, the Congress, and broadly speaking any kind of governmental institutions, were generally separated from the press and the media and thus did not influence the diffusion of news for their audience. That is why information were both less biased and suffered less corruption from the political field. Journalists were also allowed to attend debates in the Parliament and in the Congress. All of this encouraged not only accuracy in the news but also a more neutral point of view than the ones in their French counterpart. During the Third Republic, French journalism endured many forms of censorship such as corruption or bribes from political figures, and that led to interviews which gave only the point of view politicians decided. Additionally, both the American and the English journalistic budgets were substantial which allowed the agencies to dispatch more correspondents abroad, and hence provide more international news. It seems in fact that these Anglo-American journalistic practices were imported into many countries, especially in Europe. Schudson (2008: 10) compares in this sense the evolution of Anglo-American and French journalistic practices and noted an important difference, taking the example of interviewing which was “a practice that became widely accepted in the United States by the 1880s, but that was judged unseemly in much of Europe until after World War I”.

Since its emergence until nowadays, American journalism has therefore undergone many changes over time. Nevertheless, its primary function was – and still is – to inform people of what is happening in the world and to pass news on in an objective and reliable manner. To do so, journalists have to transmit and diffuse news convincing the citizens of the validity of their words. Watson (2008: 46) further defines the practices of journalism, stating that the Hutchins Commission, which served as establishing the principles of journalism ethics, claimed that there was a need

to present “a truthful, comprehensive, and intelligent account of the day's events in a context which gives them meaning.”(Hutchins Commission Report, *supra* note 30, at 21.). This idea is anchored to the notion that the press should not fabricate information and should rely on credible, authoritative sources for the information it disseminates. Opinion should be clearly identified as such and not presented as facts. Facts alone can misrepresent the truth, the

commission advised.

That is why journalists tend to focus on facts instead of giving their opinions about the events they depict. In this sense, Joseph Pulitzer famously claimed that “In America, we want facts. Who cares about the philosophical speculations of our correspondents?”<sup>4</sup> American and British journalists only concentrated on facts, hence the invention of “fact-centered discursive practices.” (Chalaby, 1996: 310). Indeed, journalists are the bearers of information and it is only thanks to what they decide to put in or to leave out that people come to know what is happening in the world. In this sense, news is regarded as a social construct which gathers human beings into a larger community. People receiving the news, either via newspapers, radio or television can feel a sense of belonging and a better perception of the world surrounding them. Schudson (2008: 8-9) attributes six main functions to journalism in democratic countries: information, investigation, analysis, social empathy, public forum and mobilization. Through these six aspects, he shows us that the journalists' role is to deliver news to a large public, distinguishing between the true and the false through a meticulous analysis of the facts in order to give people a choice to build a mental representation of the environment surrounding them.

Now, if we explore in more details the evolution of political journalism, various changes occurred over the last decades. Many journalists turned towards the political dimension in order to investigate what happened in political institutions. Both in the United States of America and in the United Kingdom, journalists obtained the right to sit in Congress and in Parliament, so that citizens could now have access to some information about their governmental institutions. Later, news conferences served to put into question “authoritative elites” (Barnhurst, 2015: 1251) and they created a frame where journalists could ask questions to political figures, recording interviews. From then on, politicians could directly express themselves in front of journalists, who were either recording or filming the interviews. This shift in political journalism came to change the citizens' perception since they were then able to hear and see politicians speaking in live action. But the most important advance is probably the birth of political interviews, which has thoroughly marked a major change in political journalism. Considered to be one of the main tools to obtain information from a political figure, the practice of interviewing became more and more used in the United States from the 1880s. Political interviews consist in either a face-to-face conversation between a political figure and a journalist or a group of journalists asking questions to a political guest. Filmed and released to a large audience, political interviews give a sense of intimacy into the politician's life. That is why the distinction between the public sphere and the private sphere can be blurred, since

---

4 Chalaby, Jean. Journalism as an Anglo-American invention. A comparison of the development of French and Anglo-American journalism, 1830s-1920s. *European Journal of Communication*, 11 (1996): 311. (in Loliée, 1903b: 716)

the journalist sometimes switches from economic or social questions concerning the politician to personal questions, intruding into the politician's private life. This conversational characteristic can give viewers an impression of genuineness from speakers, as if they were watching two people openly chatting together. However, Bull and Mayer (1993: 651) remind us that political interviews are actually a false representation of reality since “to some extent it is a form of illusion; what appears to be a conversation is in fact a performance, arranged to take place for an overhearing audience potentially of millions.” Both the journalist and the guest have to play a role while talking with each other; the politician has to convince an audience to agree with what he says in order to gain partisans and conversely the journalist needs to ask engaging questions at the right moment insofar as his aim is to obtain the politician's truthfulness. Political interviews resemble a game of hide-and-seek, where one of the players can lose. Broersma (2008: 143) offers a definition of the interviewing practice, stating that “the interview as a journalistic form presupposes an exchange of ideas and opinions. Both the interviewer and the interviewee have to commit themselves to a certain extent. An interview is never informal – it is comparable to a chess game.” Indeed, if the journalist only asks tedious questions, the interview is going to be uninteresting and therefore his reputation can be at stake. Conversely, if the guest is either hesitant or on the contrary, if he answers questions too quickly, his sincerity can be put into question. The series of interviews between David Frost and Richard Nixon, former President of the United States at that time, which took place in the 1977, are a great illustration of the political interviews' dangerousness. The so-called *Nixon Interviews* came to expose Richard Nixon's role in the Watergate affair. Through this series of interviews, Nixon publicly confessed that he played a role in this affair and came to the conclusion that “Yep, I let the American people down. And I have to carry that burden with me for the rest of my life.”<sup>5</sup> These now famous political interviews were a huge boost in David Frost's career whereas Nixon came to be widely criticized.

Generally speaking, both the War in Vietnam and the Watergate scandal greatly affected the Americans. This involved a need to have even more access to information and to thoroughly analyze facts. These two important events also gave rise to a substantial wave of suspicion from the American citizens who challenged the political institutions. Schudson (2004: 1234) notes that the “Watergate contributed to a decline of Americans' trust in the federal government, already underway in the Vietnam years.” The post-Watergate era is undoubtedly marked by an increasing skepticism from the people in regards to any form of politics; governments, political figures, and institutions have from now on to be investigated meticulously. Clayman et al. (2010: 229) note that American

---

5 Extract from *The Nixon Interviews* (1977), taken from <http://www.theguardian.com/theguardian/2007/sep/07/greatinterviews1>

journalism deeply changed in the late 1960s and that the journalists' practices shifted from a descriptive style to an interpretative and negative one:

Sometimes around the late 1960s, the tenor of Washington journalism began to change. A growing body of research converges in its portrayal of a shift toward increasingly vigorous and in some respects adversarial treatment of government officials, political candidates, and their policies. Over the course of the 1970s and 1980s, news stories about sitting presidents and presidential candidates became increasingly interpretive, negative, and skeptical of motives (Hallin 1992, Patterson 1993, 2000, Smoller 1990; see also Brody 1991).

Incidentally, Barnhurst (1997: 28) refers to Schudson (2008) who claims that “interpretive journalism reached an apotheosis in the 1960s as part of a larger move in America toward the culture of criticism.” Because there was a growing concern to challenge political instances, journalists tend to shift from objectivity in the related events to a meticulous analysis of the facts, sometimes adding opinions.

The American journalistic landscape therefore greatly changed in the 1960s, which is a period regarded as a turning point. In addition to being more negative, investigative and analytical, American journalism came to be known as emphasizing sensationalism, which “is another charge that has vexed news since the rise of modernism. The term *sensationalism* appeared in 19th-century philosophy to describe human sensation as the source of knowledge” (Barnhurst, 2015: 1249). Broersma (2008: 148) insists on the fact that American journalism was very different from its European counterparts, noting among other things a modernization tending to a commercialization of the events:

Journalists and the elite in most European countries distrusted Americanization which within this discourse was seen to be a terrifying consequence of modernization. It was linked to commercialization and sensationalism, and it was considered that both of these should be rejected<sup>6</sup>. American journalism was feared because it emphasized the spectacular and sensational and appealed to emotions. Interviewing was viewed as a “monstrous departure from the dignity and propriety of journalism”(Silvester, *The Penguin Book of Interviews*, p.7 )

The rapid growth of news available to the public changed the face of journalism; in other words, mass communication brought a new dimension to the way information was delivered. Mass press initially developed in the nineteenth century with newspapers delivering the news. This was at first the only way for people to access information. Along with radio and newspapers, a new form of news emerged with the television broadcast. This modern source of information still gave news to an audience, adding this time pictures which undoubtedly reinforced a visual representation for the viewers. Incidentally, Blondheim (2009: 186) refers to Barnouw who suggests that television news

---

6 Broersma, "Botsende Stijlen"; Requate, "Protesting against "America" as the Icon of Modernity", p.205

changed the way information was released:

In this historical context, television broadcast took shape. The nation's engrossment with national news conveyed by the reigning medium – radio – impacted TV architects' idea of news by the new medium. They tried to emulate radio news' intimacy and sociability, adding a face to it. In fact, the early television news arrangements called for the network to provide the “news sources and voices”; they just “needed help with pictures.” They got those by commissioning film producers to take care of the visuals (Barnouw 1990, 101).

Additionally, television saw a shift from sticking to the facts to adding personal commentaries or opinions about them, notably on television, according to Barnhurst (2015: 1248) who claims that “Factual news supposedly makes money when highly credible content leads to higher circulation and better ratings. [...] But US news stories shifted back into giving opinions over the 20th century, especially on television, perhaps because markets rewarded outspoken opinion and because audience allegiance to news waned.”

The greatest changes in mass communication thus appeared with new technologies, such as the radio, television, and then the booming of Internet in the late 1980s. Jucker (2011: 1422) notes that the emergence of Internet accentuated the intrusion into the private sphere more and more, and that now public and private sphere came to be even more blurred than before:

One way in which the dividing line between the private and the public is blurred is by what Imhof and Schulz (1998) call the “privatization of the public”: What used to be private increasingly enters the public sphere.<sup>7</sup> Today, the Internet is perhaps the first medium that comes to mind to illustrate blends of public and private (Dürscheid, 2007), but this development had already started before the widespread use of the Internet.

The progress and advances of technology suggest an easier and faster access to the news for the audience; mass communication is therefore regarded both as a significant shift in American society and in the culture of journalism. The rapid diffusion of news has been emphasized also with the emergence of social networks, such as Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram for instance. Through these new means of communication, the average man seems to now be able to both gather information as well as deliver news at an international level, as would journalists. Would this mean that nowadays, more or less everybody can act as the bearer of information?

### *1.2 What does it mean to be a journalist?*

The journalistic field changed in many aspects since its emergence until nowadays. Indeed,

---

<sup>7</sup> Imhof and Schultz use the expression “Privatisierung des Öffentlichen”, ‘privatization of the public’, to refer to private topics and language conquering and thereby depoliticizing the public space (Imhof and Schulz, 1998:10–11; Imhof, 1999; see also Imhof, 1998). As a related process they name “Veröffentlichung des Privaten”, ‘turning the private into the public’, which refers to the introduction of social questions into political discourse (Imhof and Schulz, 1998:10).

journalism evolved throughout the decades thanks to various means of diffusion, be it via newspapers, radio, television, or more recently Internet along with the social networks. Another important assessment is that news have been more and more easy to access by a large audience thanks to the multiplicity of means and also thanks to the instantaneousness of information available to the public. In fact, more or less everybody in democratic societies seems to be able to access information about what is happening on the other side of the world either through broadcast news, written articles or online websites. From the booming of Internet in the United States, there was a growing amount of information stocked up and released online. Surfing online soon became synonymous with possessing knowledge. Furthermore, Internet is a powerful tool available to most people in western societies, and in this sense, the journalist's status became ambiguous. Generally speaking, people are interested in what they do not know by definition. There is, it seems, a genuine desire to probe the world in which we live in order to better understand its mechanism. Kovach and Rosenstiel (2014: 12) defend this idea through Mitchell Stephens' claims:

l'information répond à un besoin fondamental. Les gens éprouvent de façon quasi instinctive le besoin de savoir ce qui échappe à leur expérience directe.<sup>8</sup> Le fait d'être informé des événements que l'on ne peut pas voir de ses propres yeux engendre un sentiment de sécurité et de confiance. C'est ce que Mitchell Stephens a appelé « l'irrépressible besoin des hommes de savoir ce qui se passe dans le monde. » (Mitchell Stephens, *History of News*, p.18)

The flow of information observable online is both abundant and dangerous. First of all, information is abundant because everybody is able to publish news on Internet, and is in a sense, bearer of the current affairs. When talking about the fall of Communism in Poland, Kovach and Rosenstiel (2014: 26) claim that the new technologies appearing allowed a tendency to a democratic system, claiming that “la technologie permettait désormais à trop de gens d'accéder à l'information, trop rapidement. Et l'information engendrait la démocratie.” The end of Communism in the Eastern bloc was directly linked with the emergence of new technologies, according to them. Kovach and Rosenstiel (2014: 20) add that the instantaneousness of information is accentuated by new technologies and people using their mobile phones to deliver news, especially in moment of crisis, such as the terrorist attacks in Madrid, New York and London:

Les victimes des attentats utilisent les objectifs et les claviers de leurs téléphones portables pour alimenter un journalisme de citoyens qui nourrit la planète entière. La marée de l'expression spontanée est si forte – en vingt-quatre heures : vingt mille mails, plus de mille photos et vingt vidéos utilisables – qu'une seconde frontière tombe : celle qui sépare Internet des autres médias. Au-delà de l'utilisation des témoignages pris sur Internet dans la préparation des informations, les chaînes de télévision de la BBC, ITV et

---

<sup>8</sup> Harvey Molotch et Marilyn Lester, “News as Purposive Behavior: On the Strategic Use of Routine Events, Accidents and Scandal », *American Sociological Review*, 39, février 1974, p. 101-112.

Skynews ainsi que les quotidiens *The Daily Mail* et *The Guardian* diffusent pour les uns des vidéos et pour les autres, en première page, des photos captées sur le réseau.

However, information can be dangerous if not well-mastered because there is a tendency for journalists to be competitive and to focus on unearthing information as quickly as possible. This involves that there are sometimes mistakes in the release of information to the audience, especially when dealing with crises. As an example, the attacks on Charlie Hebdo, on January, 7<sup>th</sup> 2015, gave rise to many distortions in the events related: insofar that the goal of journalists was to deliver information as fast as they could, one of them incorrectly released the name of an alleged offender who was in fact innocent, information which was soon picked up by other medias. One of the journalists' aim is indeed to attract as many people as they can in order to make profit on the events occurring in the world. Does it mean that because information can be diffused through many different means, everybody is now able to diffuse information and news and in this sense, is a journalist?

Being a journalist involves both that it is someone's job and that he is under some specific rules which belong to the journalistic field. Dico-press.com website goes even further, claiming that

Un journaliste est une personne dont l'activité professionnelle est le journalisme. Un journaliste écrit des articles ou en fait une présentation pour une diffusion ou une publication dans un média de masse comme un journal, la télévision, la radio, un magazine, un film documentaire ou l'Internet. On parle également de reporter (de l'anglais : "report", rapporter) car il rapporte des faits dans l'objectif d'informer le public.<sup>9</sup>

The journalists' main role is indeed to inform people of what is happening in the world, allowing a better representation of the citizens' environment; they are therefore the protectors of an educative function. Because “news is by definition a second-hand account” (Barnhurst, 2015: 1246), journalists should stick to the facts as closely as possible, in order to depict the events in an objective and reliable manner.

In *Journalism Ethics by Court Decree*, Watson (2008) proposes the founding principles of the American journalism. He therefore explains that even though to be a journalist means to work as a journalist, “the United States does not have a code of journalistic responsibility enshrined in law or an agency to oversee the practice of journalism, nor are journalists required to be licensed or otherwise accredited” (2008: 1). And Kovach and Rosenstiel (2014: 26-27) to add

A quoi sert le journalisme ? Cette question, aux États-Unis, ne s'est trouvée que rarement posée au cours du dernier demi-siècle, que ce soit par les citoyens ou par les journalistes. Vous possédiez une rotative ou une autorisation d'émettre sur un certain canal et vous « produisiez » du journalisme, voilà tout.

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.dico-presse.com/Journaliste.html>

In this sense, we can ask ourselves what does it really mean to be a journalist nowadays?

In the 1920s, journalists already tended towards an exaggeration in the release of information. In order to counter this tendency, the first half of the XXth century saw the emergence of schools, as Barnhurst (1997: 49) states, “the 1930s through the 1950s saw many leading journalism schools founded”, in order to form future professional journalists. The focus was on delivering exact news and therefore avoiding any distortions in the events occurring. In order to limit the excesses of journalism, the law could intervene so as to regulate the journalists' behavior. Watson (2008: 2) insists on the limitations set by the law to deliver objective and reliable news:

But there have been instances in which the law has been used to require or encourage ethical conduct by journalists or to permit punishment of unethical behavior. A classical example was a Washington Supreme Court decision in 1997 that allowed a newspaper to impose sanctions on a reporter for violating the newspaper's ethics code provisions that promoted objectivity by banning apparent conflicts of interest. Perhaps the most publicized example occurred in 1991 when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that journalists who break promises of confidentiality to sources can be subject to liability under state law.

As much as possible, journalistic institutions tried to prevent any misbehavior in the practice of journalism. This has been notably true over the decades since the American journalism tended to shift towards sensationalism, since it seemed that people were attracted by this type of journalism. Watson (2008: 17) recalls that there are five main elements that journalists follow to depict the news and that “despite periodic shifts in emphasis and the expansion of values espoused by the various codes over the course of nearly a century, there are five fundamental principles of journalism ethics that are common to nearly all of them: truth, privacy, independence, news gathering, and protecting sources.”

Journalists choose which information they want to transmit to their audience and what they prefer to set aside. It is thanks to the information delivered to the public that citizens form the widespread representation of the world in which they live. In order to tell people what is happening in the world, journalists resort to a specific linguistic structure. Indeed, they use a particular type of language; what Chalaby (1996: 304) refers to as the “autonomous *field of discursive production*, the journalistic field.” Journalism is thus a discursive genre which needs to be recognized by its readers. Indeed, the discourse used by journalists is a particular one since “the news is a discourse insofar as journalists use language in a specific way. In the linguists' lexicon, “discourse” designates a particular materialization of language.” (Chalaby, 1996: 685).

The language used in journalism remains the same, but the content of the topics changes. That is what Barnhurst (2003: 112) insists on in his article, stating that “the content, the information, changes every day, and different information could be presumed to produce different effects and

affect, but the news performs the same ritual function day after day because the media package it into the same form.” Broadly speaking, medias create a standard frame for the citizens, delivering news in a conventional way in terms of the form.

Even though the First Amendment focuses on the freedom of speech and on the freedom of the press, among others, there was a need to regulate the practices of journalism in order to avoid any misbehavior or excess from the journalists. Subjected to a code of ethics, the Commission on Freedom of the Press, created in 1947, founded the principles of journalism as well as the procedures to follow in order to exercise this profession. This code of ethics set the rules which must be strictly respected so as to deliver objective news under a certain form of regulation. Because “freedom of the press is a fundamental principle of the U.S. Constitution” (Watson, 2008: 54), it is only thanks to these rules that the First Amendment is going to function correctly in the United States of America.

Since news is now released even faster via Internet, we can ask ourselves if our society tends to see a decline, or even the death of newspapers. Indeed, when daily newspapers only recall the events of the past days, the Internet is able to deliver almost instantaneously information happening at that time. In this sense, Fogel and Patino (2005: 15) suggest that the birth of the Internet created a new dimension to the way information is now released, since

Une presse neuve est née sur Internet, avec son identité, son langage et une croissance si vive que ses concurrents s'en sont défiés. La crainte de perdre des lecteurs au profit des sites d'information est devenue la routine des journaux avant que les médias audiovisuels s'inquiètent à leur tour.

In order to thwart the impact of Internet, more and more newspapers now have an online version, frequently updated, so as to be able to answer the demand for a continuous news coverage.

What remains certain is that information is now accessible through various means allowing human beings more awareness of the world surrounding them.

### *1.3 Contexts of the studied periods: the 1960s-1970s in comparison with the 2000s-2010s*

The two periods of time studied are very different in regards to the socioeconomic situations, technological progresses and the political parties concerned, among others. The work concentrates on the 1960s-1970s in comparison with the 2000s-2010s, in the United States. The political interviews of four different Presidents of the United States were used in order to draw some patterns over the decades and conversely to observe some notable changes in political interviews. The main concern was to see whether the way journalists and Presidents express themselves evolved over the decades. Both Presidents from the Democratic Party and the

Republican Party were chosen in order to have a respected equality in terms of political parties. Therefore, the corpus of videos contains ten different dyadic political interviews between the President of the United States and a journalist, as well as interviews between the First Lady and a journalist; in our case, Jacqueline Kennedy and Michelle Obama. The 1960s-1970s interviews thus concentrate on both President John Fitzgerald Kennedy – and his wife – and President Richard Nixon while the 2000s-2010s interviews include President George W. Bush and President Barack Obama (as well as his wife). The political interviews used focus on specific periods of time: before the President's presidency, as well as during the term and after the term. The idea was to observe if, depending on the period in which the political interviews were filmed, the journalist's position and strategy changed in the interviews, and if the President of the United States' way of communicating in political interviews varied over the years.

To begin with a major element, it is important to keep in mind that the socioeconomic situation is undoubtedly different between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s. In the mid-twentieth century, the United States of America entered into the Vietnam War, and that for almost twenty years (1955-1975). Even though both the Vietnam War and the failure of the Bay of Pigs Invasion in the beginning of Kennedy's presidency in 1961 brought disruptions in the political landscape, the early 1960s are also marked by social progresses, especially thanks to the African-American Civil Rights Movement (1954-1968) and, generally speaking, “most years between 1945 and 1970 had featured vibrant economic growth” (Patterson, 2005: 9). John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who became the thirty fifth President of the United States (1961-1963), seemed to have gathered the American people during his presidency, around the central question of equality among the citizens. However, the late 1960s-early 1970s was deeply marked by an increasing criticism from journalists along with the Americans' growing skepticism; Patterson (2005: 89) notes that “disgust with politicians was an especially notable characteristic of American popular attitudes from the late 1960s forward.” John Fitzgerald Kennedy's assassination in 1963, the Tet Offensive in 1968 as well as the Watergate affair, changed the face of the nation. Indeed, “the presiding model of scandal politics” (Schudson, 2004: 1232), the Watergate affair, publicly exposed in 1972, forced Richard Nixon to resign from presidency two years later in 1974. This crisis deeply changed the public's vision of politics and expectations in regards to their country. This was further bolstered by the increasing skepticism of the American people in regards to their involvement in the Vietnam War. It is interesting to note that the Watergate scandal influenced the linguistic field as well since the word *Watergate* itself serves as the basis for other sorts of scandals and their etymological derivations. Indeed, the suffix *-gate* is now widely used for scandals or controversies, especially those involving public figures. Collins Dictionary Online proposes a definition for the *-gate* suffix as “indicating a

person or thing that has been the cause of, or is associated with, a public scandal; examples: Irangate, Camillagate<sup>10</sup>. The use of the suffix *-gate* is not solely restricted to the English language because countries such as Germany, Greece or Korea also use it to refer to political scandals. Additionally, the 1960s-1970s period in the USA was marked by the increasing news coverage of both politics and government as well as strongly influenced by the emergence of public presidential news conferences. In comparison, in the years 2000s-2010s, new technologies were adopted and mastered and have now entered our daily lives. The creation of Internet in the 1980s has revolutionized the way information is available and released because it allows an immediate access to the news and in that sense a vulgarization of the journalists' status since almost everybody is able to deliver information, be they journalists or amateurs. Information is now passed much faster than a few decades ago via newspapers, radio, television, or Internet. The recent years have added even more access to immediate information through the use of social networks (Twitter, Facebook, Snapchat, Instagram, among others).

## 2) Commonalities between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s

### 2.1 *The political interview model*

In the corpus of political interviews chosen, all of the ten videos highlight dyadic interviews between one President of the United States and a journalist (or the First Lady and a journalist). This involves that these videos have deliberately been selected because they share the face-to-face format of interviews between a journalist and a political figure. They all follow the turn-taking pattern, which consists in general interviews – and therefore it applies to political interviews as well – of the question/answer format. Bull and Mayer (1993: 652) claim in this sense that

the exchange of information in political interviews is profoundly influenced by rules which appear to regulate the interaction. For example, the pattern of turn-taking is quite distinctive (Greatbatch, 1988). Typically, the interviewer both begins and ends the interview; he or she is also expected to ask questions. [...] The questions/answer format has the additional advantage of allowing interviewers to seek the opinions and perspectives of others while refraining from overt comment, since the interviewer is expected to appear neutral, another important feature of the televised political interview (Clayman, 1988).

Indeed, the question/answer format is the standard model used in political interviews; it is the basic tool used to communicate and exchange ideas between the guest and the host, in front of cameras, and indirectly in front of a large audience watching interviews. Broersma (2008: 143) states that “besides being a discursive practice, the interview is also a much used genre. This textual form represents a conversation – although some people might consider it an interrogation – between a

<sup>10</sup> [http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/gate#gate\\_4](http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/gate#gate_4)

journalist and an interviewee.” Journalists aim at asking questions to their guests in order to extract as much information as they can, seeking for true and reliable answers from politicians. Conversely, the question/answer format is also greatly used by guests who respond to the journalists' questions, in order to convince the audience. Generally speaking, each of the participant has an assigned role: journalists ask questions while guests answer them.

The corpus of videos is composed of five videos for each of the period, be it for the 1960s-1970s or the 2000s-2010s. Additionally, four subcategories have been created in order to mix the political interviews' contexts. One video for each of the period focuses on political interviews before the term and another one after the term, as well as a video per period concentrating on the First Lady being interviewed by a journalist. Finally, the last subcategory gathers two political interviews for the Kennedy/Nixon years and Bush/Obama terms. These subcategories have been chosen in order to observe whether or not the way political interviews took place changed, depending on the contexts. Indeed, when looking at political interviews between a politician and a journalist before the presidency, the guest must try to gather people around his ideas so as to gain their support. In comparison, during a President's term, political interviews might show that he can use political interviews as a powerful tool, explaining his decisions, his actions, reassuring his citizens or convincing them to trust him. When dealing with post-term interviews, journalists tend to focus more on summarizing what has been accomplished by the President and asking him whether or not he would have changed things during his presidency. Finally, interviews with the First Lady highlight a lighter tone used by journalists and less aggressiveness; she has indeed a different role since she does not hold an elected office and is therefore affiliated with the average citizen but is also considered a political figure since she is the President of the United States' wife.

Generally speaking, the media market imposes strict rules in terms of time limit. The notion of time is indeed essential in everyday life, and even more in the news' business, because more than ever, the slogan “time is money” is of a great importance in the world of media since the amount of coverage offered by broadcast news is limited by the length of the program. Political interviews can genuinely be regarded as a game where participants need to convince their audience, either by asking pertinent and newsworthy questions or by answering them in a persuasive manner, in a very limited time. In other words, the main factor to keep in mind is that political interviews truly represent a race against time.

Even though the turn-taking model is the basic rule followed both by the President of the United States and the journalist, the political interviews are composed of many other phenomena, such as overlaps, various forms of delays, different types of questions and therefore different types of answers, and so forth. The corpus of ten videos shows that when it comes to the studied

phenomena, there have been many changes over the decades between the two periods studied. However, some elements found in communications remain the same in the 1960s-1970s in comparison with the 2000s-2010s, whereas others completely differ and changed over the decades. The two following sections will present several phenomena which, over the decades, remain the same. On the one hand, some types of overlaps and delays did not change from the 1960s-1970s to the 2000s-2010s in political interviews. Both the case of “interjacent” overlaps and gaps illustrate that these elements were used half a century ago as much as nowadays. On the other hand, the amount of open questions, both straight preferred and dispreferred answers, as well as vocalizations, remains the same, so that the data shows that there are points of commonalities between the periods.

### *2.2 Overlaps and delays in the 1960s-1970s and in the 2000s-2010s: points of commonalities*

When looking at the data, we can observe that the amount of overlaps occurring in the 1960s-1970s is relatively stable compared to the recent years. Indeed, there are between two to eight occurrences of overlaps per videos during the Kennedy/Nixon years. Additionally, what appears as extremely surprising is that the total amount of overlaps seems to be almost identical between the samples of the 1960s-1970s or the 2000s-2010s. The following chart highlights that the amount of simultaneous talks in the first period is relatively the same as that of the videos of the beginning of the twenty-first century, with the exception of the two videos entitled *Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama* and *Michelle Obama on life after the White House*.

	<b>1960s-1970s</b>		<b>2000s-2010s</b>
	Journalist/President		Journalist/President
Richard Nixon interview Vietnam	8	Bush's final days	6
CBS TV interview with JFK	2	Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama	42
President John Fitzgerald Kennedy after two years	4	Barack Obama on Tavis Smiley	5
Richard Nixon, Watergate	6	President Obama talks ISIS, immigration, and midterm elections	3
March 24, 1961,	5	Michelle Obama on life	32

New First Lady		after the White House	
----------------	--	-----------------------	--

The higher number of overlaps for these two videos is explained by different factors. The first video mentioned tends to reflect forms of aggressiveness from the journalist's part. Indeed, this video is composed of forty two occurrences of overlaps, which notably exceeds the average of the other videos. In fact, the 1960s-1970s interviews gather between two to eight occurrences of overlaps, while the 2000s-2010s political interviews have between three to six instances of overlaps. Because the amount of overlaps in the interview between President Obama and the journalist Bill O'Reilly considerably outnumbered the amount found in the others, this interview has not been taken into account in the total amount of overlaps in this section, and it is going to be discussed in part 3.4. The second interview between the First Lady and the journalist is taken from the broadcast Extra TV, which is assimilated to a celebrity and gossip program. The interviewer status is complex since he is both a producer and an actor, but not a professional journalist. The fact that numerous overlaps occur in this video may be explained by the informality of the interview as well as the host's rhetoric.

The data therefore proves that the number of overlaps found in political interviews remains relatively stable over the decades. Even though Clayman et al (2010: 240) note that substantially increasing forms of aggressiveness appeared in 1969, the corpus did not reveal changes in terms of instances of simultaneous talks. We could have expected that more overlaps might have been found in the videos of the 2000s-2010s, showing the increased aggressiveness over the decades, but this is finally not the case. Aggressiveness is actually present through other phenomena, such as the way questions are asked.

Additionally, overlaps produced by journalists at post-transition onsets are pretty similar for the two periods studied, be it for the Kennedy/Nixon years or for the Bush/Obama period; except the case of the two videos already mentioned. This means that political journalists seem to use the same ratio of overlaps occurring “at recognitional onsets”. In other words, the data show that journalists tend to cut the other participant off once they have enough information to take the turn, which in many cases, does not disturb the smooth talk-in-process. The following example is a clear illustration of an overlap produced by the journalist “at recognitional onset”, cutting off President Kennedy at the very end of his turn on line 87.

*President John Fitzgerald Kennedy after two years (1962)*

77 Pr: the fact is president eisenhower has great influence  
78 toDAY (.) in the republican party and therefore in  
79 the country and has great influence in foreign policy

80 and doesn't even hold office (.) in some ways his  
 81 influence is greater in some- to some degree (.) so  
 82 that the- the same is really true uh also president  
 83 truman president hoover .hh i don't think that uh it  
 84 depends on uh the- thi influence of a president uh  
 85 's still substantial in his second term ↓ (.) though i  
 86 haven't had a second term i think it i[s hehehe ]  
 87 Jo: → [hehehe ]  
 88 ((inaudible))

In the extract above, President Kennedy produces a long turn from lines 77 to 86. In fact, his turn is composed of several TCU, since he elaborates and expands what he wants to say. The “post-transition” onset overlap found on lines 86-87 is actually created by the journalist who comes in laughing. The fact that the journalist cuts him off, not producing a TCU but rather laughing, illustrates that he has understood what President Kennedy was saying since he has enough information to react.

Furthermore, overlaps produced in “interjacent” onsets both by the journalist and the President of the United States remain the same regarding the two periods studied. The following example, taken from the 2000s-2010s period, shows that it is difficult to establish any relationship between the occurrence of overlaps in “interjacent” onsets and the prediction of their location. In the following example, the “interjacent” onset is created by the journalist who decides to come in, even though he does not have enough information to take the turn.

*Richard Nixon interview – Vietnam (Merv Griffin Show 1966)*

1 Jo: how do we look around (.) the wor[ld ]  
 2 Pr: [((clearing his throat))]  
 3 (>0.2)  
 4 well naturally it depends  
 5 → on [what you're talking about]  
 6 Jo: → [it's a very (.) big question > isn't it<]  
 7 Pr: it's a complex (.) problem and a- and naturally a  
 8 complex world (.) uhh but having said that (.) uhh i  
 9 would- i would suggest that thi- (.) the RO:le of (.) a  
 10 leading nation (.) a powerful nation (.) uhhh which the  
 11 united states (.) uh has to play now (.) i(t) is (.) never  
 12 going to be one in which we are going to be loved (.) a:

In this extract, the journalist asks an open question to Richard Nixon who starts a responsive answer, beginning by “well”. It seems that the politician is ill-at-ease answering this question, which is why the journalist takes the turn, trying to reassure the President that he understands his question was difficult to answer and by this encourages him to continue.

Because the practice of interviewing is by definition the exchange of ideas, it involves a mutual understanding and listening process, that is why most of the political interviews from the corpus did not reveal any overlaps occurring in “interjacent” onsets.

Broadly speaking, gaps are overwhelmingly used by Presidents of the United States over the decades, both in the 1960s-1970s and in the 2000s-2010s. Indeed, gaps display a moment of delays in the discourse, particularly notable at the end of a turn construction unit. This means that most of the time, gaps exhibit a “natural” gap since they may be followed by expansions of the previous turns. It is common to find a linking word right after gaps, so that they are used to add more information on what has previously been said. As an example, the following extract shows that Presidents tend to mark a moment of pause in their discourse, followed both by conjunctions and expansions, adding more details (on lines 16, 22 and 27).

*President Obama talks ISIS, immigration, and midterm elections*

14 Pr: no actually (.) what it signals is a new phase (.) uhm (.)  
 15 a (.) first of all let's be clear ↓ isil is a threat not only  
 16 → to iraq (.) but (.) also the region (.) a:nd ultimately  
 17 over the long term could be a threat to the united  
 18 states .hh uh this is (.) uh an extreme group of the sort  
 19 we haven't seen before but it also (.) combines terrorist  
 20 tactics **WITH** on the ground capabilities uh in part  
 21 because they incorporate a lot ov (.) saddam hussein's  
 22 → old (.) uh military commanders (.) a:nd (.) >yihknow<  
 23 this is a threat that we(r) are committed not only to  
 24 degrade but ultimately destroy it's gonna take some time  
 25 .hh what we **KNEW** was that (.) phase one was getting  
 26 an iraqi government (.) tha:t (.) was inclusive (.) and  
 27 → credible (.) and we now have done that (.) uh a:nd so  
 28 **NOW** (.) what we've done is rather than just try to (.)  
 29 halt isil's momentum ↓ (.) we are now in a position to  
 30 start going on some offense (.) the air strikes have been  
 31 very (.) effective i:n degrading isil's capabilities and  
 32 slowing the advance that they were making (>0.2) now  
 33 what we need is ground troupes (>0.2) iraqi ground  
 34 troupes that can start pushing them back

In this sample, President Obama initiates a second pair part, answering to the journalist's previous question. After having produced a straight dispreferred answer “no” (line 14), he knows that he needs to justify himself in order to convince both the political journalist and the audience; a minimal answer would not be sufficient nor effective. That is why he starts expanding his turn from line 14 to line 34. The three different arrows highlight how President Obama resorts to gaps in order

to mark a logical delays in his turn. All of the three examples show that he could have stopped right after the end of the TCUs since he has given enough information for the journalist to take the turn. But the observable gaps on lines 14, 22 and 27 are powerful since they create both the end of his TCUs and the beginning of his expansions. In each case, he adds information thanks to the use of the conjunctions “and”, as in “and ultimately” (line 14), “and you know this is a threat” (line 22) and “and we now have done that” (line 27). The very same phenomenon occurs for the period that spread from the 1960s to the 1970s. Indeed, the instance below is an illustration of gaps, used as a sort of transition from the end of a TCU to the beginning of an expansion, on lines 39 and 45.

*President John Fitzgerald Kennedy after two years (1962)*

38 Pr: well i think we'll be in about the same position of the last  
 39 → two years (.) and i think that uhhh as i say what we have is  
 40 controversial will be very closely uh contested  
 41 Jo: did the complexion in the house change a little bit by the  
 42 shi:ft[s ((inaudible)) ]  
 43 Pr: [i would say it's SLI]ghtly against us more than it  
 44 was ↓ but not quite as good shape as it was for the last  
 45 → two years (.) but uh we're about where we were the last  
 46 two years which means every vote will be three or four  
 47 votes either way

In this example, President Kennedy's gaps demonstrate twice that they both end the TCUs and start the following expansions. Both on lines 39 and 45, these gaps present moments of pauses in the President's discourse, showing that he could have ended his turn at the gaps' location. However, the guest uses gaps in order to add more information, whether resorting to the conjunction “and” (line 39) or “but” (line 45), which allows him to expand his previous turns.

The total amount of pauses produced by journalists remains roughly the same over the decades. Indeed, the ratio is approximately between ten to twenty silences per interview studied, and tend to appear when initiating pre-expansions or asking questions.

### *2.3 Questions and answers in political interviews in the 1960s-1970s and in the 2000s-2010s*

Questions and answers in political interviews are truly the core of communication. They are important tools which create language and establish a dialogue between participants. Clayman et al. (2010: 234) argue that questions are to be regarded as the starting point of interviews since “journalists' questions can influence the president's responses as well as subsequent news coverage, and may themselves be incorporated into quotations and soundbites (Clayman 1990).” Both hosts and guests have their own role to respect, journalists asking the questions and the guests generally

answering them. In other words, questions and answers frame political interviews insofar as each of the participant has a specific part to play in front of an audience.

In the corpus of videos, the total amount of questions asked in political interviews in the 1960s-1970s is inferior to those found in the 2000s-2010s interviews, probably because Presidents tend to speak more than they used to nowadays and conversely journalists keep the turn longer now than they did during the Kennedy/Nixon years. However, it is interesting to note that the number of open questions asked by journalists to Presidents of the United States do not differ between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s. Indeed, journalists seem to take the turn producing first pair part open questions just as much nowadays as they did fifty years ago. Open questions usually begin with a WH-interrogative pronoun, so that journalists use “why”, “when”, “what” and “how” as a starter of their open questions. These interrogative pronouns involve a larger flexibility for Presidents to answer, since they do not need to produce a yes/no answer. Even though their answers are obviously orientated, they are not restricted to a negative or a positive answer. The two following samples illustrate different occurrences of open questions from the journalist's part, both taken from the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s periods.

*March 24, 1961 : New First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy interviewed by Sander Vanocur*

44 Jo: → what do you conceive (.) is your role (.) as the first lady  
 45 and i mean your role mrs kennedy  
 46 (.)  
 47 Fr: of course i do have an official role as wife of the  
 48 president (.) .hh and i think every first lady (.) .hhhhh

In this example, the journalist initiates a first pair part taking the form of an open question on lines 44 and 45. Beginning his turn with the use of the WH-interrogative pronoun “what”, his question gives a great flexibility for the First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy to answer. Indeed, the wh-interrogative pronoun opens up possibilities for her to answer. Additionally, the question itself is very broad since the journalist asks her what is the role of the First Lady.

The following extract, taken from the 2000s-2010s period highlights another form of open question, once more through the use of the wh-interrogative pronoun, on line 12.

*Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama before the Super Bowl*

12 Jo: → when did **YOU** know there were gonna be problems  
 13 with those computers  
 14 Pr: well i think we all anticipated that there'd be glitches  
 15 cause any time you got technology a new program  
 16 rolling out there gonna be some glitches .hh i don't

17 think (.) uh i anticipated or anybody anticipated uh  
 18 the degree of the problems with the website [an::d]

The journalist takes the turn on lines 12 and 13, asking President Obama an open question and beginning his first pair part with the interrogative pronoun “when”. Even though open questions tend to leave more possibilities for the guest to answer than closed questions, this extract illustrates how aggressiveness is perceived in the journalist's question, through the use of the emphasis “you”, clearly intending to underline President Obama's personal responsibility in this matter, and possibly as a form of reproach.

Finally, the last example illustrates how sometimes the established roles of both hosts and guests can be inverted. Sometimes, the usual role of guests and hosts are interchangeable so that Presidents can ask questions to journalists, as in the example below which shows that the former President Richard Nixon gets into the position of the journalist whereas David Frost becomes the interviewee.

*Frost/Nixon (1977) Segments 1&2 - Watergate/Nixon and the World*

1 Jo: would you:: (>0.2) go further than mistakes:: (.) that  
 2 you've explained how you got caught up (.) in this  
 3 thing (.) you can ex- you've explained your motives  
 4 .hhhh and all the quibble >of that< any of that (.) but  
 5 just coming to the sheer substance (>0.2) .hh (.) would  
 6 you go further than mistakes: the word (>0.2) that  
 7 seems n- n- not enough for people to understand  
 8 (>0.2)  
 9 Pr: → what word would you (.) express  
 10 (>0.2)  
 11 Jo: my goodness that's a hhh. (>0.2) **I** think (.) that there  
 12 are (.) three things (.) since you ask me (.) **I** would  
 13 like to hear you say i think the american people would  
 14 like to hear you say (.) .hhh one is (>0.2) there was  
 15 probably mo:re (.) than (.) mistakes there was (>0.2)  
 16 wrongdoing (.) whether it was a cri:me or not yes it may  
 17 have been a crime too (>0.2) SE:condly (>0.2) hh. (.) i  
 18 did (>0.2) >and i'm saying this without questioning the  
 19 motives right< i **DI**d (.) abuse the power i had as president

The journalist asks a closed question from line 1 to line 7, beginning his turn with “would you”. He recycles his turn since he repeats the very same structure on lines 5 and 6 “would you go further than mistakes”. His FPP is followed by a long pause, which is actually a long attributable silence from the President's part. Indeed, the journalist has produced a full TCU since his turn is complete both in terms of grammar and in terms of pragmatics. Richard Nixon finally takes the turn

on line 9. Instead of answering the question, he changes the guest/host's status and initiates himself a first pair part open question “what word would you express?”. Both the long attributable silence that followed and the interjection “my goodness” (line 11) shows how surprised the journalist David Frost is. He answers the former President's FPP, merging both the first person singular “I” with the community of “the American people” in order to re-establish the basic structure of question-answer where journalists ask questions and guests answer them.

The data shows that the number of closed questions, on the contrary, greatly differs between these two periods. There was indeed less closed questions during the Kennedy/Nixon political interviews than there are nowadays. Because closed questions require a yes/no answer, the investigation through the corpus of videos shows that the ratio of straight preferred and straight dispreferred answers is almost identical if we compare the 1960s-1970s with the 2000s-2010s. Most of the time, when this type of questions is asked by journalists, Presidents tend to resort to the mitigations “well” or “you know” in order to begin their answer, followed by expansions. This is especially notable for the Bush/Obama political interviews since the use of semantically empty words such as “well” and “you know” is much greater for Presidents nowadays than fifty years ago. Even though the mitigations are also used by Presidents to begin their turns, answering the journalists' questions, their occurrences are lower in comparison with the 2000s-2010s. The minor amount of straight preferred and straight dispreferred answers in the 1960s-1970s can be explained by the fact that both President Kennedy and President Nixon, if they do not initiate a yes/no answer, tend to use the personal pronoun “I”, as in “I would say”, “I suppose”, “I would see no objection”, and so on. Instead of producing a direct yes/no answer, they tend to take the turn with other forms.

### 3) Significant differences between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s

#### 3.1 *Extra-linguistic evolution over the decades: how political interviews evolved*

Clayman et al. (2010: 234) found that the 1950s are marked by a turning point in the journalistic landscape because this is a time “when the era of public presidential news conference began.” Political interviews came to emerge in the second half of the twentieth century as well, becoming one of the most important tools used by journalists to communicate with a political figure, in front of cameras. This new means of communication would now directly give access to the politicians' words. From then on, the American citizens could see and listen to what the politicians have to say, answering the journalists' questions. A new dimension therefore emerged thanks to the interviewing model, allowing the average citizen to feel more directly implicated in the country's politics.

In the corpus of videos, not all the political interviews have the same setting nor do they show the same level of formality. Some of the interviews take place in the White House, while others have a less formal setting, such as in television studio sets as the case of Tavis Smiley interviewing future President Obama and the dyadic conversation between Richard Nixon and Merv Griffin in the *Merv Griffin Show*. The way participants communicate with each other also changed in many respects over the decades. The journalist's position shifted from a passive actor asking questions to the President in the 1960s-1970s to a more active element, being more aggressive and suspicious than before. Indeed, the American citizens' vision regarding the President of the United States' changed over the decades, becoming more and more skeptical.

The two following sections highlight important differences concerning the two periods studied, both in terms of overlaps and delays and the way the question-answer format changed over the decades.

### *3.2 Overlaps and delays in the 1960s-1970s and in the 2000s-2010s: notable differences*

To begin with overlaps, the first striking difference between the two periods studied focuses on the transition relevance place (TRP). When participants are talking at the same time, it involves the creation of simultaneous talks which may or may not disturb the smooth talk-in-process. Three different categories have been established: overlaps found at a post-transition onset, in “interjacent” onsets and transition relevance place. This section focuses on the latter one, since the difference among the two periods is notable. The TRP is a type of overlap which occurs at a location where both speakers can take the turn or keep the turn. They are both “legitimate” to speak and this kind of overlap is actually produced involuntary by speakers since the TRP is created by both of the participants. The two following examples, taken from the 1960s-1970s period as well as the Bush/Obama interviews, illustrate how common it is to find speakers talking at exactly the same moment, since they both speak at a TRP.

#### *President John Fitzgerald Kennedy after two years (1962)*

50 Jo: do you have a very crucial vote at the outset on this  
 51 rules committee fight again do you think and uhh =  
 52 Pr: = i hope that the rules committee is kept to its  
 53 present uhh number because we can't function if it  
 54 isn't (.) besides well we're through if we loose uh  
 55 if- if they try to change the rules nothing controversial  
 56 in that case would come to the floor of the congress (.)  
 57 → [our whole pro]gram would be emasculated  
 58 Jo: → [in other words]  
 59 Jo: as a young congressman sir you voted (.) to impose a  
 60 two term limitation on presidents (.) now that you held  
 61 the office for a while and also observed this effect on

62 president eisenhower's second term (.) would you  
 63 repeat that vote E:ven if the amendment did not apply  
 64 to yourself

The first extract above shows that the President both answers to the journalist's FPP (lines 50-51) and elaborates his turn, giving justifications, especially through the use of “besides” which adds information. The fact that his turn reaches completion on line 56, and is also followed by a brief pause, lets the journalist think that his TCU is finished; that is why he decides to take the turn, summarizing what has been said for the audience “in other words” (line 58). However, President Kennedy keeps talking since he wants to add even more elements to his turn; hence the TRP on lines 57-58.

The second extract below illustrates the very same phenomenon, since the journalist takes the turn, thinking that the First Lady has finished her TCU.

*Michelle Obama on life after the White House*

29 Jo: what advice do you have for the next first lady (.) or- or  
 30 for bill clinton should he be[come] the first gen[tleman ]  
 31 Fr: [uh uh] [uhm uhm]  
 32 is that what you would call him first gentleman  
 33 Fr: → i think so [but m]aybe we'll see =  
 34 Jo: → [right ]  
 35 Jo: = we'll see

The journalist asks an open question to Michelle Obama on line 29 and 30 which finally takes the form of a closed question on line 32 “is that what you would call him First Gentlemen?” The guest therefore takes the turn in order to produce a responsive SPP, expressing her agreement (line 33) and saying “I think so”. She thus produces a TCU because her turn is complete both in terms of pragmatics and in terms of grammar. This could signal to the journalist that she has finished answering and that he can uptake the turn, which he does when saying “right”. Indeed, this token shows that they have both reached completion and that the topic is now over. But Michelle Obama finally adds more information, contrasting her turn with the conjunction “but” (line 33), which creates an overlap found at a transition relevance place on lines 33 and 34.

In terms of delays in discourse, there is an important difference regarding both the use of intra-turns silences and attributable silences when looking at the two periods studied. Intra-turn silences are a type of delay in discourse which creates a moment of pause within the turn construction unit (TCU) itself. It means that the current speaker has not produced a complete TCU yet, even though marking a moment of pause. The use of intra-turn silences generally involves that the current speaker is going to add more information so that he expresses a complete turn, both

regarding pragmatics and grammar. The use of intra-turn silences is greater for the journalists in the 1960s-1970s than it is today, especially because the way questions were asked was slower. On the contrary, Presidents of the United States tend to produce more intra-turn silences nowadays than fifty years ago. In the following examples, we will see the two different cases: the use of intra-turn silences both by journalists and Presidents.

*Frost/Nixon (1977) Segments 1&2 - Watergate/Nixon and the World*

1 Jo: → would you:: (>0.2) go further than mistakes:: (.) that  
 2       you've explained how you got caught up (.) in this  
 3       thing (.) you can ex- you've explained your motives  
 4       .hhhh and all the quibble >of that< any of that (.) but  
 5       just coming to the sheer substance (>0.2) .hh (.) would  
 6       → you go further than mistakes: the word (>0.2) that  
 7       seems n- n- not enough for people to understand

In this example, the journalist David Frost produces several times intra-turn silences. On line 1, he initiates a first pair part open question “would you”, which is followed by a long intra-turn silence. Indeed, the fact that he only expresses the modal “will” and the second person singular “you” does not constitute a TCU since his turn is not complete. He repeats the use of an intra-turn silence on line 6, when he recycles the open question, saying “would you go further than mistakes the word”. The journalist's clause clearly lacks something here, since his turn is not complete in terms of pragmatics nor in terms of grammar. Intra-turn silences seem to emphasize what comes next, so that viewers of this political interview are struck by the words following the pause.

As mentioned earlier, the use of intra-turn silences by Presidents is a recent phenomenon, since they tend to use it more than President Kennedy and President Nixon did in the 1960s-1970s.

*President Obama talks ISIS, immigration, and midterm elections*

25 Jo: → .hh what we **KNEW** was that (.) phase one was getting  
 26       an iraqi government (.) tha:t (.) was inclusive (.) and  
 27       credible (.) and we now have done that (.) uh a:nd so  
 28       → **NOW** (.) what we've done is rather than just try to (.)  
 29       halt isil's momentum ↓ (.) we are now in a position to  
 30       start going on some offense (.) the air strikes have been  
 31       → very (.) effective i:n degrading isil's capabilities and  
 32       slowing the advance that they were making (>0.2) now  
 33       what we need is ground troupes (>0.2) iraqi ground  
 34       troupes that can start pushing them back

In this example, only three instances of intra-turn silences are going to be discussed, even though others are present in this extract. President Obama has previously started a responsive

action, answering the journalist's question “what is this signal that what we've done so far hasn't worked?” (lines 11 to 13). Indeed, he has produced the straight dispreferred answer “no” (line 14) and he is now elaborating his turn, justifying his answer. On line 25, the President produces a first noticeable intra-turn silence because the words preceding the pause necessarily require more elements. The fact that he says “what we knew was that” needs to be followed by more information since this clause cannot stand on its own. Later on, President Obama uses two conjunctions in a row “and so” (line 27), followed by the time marker “now” which is produced with emphasis. Once again, the clause “and we now have done that and so now” is not a turn construction unit because it is not grammatically complete nor pragmatically complete. Finally, the last example of intra-turn silence is found on line 31. This occurrence is noteworthy because the guest starts a new TCU, beginning his verb phrase “the air strikes have been very”. The adverb “very” obviously requires a noun, which in this case is missing. In fact, the intra-turn silence creates a delay in the structuration of a full sentence and therefore in the elaboration of a complete TCU.

Additionally, the attributable silences to Presidents are also to be seen as a notable difference between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s. Indeed, when looking at the data concerning the recent years, there is only one case of such delays in discourse, and it is attributed to the journalist. The following extract highlights that this pause is attributable to the journalist Bill O'Reilly.

*Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama before the Super Bowl*

7 Jo:    october first it rolls out  
 8 Pr:    right  
 9 Jo:    immediately there a:re problems with thi computers  
 10 Pr:    right  
 11     → (.)  
 12 Jo:    when did **YOU** know there were gonna be problems  
 13        with those computers

This extract shows how the turn-taking is organized and how the speaker change quickly shifts from one speaker to another. Indeed, the journalist produces a first TCU on line 7, followed by President Obama's alignment with what has just been said, producing the minimal response “right” (line 8). The very same structure is repeated right after since the journalist produces a new TCU followed once more by the President's token “right” (line 10). This chain of speaker change finishes with an attributable silence found on line 11, which is allocated to the journalist. In fact, the pause is attributable to the journalist for two reasons: the President has expressed his alignment and the delay is found in between the current speaker and the next speaker to come. In this case, the journalist is supposed to take the turn and start a new turn. On the contrary, the Kennedy/Nixon

years illustrate that Presidents of the United States clearly have more attributable silences than their successors. As an example, the extract below shows that it is common that silences are attributable to Presidents.

*Richard Nixon interview – Vietnam (Merv Griffin Show 1966)*

20 Jo: [well let's stop with vietnam for a minute] we hear a  
 21 a great deal nowadays mister nixon (.) uh people are  
 22 beginning to say: (.) that (.) shouldn't this war be  
 23 discussed in congress  
 24 (>0.2)  
 25 Jo: with our commitment over there of men (.)  
 26 and as much money as we are spending in fighting  
 27 the war (.) isn't this something that should be  
 28 (>0.2) debated **AND** discussed in the congress of  
 29 the united states  
 30 → (>0.2)  
 31 Pr: i would see no objection to having (.) a discussion in  
 32 congress (.) uhh provided that discussion (.) uhhh did  
 33 not give the impression of great division in the united  
 34 states and so far as supporting (.) thi: president of the  
 35 united states and (.) uh thi american commitment in  
 36 vietnam (.) now i don't mean by that that everybody in the  
 37 united states has to agree (.) with the commitment (.) uh

The extract above shows that the pause found on line 30 is attributable to President Nixon. The journalist begins an FPP asking his guest “shouldn't this war be discussed in Congress?”. This turn is actually a TCU and is followed by a long pause. But Richard Nixon does not come in, which is why the journalist expands his turn, from lines 25 to 29. In fact, he recycles his question, asking the President “isn't this something that should be debated and discussed in the Congress of the United States?” in order to reformulate his previous question. The long pause which follows is undoubtedly attributable to President Richard Nixon because the journalist has produced a TCU twice in this extract and cannot expand his turn indefinitely; the guest is supposed to answer the question.

Continuing with what is known as latched talks, we can observe that there is an increasing number of them in the recent years, compared to their instances during the Kennedy/Nixon years. Indeed, all of the videos taken from the 2000s-2010s show one or more occurrences of latched talks. In other words, it is very common nowadays to find in dyadic political interviews that a changing speaker is commonly found in close temporal proximity, so that there is only a small amount of time between the end of the current speaker's turn and the beginning of the recipient's next turn. Because

many scholars noted a tendency towards aggressiveness and the desire to keep the turn or to answer faster from the end of the 1960s, latched talks seem to be the result of a struggle in communication. Presidents of the United States in the 1960s-1970s did not have the same position as nowadays. Indeed, when looking at the Kennedy political interviews, viewers have the feeling that journalists enhance the validity of the words expressed by President of the United States, not asking him embarrassing questions nor cutting him off in “interjacent” onsets. In fact, most of the overlaps occurring during this period are to be found at transition relevance place (TRP), which means that there was no desire to provoke the President, but rather journalists were aiming at displaying him in a new environment, showing his sympathy. Incidentally, Clayman et al. (2010: 232) note that the thirty fifth President of the United States might have had favorable relationships with journalists, stating that “John Kennedy is believed to have had extraordinarily friendly relations with the press corps because of his affinity for journalists and his personal comfort with the media spotlight.” Indeed, it seems that there is a higher number of latched talks in the recent years (between 1 to 16) compared to those found in the 1960s-1970s (between 0 to 1). Indeed, the data shows that the number of latched talks for the Kennedy/Nixon years fluctuates only between 0 to 1. The explanation could be that journalists, and conversely the Presidents of the United States, leave a bit of space between the current speaker's turn and the turn to come. There is no obvious desire for political journalists to claim the turn quickly since they let their guests talk without interfering in what they have to say. In fact, the two following examples taken from the 1960-1970s prove that it is in fact President Kennedy who twice comes in quickly and takes the turn, creating the latched talks.

*President John Fitzgerald Kennedy after two years (1962)*

50 Jo: do you have a very crucial vote at the outset on this  
 51 rules committee fight again do you think and uhh =  
 52 Pr: → = i hope that the rules committee is kept to its  
 53 present uhh number because we can't function if it  
 54 isn't (.) besides well we're through if we loose uh  
 55 if- if they try to change the rules nothing controversial  
 56 in that case would come to the floor of the congress (.)  
 57 [our whole pro]gram would be emasculated

In this case, the journalist initiates two different FPP open questions, each of them beginning with the auxiliary “do you” (lines 50-51). We can observe that he did not have finished his turn since he produces the conjunction “and” (line 51) followed by the vocalization “uh”. Indeed, the conjunction clearly shows that he has more to say and that he wants to add information in order to

create a full TCU and therefore a complete question. However, President Kennedy does not wait until the complete question is formed and takes the turn through a latched talk, on line 53. The following example illustrates another of Kennedy's latched talk.

*CBS TV interview with President John Fitzgerald Kennedy on Sept. 2, 1963*

110 Jo: hasn't every indication from uh saigon been that  
 111 uh (.) president diêm has no intention of  
 112 changing his pattern =  
 113 Pr: → = if he doesn't change it then of course that's (.)  
 114 his decision he's been there ten years n' as i say  
 115 he has carried this burden uh well he's been  
 116 counted out a number of occasions **OUR** best  
 117 judgment is that he can't be successful in this  
 118 basis (.) we hope that **HE** comes to see that but  
 119 in the final analysis it's the people and the  
 120 government themselves who have to win or lose  
 121 this struggle all we can do is HELP (.) and we're  
 122 making it very clear (.) but i don't agree with those  
 123 who say we should withdraw (.) that'd be a great  
 124 mistake that'd be a great mistake i know people  
 125 don't like americans to be engaged in this kind  
 126 of an effort n' forty seven americans have been  
 127 killed (.) in combat (.) with the enemy (.) uh but

In this sample, the journalist produces a TCU since his turn is complete, from lines 110 to 112. President Kennedy once again comes in in close temporal proximity, without any moment of delay between the end of the current speaker's turn and the beginning of his own turn, from line 113.

Finally, the 2000s-2010s political interviews are deeply marked by the use of repairs, both from the journalist's part and from the President's part. In the recent years, it seems that the speed in which the guest and the host talk to each other, in dyadic political interviews, is faster than it was during the Kennedy/Nixon years. Indeed, there is both more speaker change nowadays than there was fifty years ago as well as a higher flow of communication. That is why there is a tendency both for journalists and Presidents to produce repairs in their turns. Indeed, the corpus of videos illustrate that it is common for political journalists and for Presidents of the United States to re-use a word or a clause which has been produced earlier. The following example shows the President's discomfort, which is observable through a stuttering effect on line 118.

*Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama before the Super Bowl*

116 Jo: = he didn't te[ll- he didn't u]se the word terror ↑  
 117 Pr: [in benghazi ]

118 Pr: → you know hhh. eaha in- in the heat of the moment bill  
 119 what folks are focused on is (.) what's happening on the  
 120 ground (>0.2) do we have eyes on it (.) how can we make  
 121 sure our folks [ are secu:re (.) so: i i've ]  
 122 Jo: [yeah but i just want to get this on the record]  
 123 did he tell you it was a terror attack =

In the extract above, the journalist produces an FPP closed question, beginning his turn with the negative form “he didn't tell” (line 116). But he stops in the middle of his question, changing the form of his question by “he didn't use”. Indeed, there is a careful need to select the right words in order to obtain information from his guest without being too aggressive. The result is that President Obama does not feel at-ease answering his question because he begins his turn with the filler “you know”, as well as an out-breath and a sound “eaha”. He finally starts his TCU with a repair, producing twice “in” which creates a stuttering effect and therefore shows his awkwardness on line 118. In this interview between Bill O'Reilly and President Obama, the guest produces forty eight occurrences of repairs, which is the highest amount of repairs when looking at the rest of the data. Indeed, this is also the political interview which illustrates the most a form of aggressiveness from the journalist, regarding the overlaps and the questions put in the negative form. The following chart highlights that the 2000s-2010s are undoubtedly different from the 1960s-1970s in terms of repairs.

	1960s-1970s			2000s-2010s	
	Journalist	President		Journalist	President
Richard Nixon interview – Vietnam	1	13	Bush's final days	1	11
CBS TV interview with JFK	2	9	Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama	9	48
President John Fitzgerald Kennedy after two years	0	13	Barack Obama on Tavis Smiley	3	15
Richard Nixon, Watergate	8	4	President Obama talks ISIS, immigration, and midterm elections	4	21

March 24, 1961, New First Lady	0	7	Michelle Obama on life after the White House	6	11
TOTAL	11	46	TOTAL	23	106

This section has shown that the two periods studied differ both in terms of overlaps and delays in discourse. The first category proves that overlaps found at a transition relevance place is more common in the 1960s-1970s than in the recent years. Additionally, when looking at the pauses, both the use of repairs and latched talks increased over the decades whereas the attributable silences are very much a phenomenon of the Kennedy/Nixon years. Finally, intra-turn silences seem to be more used by Presidents nowadays than they were fifty years ago, and conversely, they were definitely a tool more used by journalist in the 1960s-1970s than today.

### *3.3 The evolution of questions and answers in the 1960s-1970s and in the 2000s-2010s*

Many changes occur from the 1960s-1970s to the 2000s-2010s in terms of the types of questions asked by journalists to their guests. Nowadays, journalists ask more questions to their guests than they used to fifty years ago. Indeed, the process of speaker change differs for the two periods studied. When looking at the 2000s-2010s data, it appears that the system of different turns produced by different speakers is a more common pattern than the one found during the political interviews of both President Kennedy and President Nixon. This is explained by the fact that in the 1960s-1970s, the interview phenomenon was new and that the journalist's position was not the same as it is now. It seems that when asking questions, journalists tried to make their comfortable, asking them simple questions and letting them speak as much as they wanted to. On the contrary, journalists of the recent years tend to probe their political guests in order to obtain as much information as they can and conversely, the Presidents wish to highlight the validity of their words in the interviews. In other words, the talk is more disputed between a journalist and a political figure nowadays compared to the 1960s-1970s. Actually, the important shift from the late 1960s gave rise to an increasing wave of suspicion both from the journalists and the American citizens. That is why it is also important to note that there are more closed questions asked by journalists in the 2000s-2010s than they were fifty years ago. This is another factor which proves that nowadays, journalists tend to further scrutinize politicians than before so as to expose mistakes or wrongdoings. The tendency over the decades for journalists to ask a higher number of closed questions compared to political interviews during the Kennedy/Nixon years is observable through the following chart, which illustrates that the amount of closed questions and to a further extent, the total amount of questions asked by journalists nowadays, is much higher than in the 1960s-1970s.

	1960s-1970s			2000s-2010s	
	closed questions	total questions		closed questions	total questions
Richard Nixon interview – Vietnam	4	6	Bush's final days	6	9
CBS TV interview with JFK	3	4	Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama	11	13
President John Fitzgerald Kennedy after two years	4	5	Barack Obama on Tavis Smiley	0	2
Richard Nixon, Watergate	0	1	President Obama talks ISIS, immigration, and midterm elections	9	11
March 24, 1961, New First Lady	12	14	Michelle Obama on life after the White House	1	9
TOTAL	23	30	TOTAL	27	44

Additionally, Clayman et al. (2010: 230) note an “aggressive questioning” from political journalists towards their guests in the recent years, which can be seen through the closed questions produced in the negative form. It is therefore common to find verbs put in the negative form, in the corpus, such as the lexical verb DO: “didn't” and “don't” as in “wasn't that the biggest one?”; “it's in the past but isn't that the biggest mistake?”. The most noticeable examples are found in the video opposing the journalist Bill O'Reilly to President Obama, when the journalist asks him closed questions such as “you just didn't know when it rolled out that this was going to be a problem?”; “why didn't you fire Sebelius the secretary in charge of this?”; “you're not gonna answer that?”; “wasn't that the biggest one?”; “it's in the past but isn't that the biggest mistake?” and “he didn't use the word terror ?”

Furthermore, there is the recurrent use of negativity, notably through the conjunction “but” which contrasts what has just been said, or even prefixes such as in the question “what were you most **un**prepared for ?”

Another fundamental point concerns the use of semantically empty words, such as the case

of “you know”. Indeed, this is probably due to the evolution of the language, but this is not to say that it hasn't been more and more used over the decades, especially by President Obama. As an example, the extract below shows that the guest often resorts to this “filler” when speaking.

*Barack Obama on Tavis Smiley*

21 Jo: you know ancestors are jumping up and dow[n screami]ng  
 22 Pr: [well yee::]  
 23 at the thought of you raising that kind of money ↑ =  
 24 Pr: = well especially because we've raised (.) more money (.)  
 25 in small INcrements  
 26 Jo: right =  
 27 Pr: = from small donors than all the democratic candidates  
 28 combined (.) so it's re- it's reflective of the grass roots  
 29 enthusiasm that we've been seeing in the campaign (.)  
 30 → uh a:nd >yihknow< the challenge now for us is to make sure  
 31 that we get **KNOWN** (.) uh beyond that (err) enthusiastic BAse  
 32 → of supporters (.) to the broader public and >yihknow< that's  
 33 obviously a big challenge uhh you know when you're  
 34 running a national race and you've only been on the national  
 35 scene (.) basically for (.) three and a half four years

In this example, President Obama produces twice the token “you know” which seems to be a means for him to keep the turn while thinking of what to say next. From line 24, the guest creates a turn construction unit, explaining how he was able to gather money for his presidential campaign. He later expands his turn from line 27, giving more explanations until line 29 when his turn reaches completion. Indeed, his turn is complete and finishes with a brief pause. He decides to keep the turn, producing a vocalization as well as the conjunction “and” (line 30) which proves that he has more to say. Indeed, all of this is followed by the filler “you know”, expressed in its weak form. He repeats this filler on line 32, once more produced right after the conjunction “and”, as if it were a means for President Obama to keep the turn and show to the host that he has more to say.

The use of semantically empty words is a recent phenomenon because when looking at the 1960s-1970s data, none of the videos contained this type of words, whereas the recent years have proven that there is a tendency for both President Bush and President Obama to use them in their turns. Indeed, while absent in the corpus of videos concerning the Kennedy/Nixon years, the amount of fillers fluctuates between two to eighteen occurrences for the 2000s-2010s.

Finally, the last important difference between the two periods studied focuses on the use of mitigations beginning a turn by Presidents of the United States. There is indeed a tendency nowadays to resort to mitigations in order to answer to the journalists questions. The frequent use of “well” beginning the responsive SPP by Presidents, or only starting a new TCU, is very common

nowadays. The following example illustrates a case where President Bush engages a second pair part, beginning his turn by the use of “well” on line 62.

*Bush's final days*

60 Jo: let's talk a little bit about (>0.2) eight years as being president (.)  
 61 what were you most **UN**prepared for↑  
 62 Pr: → .hhhhhh **WELL** i think i was hh. unprepared for war  
 63 (>0.2)  
 64 Pr: >'notherwords< i didn't **CAM**paign and said (.) please vote for me  
 65 i'll be able to **HAN**dle (>0.2) **A**- uhh an atta::ck (.) >i 'notherwords<  
 66 i didn't an**TI**cipate war uhhh presidents (.) one of the thing about  
 67 the modern **PRE**sidency (.) is that (.) the unexpected will happen

The journalist produces an FPP open question on lines 60-61 to which the President initiates a responsive SPP. He begins his turn with a pretty long out-breath which allows him to think while showing that he is going to answer. The fact that he does not answer straightaway the journalist's question gives the feeling that his answer must be honest. In fact, if he had answered the question faster, his truthfulness could have been questioned. The mitigation “well” actually succeeds the out-breath which reinforces the idea that President Bush takes the time to thinking of an honest answer. However, not all mitigations “well” begin a responsive SPP open question since the token “well” is sometimes also used to begin a turn, answering a closed question, as in the case below.

*Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama before the Super Bowl*

19 Jo: [right] so  
 20 you just didn't know when it rolled out that this was  
 21 going to [be a (.) problem]  
 22 Pr: → [ well (.) i ] don't think- as i said i don't  
 23 think anybody anticipated the- the- the degree of uhh  
 24 problems that you'd had on healthcare.gov uh the good  
 25 news is is that right away we decided how we're gonna  
 26 fix it (.) it got fixed uh within a month and a half (.) uh  
 27 it was up and running and now it's working the way it's  
 28 suppo[ sed to ] and we've signed up

In this example, President Obama comes in in the end of the journalist's current turn, overlapping him on line 22. This overlap is known as a post-transition onset since the guest has enough information to take the turn. He therefore interrupts the current turn, producing the mitigation “well” and answering to the journalist's closed question. The fact that there is a simultaneous talk at this time shows that the President both wants to take the turn and to re-orientate the topic being discussed.

This section has proven that there are some differences between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s, when looking at the evolution of the questions asked and their answers. Indeed, the recent years are marked by a multiplicity of phenomena, especially focusing on both the total amount of questions as well as the closed questions which are higher in comparison with the Kennedy/Nixon years. Both the use of fillers within the turns and the mitigations “well” beginning a turn are also very much part of the 2000s-2010s period. Even though there are noticeable differences between the two periods studied, it is important to note that two videos stand out in terms of aggressiveness and conversely, in terms of friendliness.

### 3.4 *The case of two specific videos*

In the corpus of videos, two political interviews distinguish themselves from the others, because of their specificity. Indeed, both of the videos taken from the 2000s-2010s period entitled *Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama* and the famous *Frost/Nixon (1977) Segments 1&2 - Watergate/Nixon and the World* are to be regarded differently from the others.

The first video mentioned is particular since it is composed of many more occurrences of overlaps than the other political interviews. Indeed, the total amount of overlaps for this extract comes to forty two instances of simultaneous talks. Different factors can explain why so many overlaps occur. This dyadic interview takes place in the White House, between the journalist Bill O'Reilly and the current President of the United States, Barack Obama, leader of the Democratic Party. The journalist is in favor of the opposite party, therefore affiliated with the Republican Party. The number of overlaps can be directly linked with the different political affiliation of the two participants, since the journalist can have some difficulties in trying to be neutral and thus being more aggressive than his counterpart journalists. Furthermore, he is considered to be a polemicist, which means that he has deep-seated opinions; this implies that he is more prone to interrupt politicians, repeat the same questions until he has satisfying answers, and so on. Merriam Webster website proposes a definition of the term polemic as “a strong written or spoken attack against someone else's opinions, beliefs, practices, etc.”, adding that polemics is actually “the art or practice of using language to defend or harshly criticize something or someone”<sup>11</sup>. Furthermore, the chart below shows that the amount of overlaps found at a post-transition onset produced by the journalist is almost twice as many as those created by the President. Overlaps at a post-transition onset involve that the current speaker has given enough information to the recipient but he has not reached completion in his turn. The listener, even though aware that the current speaker has not finished his turn, decides to come in. As an example, the following extract proves that this is a

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/polemic>

current pattern used by the journalist, in order either to take the turn and re-orientate the conversation or to obtain more information on the current topic being discussed, on lines 55 and 58.

*Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama*

- 49 Pr: = we've got three million young people uhhh under the  
 50 age of twenty six who were signed up on their parents'  
 51 plan and so (.) (mm) what we're constantly figuring out  
 52 is how do we continue to improve it ↑ how do we make  
 53 sure that the folks who don't have health insurance can  
 54 get heal[th insu]rance  
 55 Jo: → [okay ]  
 56 Pr: and those who are under insured are able to get better  
 57 health insuran[ce]  
 58 Jo: → [ i-] i'm sure- i'm **SU**:re that thi uh intent  
 59 is noble but i'm a tax payer

In this case, President Obama produces a long turn, from lines 49 to 54. He justifies one of his actions and talks about the healthcare.gov website, showing that he and his team have made progress in this matter. He keeps the turn for quite a long time until the journalist comes in on line 55 and produces an overlap at a post-transition onset. Indeed, he has enough information to produce a minimal token “okay” which is considered to be a “change-of-activity tokens, which mark a transition to a new activity or a new topic in the talk (e.g., *Okay, Alright*)”, according to Gardner (2001: 2). This brief response is actually a means for the journalist both the say that he has understood what the President was getting at and to claim the turn. Indeed, Gardner (2001: 16) refers to Beach (1993) and states that

A further type of response token is Okay, one of the major uses of which Beach (1993) characterizes as “both closure-relevant and continuative”. He says that Okay is activity-shift implicative, that is, one conversational action is completed, and its speaker is ready to move on to a next one. A recipient's use of Okay upon apparent completion of this action or set of actions is typically saying that participants can now negotiate moving on to a next action, or to a new action series.

But President Obama continues his turn with the use of the conjunction “and”, expanding his turn until line 57. The journalist produces another post-transition onset overlap on line 58 since there is a simultaneous talk at the very end of Barack Obama's turn. These two overlaps highlight impatience from the journalist since he interrupts the political guest twice where he could have waited to take the turn without cutting him off.

Additionally, latched talk is a form that prevails all along this interview, which reinforces the idea that there is a form of aggressiveness from the journalist. The fact that turns come one after the

other without any delays shows that participants wish to keep/take the turn and that there is a form of struggle in communicating with each other. When looking at the data, the total amount of latched talks is by far the most predominant for this political interview; the others gathering between zero to nine occurrences.

<i>Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama</i>		<u>Journalist</u>	<u>President</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Overlaps</u>	occurrences	42	42	42
	at a transition relevance place (TRP)	7	7	7
	at a post-transition onset	15	8	23
	in "interjacent" onset	4	8	12
<u>Delays in the discourse</u>	latched talks	16	16	16

The second video, taken from the *Nixon Interviews* (1977) is a political interview opposing the former President of the United States, Richard Nixon, and the journalist David Frost. Conversely to the political interview between Bill O'Reilly and President Obama, this video is composed of much less overlaps (only six occurrences). This political interview reveals a state affair in which President Nixon played a major role. What is striking in this interview is the total amount of vocalizations produced by the politician, which illustrates how difficult it is for him to speak about what happened several years ago and his involvement in the Watergate scandal. This is actually a moment of intimacy which takes place in front of cameras. Incidentally, Clayman et al. (2010: 242) claim that "Nixon and Reagan gave more speeches than news conferences", probably because they tried to avoid news conferences and political interviews, feeling uncomfortable in front of cameras answering the journalists' questions. Indeed, former President Nixon's discomfort is observable in the number of vocalization which is higher than all of the other videos, even those of the 2000s-2010s period. The production of many "uh" shows how ill- at-ease he is while talking about his past actions concerning the Watergate scandal.

Additionally, the amount of long pauses, both for the journalist David Frost and the guest Richard Nixon is important insofar as it is by far the most striking difference within the 1960s-1970s period. In fact, the long pauses vary from zero to eight occurrences during the

Kennedy/Nixon years. The chart below summarizes the number of instances regarding the long pauses, both for the journalist and the politician.

		<u>Journalist</u>	<u>President</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Delays in the discourse</u>	brief pauses	21	56	77
	long pauses	12	15	27
	total pauses	33	71	104

The number of long pauses can be explained by the fact that this interview reveals a state affair. Indeed, David Frost insists on what happened in 1972 and wants to obtain more information about the affair. He puts himself in the position of the average American insofar as he talks in the name of the American citizens. The flow of communication is slow, the journalist carefully choosing his words to voice the demand of the American people for explanations of Richard Nixon's involvement in this state affair. Conversely, the former President's numerous long pauses illustrate both that the topic is sensitive and that he actually publicly confesses having taking part in the Watergate scandal. The following extract shows Richard Nixon's discomfort in talking about the events which took place two years preceding this political interview with David Frost.

*Frost/Nixon (1977) Segments 1&2 - Watergate/Nixon and the World*

46 we had the second and third summits (.) i think one of the  
 47 major reasons i stayed in office was (.) my conce:rn (.)  
 48 about keeping the china initiative the soviet initiative (.)  
 49 uh the vietnam fragile peace agreement and (.) then (.)  
 50 an added dividend the first break through in moving  
 51 toward (.) uh not love (.) but at least not war in the  
 52 mideast  
 53 Jo: yo[u ]  
 54 Pr: [an]d NOw coming back to (.) the whole point of  
 55 → (>0.2) uhhh (.) whether i should have resigned then  
 56 (.) and uh(.) how i feel now (.) let me say i- i just  
 57 didn't make mistakes in this period i think some of  
 58 my (.) mistakes that uh i regret most deeply came  
 59 with the statements that i made afterwards uhhh  
 60 some of those statements: uhhh were misleading (.)

All along the extract, Richard Nixon comes back to his stay in office. We can notice many brief pauses within his turn, either intra-turn silences or gaps. The location of the long pause found on line 55 is nevertheless significant. Indeed, he now directly talks about his non-resignation when he was President of the United States, from 1969 to 1974. The topic is indeed delicate, which can be

seen through the use of “now coming back to the whole point of” which serves as a transition to some sort of revelation, followed by a long intra-turn silence on line 55.

This part focused on the comparison between the two periods of time studied. In re-contextualizing both the birth of journalism in the United States and its development, it has been proved that the data coincides with the history of this country. Indeed, scholars agree that there was an important shift in the evolution of political journalism from the Kennedy/Nixon years until nowadays. As an example, the aggressive form of questioning is noticeable in the video entitled *Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama* since there is both the repetition of the question directed to the guest as well as a tendency to ask questions put in the negative form. Even though all of the ten extracts follow the same basic question-answer format of political interviews, and therefore show certain similarities, it has been shown that there are differences in the interviewing practices between the 1960s-1970s and the 2000s-2010s.

## Conclusion

This research project aimed at comparing political interviews between a journalist and a political figure at two different periods of time. The Kennedy/Nixon years are anchored in a period where both news conferences and the practice of interviewing emerged in the United States, since their birth can be dated back to the mid-twentieth century. Indeed, seeing and listening to political figures on television was very much new in the 1960s-1970s. On the contrary, the 2000s-2010s is a period which is characterized by new means of communication as well as the emergent instantaneousness of information released online. The turn-taking system was, and still is, the common model used in political interviews. Indeed, the format of this particular type of interview is generally the same, keeping the question-answer format as basic frame set for dyadic political interviews. Additionally, the research project showed that many commonalities remain over the decades. Surprisingly, the number of overlaps is pretty much the same regarding the two different periods of time studied. Indeed, the corpus highlights that there is between two to eight occurrences of overlap in the 1960s-1970s while the extracts from the Bush/Obama years are composed of three to six instances of overlap. This analysis however leaves out the two political interviews from the 2000s-2010s entitled *Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama* and *Michelle Obama on life after the White House*, since they are marked by a higher number of overlaps (respectively forty two and thirty two situations of overlaps). Looking at a particular type of overlap, the data proved that overlaps found in “interjacent” onsets are as much used nowadays as they were during the Kennedy/Nixon period. Indeed, there is a tendency both for the journalist and the politician to cut the current speaker off in the middle of his turn, without having enough information to take the turn. Furthermore, overlaps occurring at post-transition onsets and produced by journalists tend to be used as much nowadays as they were in the 1960s-1970s. This means that political journalists cut their guests off once they have enough information to take the turn: this type of overlap can be used in order to re-orientate the topic being discussed, change the current topic, ask for more information, and so on. In addition to overlaps, gaps are another point of commonality between the Kennedy/Nixon years and the recent years. In fact, the number of gaps produced by Presidents of the United States remain almost identical whether we are looking at the data from the 1960s-1970s or the 2000s-2010s. Politicians from the two periods studied create a pause at the end of a possible turn construction unit (TCU) which seems “more natural” since there is both the possibility for the current speaker to expand his turn and the recipient can take the turn and start a new TCU. Finally, both the open questions asked by journalists and the vocalizations they produce are statistically close in regards to the periods of time analyzed. The number of open questions only varies from one to three (with the exception of the video entitled *Michelle Obama on life after the White House*

which gathers eight occurrences of open questions). This is relatively low compared to the number of closed questions asked in the two periods, especially when looking at the data from the 2000s-2010s. It means that there is a growing tendency over the decades to give less possibilities for the politician to manipulate their answer, since journalists aim at a straight yes or no answer.

However, there was a growing concern for the American population to further scrutinize politicians, especially since the Watergate scandal. It seems that both the political journalist's way of interviewing and the President of the United States' position changed over the decades. The setting of political interviews itself is not fixed. As an example, extracts from political interviews from the two periods studied take place in the White House, in television studios or in what might seem to be a classroom.

Overlaps occurring at a transition relevance place (TRP) is one of the most striking differences between the Kennedy/Nixon years and the recent years. Because of the journalists' desire to let their guest talk, a higher number of TRP is observable for the 1960s-1970s. It means that this type of overlap is created because both of the speakers are "legitimate" to speak and there is no wish from the journalist's part to interrupt the current talk-in-process. On the contrary, the time limit is a central element in political interviews which involves several forms of evolution in journalism. Indeed, there is a faster flow of communication noticeable for the 2000s-2010s through many phenomena. There is both a higher number of occurrences of latched talks as well as a superior amount of repairs in the recent years. This proves that the process of speaker change is more frequent during the Bush/Obama years than it was fifty years ago. The time limit factor is also present within the current speaker's turn itself because there is a desire for the President of the United States to give as much information as he can in a certain amount of time. In other words, re-using a word or a clause which was started earlier in the turn involves a stuttering effect. Conversely, the use of attributable silences to President in the 1960s-1970s is higher since there was not the same struggle to keep/take the turn than it is today. In fact, both President Kennedy and President Nixon produce several silences which can be attributed to them while none of these silences occur in the 2000s-2010s from the politicians' part.

Finally, both the way questions were asked and their answers were analyzed and the data proved that there are important differences when looking at the two periods. Due to the desire to probe their guests more than before, journalists from the 2000s-2010s clearly ask more questions than they did in the 1960s-1970s. The amount of closed questions is another noticeable dissimilarity between the two periods because journalists nowadays want to obtain a yes or no answer from their guests instead of giving them a larger opportunity in their answer by asking them open questions. Also, Presidents of the United States nowadays seem to use more and more "fillers" than they did before.

Indeed, there is the redundant use of the term “you know” which never occurred in the 1960-1970s political interviews, which can be explained by the evolution of the language itself.

## Bibliography

### Books and articles:

- Amossy, Ruth, and Marcel Burger. *Polémiques médiatiques et journalistiques*. Besançon: Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté, 2011.
- Barnhurst Kevin and Mutz Diana. “American journalism and the decline in event-centered reporting”. *Journal of Communication* 47(4) (1997): 27–53.
- Barnhurst, K. G. “Contradictions In News Epistemology: How Modernism Failed Mainstream US Journalism”. *Media, Culture & Society* 37.8 (2015): 1244-1253.
- Barnhurst, K. G. “Politics In The Fine Meshes: Young Citizens, Power And Media”. *Media, Culture & Society* 20.2 (1998): 201-218.
- Barnhurst, K. G. “The New 'Media Affect' And The Crisis Of Representation For Political Communication”. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 16.4 (2011): 573-593.
- Blondheim, Menahem, and Tamar Liebes. “Television News And The Nation: The End?”. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 625.1 (2009): 182-195.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Sur la télévision*. Suivi de : *L'emprise du journalisme*. Paris: Éditions Raisons d'Agir, 1996.
- Breton, Philippe. *L'argumentation dans la communication*. Paris: La Découverte, 1996.
- Broersma, Marcel. “Journalism as a performative discourse: The importance of Form and Style in Journalism”. *Journalism and Sense-Making: Reading the Newspaper* (2010): 15-35.
- Broersma, Marcel. (2008). The discursive strategy of a subversive genre. The introduction of the interview in US and European journalism. In H.W. Hoen & M.G. Kemperink (Eds.), *Vision in text and image* (pp. 143-158). Leuven, Paris & Dudley, MA: Peeters.
- Bull, Peter, and Kate Mayer. “How Not To Answer Questions In Political Interviews”. *Political Psychology* 14.4 (1993): 651-666.
- Burger, Marcel, Jérôme Jacquin, and Raphaël Micheli. *La parole politique en confrontation dans les médias*. Bruxelles: De Boeck, 2011.
- Burger, Marcel (2010). “Le cadrage de la communication dans les médias : apports d'une analyse linguistique”, *Communication*, vol 27/2, 18-50.
- Chalaby, Jean. Beyond the Prison-house of Language: Discourse as a Sociological Concept. *British Journal of Sociology*, 47(4) (1996): 684-698.

- Chalaby, Jean. Journalism as an Anglo-American invention. A comparison of the development of French and Anglo-American journalism, 1830s-1920s. *European Journal of Communication*, 11 (1996): 303-326.
- Clayman, Steven E. et al. "A Watershed In White House Journalism: Explaining The Post-1968 Rise Of Aggressive Presidential News". *Political Communication* 27.3 (2010): 229-247.
- Conboy, Martin. *The Language Of The News*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Cutting, Joan. *Pragmatics And Discourse*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Fink, K., and M. Schudson. "The Rise Of Contextual Journalism, 1950s-2000s." *Journalism* 15.1 (2013): 3-20.
- Fogel, Jean-François, and Bruno Patino. *Une Presse Sans Gutenberg*. Paris: B. Grasset, 2005.
- Gardner, Rod. *When Listeners Talk*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub., 2001, pp. 1-64.
- Gorisch, Jan P.F.M. *Matching across Turns in Talk-in-Interaction: The Role of Prosody and Gesture*. PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, 2012.
- Hayashi, Makoto, Geoffrey Raymond, and Jack Sidnell. *Conversational Repair And Human Understanding*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Heldner, Mattias and Jens Edlund. "Pauses, Gaps And Overlaps In Conversations". *Journal of Phonetics* 38.4 (2010): 555-568.
- Iyengar, Shanto. *Is Anyone Responsible?*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991: 1-16.
- Jacknick, Christine. "But this is writing": post-expansion in student-initiated sequences. *Novitas – ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 2011, 5, 39-54.
- Kovach, Bill and Tom Rosenstiel. *Principes du journalisme*. Paris: Gallimard, 2014.
- Landert, Daniela, and Andreas H. Jucker. "Private And Public In Mass Media Communication: From Letters To The Editor To Online Commentaries". *Journal of Pragmatics* 43.5 (2011): 1422-1434.
- Nerone, J., and K. G. Barnhurst. "News Form And The Media Environment: A Network Of Represented Relationships". *Media, Culture & Society* 25.1 (2003): 111-124.
- Patterson, James T. *Restless Giant*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

- Proctor, Katarzyna, and Lily I-Wen Su. "The 1St Person Plural In Political Discourse—American Politicians In Interviews And In A Debate". *Journal of Pragmatics* 43.13 (2011): 3251-3266.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. "Some Other 'Uh(m)'s ". *Discourse Processes* 47.2 (2010): 130-174.
- Schegloff, E. A. "Word Repeats as Unit Ends". *Discourse Studies* 13.3 (2001): 367-380.
- Schudson, Michael. "Notes On Scandal And The Watergate Legacy". *American Behavioral Scientist* 47.9 (2004): 1231-1238.
- Schudson, Michael. News and Democratic Society: Past, Present, and Future. *The Hedgehog Review Vol. 10 Issue 2* (2008): 7-21.
- Schudson, Michael. "Political Observatories, Databases & News In The Emerging Ecology Of Public Information". *Daedalus* 139.2 (2010): 100-109.
- Silvester, Christopher. *The Penguin Book Of Interviews*. London: Viking, 1993.
- Watson, John C and Melvin I Urofsky. *Journalism Ethics By Court Decree*. New York: LFB Scholarly Pub. LLC, 2008.

Websites:

- <http://grammar.about.com/od/c/g/cooperativeoverlapterm.htm>
- <http://www.history.com/topics/1960s>
- <http://www.sltinfo.com/transition-relevance-places/>

Filmography

Movies:

- All the President's Men*, Pakula Alan J. (1976)
- Frost/Nixon*, Ron Howard (2009)
- Killing Kennedy*, Nelson McCormick (2013)
- J. Edgar*, Clint Eastwood (2012)
- 1971*, Johanna Hamilton (2014)

Series:

- House of Cards*, Beau Willimon (2013)
- The Kennedys*, Jon Cassar (2011)
- The Newsroom*, Aaron Sorkin (2012)

Documentaries:

*Internet: la grande illusion ?*, Réalisation : Jean-Bernard Andro – ARTE GEIE/ Zadig – France  
2016

### Transcription of symbols

Jo/Pr/Fr:	Speaker labels (e.g. Jo: = Journalist; Pr: = President; Fr: = First Lady)
[ ]	Encloses talk produced in overlap i.e. when more than one speaker is speaking
=	Links talk produced in close temporal proximity (latched talk)
> <	Talk between symbols is rushed or compressed
° °	Encloses talk which is produced quietly
<b>CAPS</b>	Capital letters and bold used to mark words or syllables which are given special emphasis of some kind
CAPS	Words or parts of words spoken loudly marked in capital letters
s:.....	Sustained or stretched sound; the more colons, the longer the sound
.hhh	In-breath, the number of 'h's representing, in some approximate fashion, the length of the in breath (it's sometimes said that each 'h' represents a tenth of a second)
hhh. the	Out breath, the number of 'h's representing, in some approximate fashion, the length of the out breath (it's sometimes said that each 'h' represents a tenth of a second)
(word)	Parentheses indicate transcriber doubt
(this/that)	Alternative hearings
((description))	Description of what can be heard, rather than transcription e.g. ((shuffling papers))
cu-	Cut-off word or sound / Repair
(>0.2)	Silence of more than 0.2 second
(.)	Silence of less than tenths of a second
^ or ↑	Indicates marked pitch rise
↓	Indicates marked fall in pitch
(hehehe)	Indicates laughter while speaking (aspiration)
((inaudible))	Indicates incapacibilities to understand the speaker

Appendix 1: Richard Nixon interview – Vietnam (Merv Griffin Show 1966)  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cDxaBJw-wZU> – beginning to 3.59 mn

Jo = Journalist ; Pr = President

1 Jo: how do we look around (.) the wor[ld ]  
 2 Pr: [((clearing his throat))]  
 3 (>0.2)  
 4 well naturally it depends  
 5 on [what you're talking about]  
 6 Jo: [it's a very (.) big question > isn't it<]  
 7 Pr: it's a complex (.) problem and a- and naturally a  
 8 complex world (.) uhh but having said that (.) uhh i  
 9 would- i would suggest that thi- (.) the RO:le of (.) a  
 10 leading nation (.) a powerful nation (.) uhhh which the  
 11 united states (.) uh has to play now (.) i(t) is (.) never  
 12 going to be one in which we are going to be loved (.) a:  
 13 our major- (.) our major (.) **AIM** and **GOAL** must be to  
 14 be respected (.) uh this was the role that the british had to  
 15 play for- uh for many many years that's the role of  
 16 other great nations have played now the united states  
 17 (.) uh whether we want it or not have to play that (.)  
 18 and so whether we're looking at the situation in vietna::m  
 19 or (.) [ in western europe or any place else ]  
 20 Jo: [well let's stop with vietnam for a minute] we hear a  
 21 a great deal nowadays mister nixon (.) uh people are  
 22 beginning to say: (.) that (.) shouldn't this war be  
 23 discussed in congress  
 24 (>0.2)  
 25 Jo: with our commitment over there of men (.)  
 26 and as much money as we are spending in fighting  
 27 the war (.) isn't this something that should be  
 28 (>0.2) debated **AND** discussed in the congress of  
 29 the united states  
 30 (>0.2)  
 31 Pr: i would see no objection to having (.) a discussion in  
 32 congress (.) uhh provided that discussion (.) uhhh did  
 33 not give the impression of great division in the united  
 34 states and so far as supporting (.) thi: president of the  
 35 united states and (.) uh thi american commitment in  
 36 vietnam (.) now i don't mean by that that everybody in the  
 37 united states has to agree (.) with the commitment (.) uh  
 38 and i don't mean by that that every congressman and senator  
 39 must agree (.) uh but if (.) we had in the senate of the  
 40 united states where this discussion would primarily take  
 41 place because the senate has more influence on foreign  
 42 policy than the house as we know (.) but if a discussion  
 43 wherta a great debate wherta take place .hhh which was  
 44 blown up out of proportion a- an(d) particularly in the  
 45 communist world i have (.) uh no doubt in my mind but  
 46 that this would have a tendency to enCOUrage our enemies  
 47 uhh to indicate that there was division in the united states  
 48 far greater than actually exist [uhh]  
 49 Jo: [are ] you af- are you afraid  
 50 that it might be discussed (.) uhh with

51 [ political ]  
52 Pr: [irresponsibly you mean ]  
53 Jo: with political (.) overt[ones]  
54 Pr: [uhhh]  
55 (.) well interestingly and ironically uhhh not political or  
56 partisan overtones because .hh uh as you will note and  
57 as most uhh viewers will note uhh the republicans (.) for  
58 the most part are supporting (.) thi:- uh the- the Johnson  
59 administration and what it's doing in vietnam (.) the division  
60 is in the democratic party (.) uhh so you wouldn't have a  
61 partisan discussion (.) but inevitably there would be a break  
62 down uhhh between those who support the firm line and  
63 those who believe that we do something else (.) just let  
64 me add one other thing (.) i think that at this ti:me uh there  
65 should not be a great debate about vietnam uh i think that  
66 at this time for example when the president has peace  
67 emissaries going to various capitals of the world uh that  
68 **ALL** (.) uh responsible people uh should have a moratorium  
69 on their discussion of what the us policy should BE (.) as far as  
70 i'm concerned for example if you werta ask me (.) and it would  
71 be a very appropriate question but would not be appropriate for  
72 me to answer it (.) if you werta asked me what i think of the  
73 president's policy and of the peace emissaries i would say (.) i  
74 would have no comment ↓  
75 Jo: [what do you think of thi: uh]  
76 Pr: [ because at a TI::ME ]  
77 Jo: oh (.) [ hehehehehe ]  
78 Pr: [i would- i would- i wou]ld only suggest it at a time (.)  
79 when negotiations are taking place or when they are being  
80 talked about this is a time uhh when all those who do not have  
81 (.) knowledge as to what's going on (.) should be silent  
82 Jo: fine (.) we'll get off the subject  
83 Pr: hehe

Appendix 2: CBS TV interview with President John Fitzgerald Kennedy on Sept. 2, 1963 - [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bOGWTEgta\\_w](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bOGWTEgta_w) – 11.26 mn to 17.42 mn

Jo = Journalist; Pr = President

1 Jo: mister president speaking of congress thi- uhh .hh  
 2 thi uhh atom (.) test ban (.) treaty (.) comes up to  
 3 the senate next uh few days (.) .hh and everybody  
 4 is predicting as i believe you are that it's goina pass  
 5 by a very good majority (.) .hh but uh as all of thi (.)  
 6 argument about it discussion about it (.) and even  
 7 suggestions from (.) high places including former  
 8 president eisenhower reserVAtion on- on the treaty  
 9 (.) do you think that that this has HUrt thi spirit that  
 10 prevailed in getting this treaty in the first place ↓  
 11 Pr: NO: if thi- (s) if thi treaty is so- is not substantial  
 12 enough to stand discussion and debate (.) then of  
 13 course it isn't a very good treaty so i don't- uh (.) i  
 14 think what would be most desirable is after all this  
 15 discussion and debate then to get a very strong vote  
 16 in the senate ↓ i think the reservation'd be a great  
 17 mistake (.) i don't think president eisenhower (>0.2)  
 18 used the reservation in the formal sense that he  
 19 wanted the senate of the united states (.) to put a  
 20 reservation on the treaty because that would mean  
 21 that the treaty would have to be renegotiate (.) he  
 22 was concerned that uh we would uh make it very  
 23 clear that uh we have the right to use nuclear  
 24 weapons in time of war well of course we do have  
 25 that right we stated it (.) the committee report of the  
 26 senate (foreign relations) committee will restate it so  
 27 i think that that would deal with the problem that  
 28 concerned him (.) otherwise i think a reservation  
 29 would- uh which would require us to renegotiate the  
 30 treaty with nearly a hundred countries (.) my opinion  
 31 would be i'd .hh be better to defeat the treaty  
 32 Jo: .hh mister president thi (.) only (.) hot war we've got  
 33 running at the moment is of course the one in vietna:m  
 34 uhh and we've got our difficulties there quite obviously  
 35 .hhh uh thi headline n' the story in the new york times  
 36 yesterday morning was rather (.) an interesting one it  
 37 said that uh (.) the administration will try diplomacy  
 38 in vietnam hehe which i'd assume we've been trying  
 39 all along  
 40 Pr: yeah  
 41 Jo: uhh what CAN we do in this situation which uh  
 42 seems to parallel other (.) uh famous deBAcles of uh  
 43 dealing with unpopular governments in the pa(st)  
 44 (>0.2)  
 45 Pr: well in the first place we oughta realize that vietnam  
 46 has been at war for twenty five years (.) and uhh the  
 47 japanese [...] (nese) i remember a good many uh  
 48 people who said that two years ago >thadi< wouldn't  
 49 last six months (.) °a° good many newspapers said  
 50 that (.) uhhh a good many local correspondents said

51 it well it's still- the war is still going and in many ways  
 52 it's going better (.) that doesn't mean however that (.)  
 53 the events of the last two months ani't (.) very ominous  
 54 (.) i don't think that uhh unless A (.) greater effort is  
 55 made by the government to win popular support that-  
 56 (wer) that the war can be won out there (.) n' the final  
 57 analysis it's their wa:r (.) they're the ones who have to  
 58 win it or lose it we can help them (.) we can give them  
 59 equipment we can send our (.) men out there as advisers  
 60 but they have to (.) win it the people of vietnam  
 61 against the communists  
 62 (>0.2)  
 63 we are prepared to continue to assist them (.) but i  
 64 don't think that the war can be wON unless the people  
 65 support the effort and in my opinion in the last two  
 66 months the government has gotten out of touch with  
 67 the people (.) thi repressions against the buddhists uh  
 68 we felt were very unwise (.) now uh all we can do is to  
 69 make it very clear (.) that we don't think this is the way to  
 70 win (.) and mas my hope that this will become  
 71 increasingly obvious to the government that they will  
 72 take steps and try to (.) bring BACK (.) popular support  
 73 for this very essential struggle (.) but these people who  
 74 say that uh we oughta withdraw from vietnam are uh  
 75 wholly wrong because if we withdrew from vietnam the  
 76 communists would control vietnam (.) pretty soon  
 77 thailand cambodia laos (.) malaya (.) would go: and all  
 78 of south east asia would be under the control of the  
 79 communists n' under domination of the chinese (.) then  
 80 india (.) burma would be the next target (.) so i think we  
 81 should stay: we should make it clear as ambassador (lodge)  
 82 did now making it clear that while we wanna help we don't  
 83 see a successful endin' de this war unless the people will  
 84 support it and the people will not support the effort (.) if  
 85 uh the government continues to follow the policy ov the  
 86 past two months (.) i hope that'll be clear to the government  
 87 (.) SShould be after all they've been conducting this struggle  
 88 for ten years and uhh i admire what thi president has done  
 89 (.) he's been counted out a number of times i'm hopeful that  
 90 he will come to see that uh (.) they have to reestablish their  
 91 relationship  
 92 Jo: do y[ou think ]  
 93 Pr: [but we ough]ta remember that they're the ones who  
 94 are dying by the thousands (.) and uh they're the ones who  
 95 have to win this war or they're the ones who'll lose it we  
 96 can't do either we can assIST them to win it and we can  
 97 warn them against loosing it (.) but the united states is  
 98 not the- (.) we don't have troupes (.) in the- (.) in ma:sh  
 99 who are dying by the thousands and uh uhh we do the best  
 100 we can to make it clear what policy they should follow but  
 101 they have to decide it  
 102 Jo: do you think that uh (.) this government still has  
 103 time to uh t[o regain the support of t]he people ↑  
 104 Pr: [ ye::s (.) i do: ]  
 105 (>0.2)

106 with changes uh in policy and uh perhaps with  
 107 uh in personnel i think it **CA:N** (.) if it doesn't  
 108 uh (.) make those changes (.) i would think that  
 109 the chances of winning it would not be very good  
 110 Jo: hasn't every indication from uh saigon been that  
 111 uh (.) president diêm has no intention of  
 112 changing his pattern =  
 113 Pr: = if he doesn't change it then of course that's (.)  
 114 his decision he's been there ten years n' as i say  
 115 he has carried this burden uh well he's been  
 116 counted out a number of occasions **OUR** best  
 117 judgment is that he can't be successful in this  
 118 basis (.) we hope that **HE** comes to see that but  
 119 in the final analysis it's the people and the  
 120 government themselves who have to win or lose  
 121 this struggle all we can do is **HELP** (.) and we're  
 122 making it very clear (.) but i don't agree with those  
 123 who say we should withdraw (.) that'd be a great  
 124 mistake that'd be a great mistake i know people  
 125 don't like americans to be engaged in this kind  
 126 of an effort n' forty seven americans have been  
 127 killed (.) in combat (.) with the enemy (.) uh but  
 128 uhh this is a very important (uh) struggle even  
 129 though it's far away (.) we **TOO**k all this (.) made  
 130 this effort to defend europe now europe is quite  
 131 secure (.) we also have to participate (.) we might  
 132 not **L**ike it in the defense of asia (.) we are in a very  
 133 uhh desperate struggle (.) against the communist  
 134 system and uhh i don't want asia to pass under the  
 135 control of the chinese i would think that would  
 136 threaten the security **NO**t like today but uh in the  
 137 nineteen seventies the late sixties that would  
 138 substantially increase our problem increase the  
 139 danger to india (.) which's five hundred million  
 140 people (.) and uhh that would join with the rest of  
 141 the (.) communist bloc uh (>0.2) they'd be that  
 142 much nearer to us

Appendix 3: President John Fitzgerald Kennedy after two years (1962) -  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=74LDApCWe\\_0](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=74LDApCWe_0) – 10.00 mn to 15.38 mn

Jo = Journalist      Pr = President

1 Jo: you were (.) once said that you were (.) reading morning  
 2 ((enjoyin at less)) (.) are you still as avid a newspaper  
 3 (>0.2) reader magazine (.) i remember those of us who  
 4 traveled with you on the campaign a magazine wasn't  
 5 safe around you dudu

6 Pr: oh it is no no (.) i think it's eeh invaluable even though  
 7 it may (.) .hh cause you uh some uh it's never pleasant  
 8 to be reading uh things uh frequently that are (.) uhh (.)  
 9 not uh agreeable news but (.) i- i would say that uh it's  
 10 an invaluable uhh arm of the presidency as a CHEck  
 11 really on what's going on in a- in administration and  
 12 more things come to my attention that uh cause me the  
 13 concern or give me information .hhh so (>0.2) i would  
 14 think that mister khrushchev o- operating in totalitarian  
 15 system which as many (.) advantages as far as being  
 16 able to move in secret and all the rest (.) there's a  
 17 terri:::fic disadvantage not having thi (.) abrasive (>0.2)  
 18 quality of the press applied to you daily to an  
 19 administration

20 Jo: when you have

21 Pr: even though we never like it even though we don't uh  
 22 even though we wished they didn't write it even though  
 23 we disapprove there still is (.) .hhh there isn't any doubt  
 24 that we couldn't do the job at all in a free society without  
 25 a very very active (.) press ↓ now on the other hand the  
 26 press has a responsibility not to distort things for political  
 27 purposes .hhhh not to just take some news in order to prove  
 28 a political point seems to me THEIr obligation is to be as  
 29 tough as they can on administration but do it ↑ in a way  
 30 which is directed towards getting as close to the truth as  
 31 they can get (.) and not merely (.) because of some political  
 32 uh motivations

33 Jo: mister president uh in the light of the election returns which  
 34 (.) at the congressional level at least were certainly a defeat  
 35 for the republican hopes (.) .hh how do you measure your  
 36 chances for significant success domestically (.) in the  
 37 congress just ahead

38 Pr: well i think we'll be in about the same position of the last  
 39 two years (.) and i think that uhhh as i say what we have is  
 40 controversial will be very closely uh contested

41 Jo: did the complexion in the house change a little bit by the  
 42 shi:ft[s ((inaudible)) ]

43 Pr: [i would say it's SLI]ghtly against us more than it  
 44 was ↓ but not quite as good shape as it was for the last  
 45 two years (.) but uh we're about where we were the last  
 46 two years which means every vote will be three or four  
 47 votes either way

48 Jo: [would you ]

49 Pr: [winning or loo]sing

50 Jo: do you have a very crucial vote at the outset on this

51 rules committee fight again do you think and uhh =  
52 Pr: = i hope that the rules committee is kept to its  
53 present uhh number because we can't function if it  
54 isn't (.) besides well we're through if we loose uh  
55 if- if they try to change the rules nothing controversial  
56 in that case would come to the floor of the congress (.)  
57 [our whole pro]gram would be emasculated  
58 Jo: [in other words]  
59 Jo: as a young congressman sir you voted (.) to impose a  
60 two term limitation on presidents (.) now that you held  
61 the office for a while and also observed this effect on  
62 president eisenhower's second term (.) would you  
63 repeat that vote E:ven if the amendment did not apply  
64 to yourself  
65 Pr: yes i would- uhh i would i know the conditions were  
66 special .hh in forty seven (.) uhhh but uhh i think eight  
67 years is enough (.) and i'm not sure that a president if  
68 he('s) (.) in my case if i were reelected uh that you're in  
69 su- a such a disadvantage uhhh (.) there aren't many  
70 jo:bs uh that isn't the power of the presidency patronage  
71 at all that's the ((afeal of)) the first month most of those  
72 jobs belong to the members of the congress anyway so  
73 PAtronage isn't the fact i think that many other powers  
74 the presidency that run in the second term as well as the  
75 first  
76 Jo: well mister president ON that point  
77 Pr: the fact is president eisenhower has great influence  
78 toDAY (.) in the republican party and therefore in  
79 the country and has great influence in foreign policy  
80 and doesn't even hold office (.) in some ways his  
81 influence is greater in some- to some degree (.) so  
82 that the- the same is really true uh also president  
83 truman president hoover .hh i don't think that uh it  
84 depends on uh the- thi influence of a president uh  
85 's still substantial in his second term ↓ (.) though i  
86 haven't had a second term i think it i[s hehehe ]  
87 Jo: [hehehe ]  
88 ((inaudible))  
89 Jo: mister president (>0.2) i'm not (.) uh point much of  
90 your program (>0.2) still remains to be passed by the  
91 congress (.) .hh there are some people (.) who say that  
92 you need to do it in the next two years (.) or it won't  
93 be done (.) should you be elected to a second term ↓ do  
94 you share that point of view  
95 Pr: you know in the first place i think we got a lot by: i  
96 uh just looking at what we set out to do in january  
97 sixty one the other day and on (.) uhhh taxes and on  
98 social security welfare changes and area  
99 redevelopment an' minimum wage the peace cor the  
100 alliance for progress [...] strengthening the defenses  
101 strengthening our space program we did all (.) those  
102 things .hhh the trade bill (.) not perhaps to the extent in  
103 every case of our original proposal but substantial  
104 PROgress i think we can do some more in the next two  
105 years (.) and i would think that there going to be new

106 problems in sixty (.) if i were reelected in sixty five  
107 and i would- (.) i don't think- i don't look at the  
108 second term as a necessarily a uh decline ( $>0.2$ ) uh i  
109 don't think that all in fact i think you know much  
110 MOre about the position it's a tremendous change  
111 to go from being a senator to being president in  
112 the first months it's uhuh uh uh a very difficult  
113 (.) but i have no reason to believe that a president  
114 with the powers of this office and the responsibilities  
115 placed on it (.) if he has a judgment that something  
116 need to be done i think he can do it just as well the  
117 second time as the first depending of course on the  
118 make up of the congress (.) the fact IS i think the  
119 congress looks more powerful sitting here than it  
120 did when i was there in the congress (.) but that's  
121 because (.) when you're in congress you're one of  
122 a hundred in the senate or one of four hundred and  
123 thirty five in the house .hhh so that your's- the power  
124 is so divided (.) but from here i look at **A:** congress  
125 (.) and i look at the collective power of the congress  
126 particularly the block action (.) which if 't wants to (.)  
127 and it's a su- substantial power

Appendix 4: Frost/Nixon (1977) Segments 1&2 - Watergate/Nixon and the World -  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6tZokyunf2Q> – 56.20 mn to 1h04.24 mn

Jo = Journalist; Pr = President

1 Jo: would you:: (>0.2) go further than mistakes:: (.) that  
 2 you've explained how you got caught up (.) in this  
 3 thing (.) you can ex- you've explained your motives  
 4 .hhhh and all the quibble >of that< any of that (.) but  
 5 just coming to the sheer substance (>0.2) .hh (.) would  
 6 you go further than mistakes: the word (>0.2) that  
 7 seems n- n- not enough for people to understand  
 8 (>0.2)  
 9 Pr: what word would you (.) express  
 10 (>0.2)  
 11 Jo: my goodness that's a hhh. (>0.2) **I** think (.) that there  
 12 are (.) three things (.) since you ask me (.) **I** would  
 13 like to hear you say i think the american people would  
 14 like to hear you say (.) .hhh one is (>0.2) there was  
 15 probably mo:re (.) than (.) mistakes there was (>0.2)  
 16 wrongdoing (.) whether it was a cri:me or not yes it may  
 17 have been a crime too (>0.2) SE:condly (>0.2) hh. (.) i  
 18 did (>0.2) >and i'm saying this without questioning the  
 19 motives right< i **DI**d (.) abuse the power i had as president  
 20 or uh not fulfilled the totality .hhhh of the oath of office  
 21 that- that's the second thing (.) and THI::rdly (.) .hh i put  
 22 the american peo- people through two years of needless  
 23 agony an' i apologize for that (>0.2) and i say that- you've  
 24 explained your motives i think those are the categories (.)  
 25 and i know how difficult it is for anyone and most of all  
 26 you but **I** think (>0.2) that (.) people need to hear it (.) and  
 27 i think unless you say it (.) you're gonna be haunted for the  
 28 rest of your life  
 29 (>0.2)  
 30 Pr: i remember uh hh. that when i (.) let halderman and  
 31 ehrlichman (.) know that they were to resign (>0.2) that i:  
 32 (.) had ray price bring in thi final draft of the speech that  
 33 i was to make the next night (>0.2) and i said to him ray::  
 34 (.) i said if you think i ough(t) to resign i said put that in  
 35 too because i feel responsible ih (>0.2) even though i did  
 36 **NO**t feel that (.) i had uh (.) engaged in these activities  
 37 c**ON**sciously uhhh hh insofar as thi (.) uh (>0.2) knowledge  
 38 of a participation in the break in (.) the approval of hush  
 39 money the approval of uh clemency etcetera the various  
 40 charges that have been made (.) well (.) he didn't put it in  
 41 (>0.2) and uhhh i must say that at that time i seriously  
 42 considered whether i shouldn't resign (.) but on the other  
 43 hand uh i feel that i owe it to history (.) uh to point out that  
 44 from that time on april thirtieth (>0.2) until i resign august  
 45 nine i did some things that were good for this country (.)  
 46 we had the second and third summits (.) i think one of the  
 47 major reasons i stayed in office was (.) my conce:rn (.)  
 48 about keeping the china initiative the soviet initiative (.)  
 49 uh the vietnam fragile peace agreement and (.) then (.)

50 an added dividend the first break through in moving  
51 toward (.) uh not love (.) but at least not war in the  
52 mideast  
53 Jo: yo[u ]  
54 Pr: [an]d NOW coming back to (.) the whole point of  
55 (>0.2) uhhh (.) whether i should have resigned then  
56 (.) and uhh(.) how i feel now (.) let me say i- i just  
57 didn't make mistakes in this period i think some of  
58 my (.) mistakes that uh i regret most deeply came  
59 with the statements that i made afterwards uhhh  
60 some of those statements: uhhh were misleading (.)  
61 uhhh i noticed for example the editor of the  
62 washington post the managing editor ben bradley  
63 wrote .hh couple three months ago something to the  
64 effect that uh as far as his newspaper is concerned he  
65 said WE uhh don't print the truth (.) we print uh what  
66 we kno:w we print what people tells us (.) uhh uhh  
67 and uh this means that we print lies (>0.2) uhhh (.) i  
68 would say that the statements that i made afterwards  
69 (.) were on the big issues true (.) that i was not involved  
70 in the matters that i have spoken to about (.) not  
71 involved in the break in that i did **NO**:t uhh engage in  
72 the- and participate and or approve the payment of money  
73 or the autorisation of clemency which of course were the  
74 essential elements of the cover up that was true (.) uh  
75 **BU**t the statements were misleading in ex**A**:ggerating (.)  
76 in that en**O**:rmous political attack i was under uh it was  
77 a five front war with a fifth column (.) uhh uhh i had a  
78 partisan uh senate committee staff we had a partisan uhh  
79 (.) special prosecutor staff uhh we had a partisan media  
80 we had a partisan judiciary committee st[aff ]  
81 Jo: [((inaudible))]  
82 and the fifth column now under all these circumstances  
83 my reactions and some of the statements and press  
84 conferences and so forth after that (.) i wan(t) to say  
85 right here and now (.) i said things that were not true  
86 (.) **MO**st of them (>0.2) were **FUN**damentally true on  
87 the big issues but (.) without (.) going as far (.) as i  
88 should have gone (.) and saying perhaps that i had  
89 considered other thin[gs ] but had not done them  
90 Jo: [well]  
91 Jo: yo[u mean- you mean- ]  
92 Pr: [and for all those thin]gs i have a very deep  
93 regret  
94 Jo: you got caught up [in so]mething and then it  
95 Pr: [yeah]  
96 snowballed  
97 Pr: it snowballed and (.) it was my fault (.) i'm not blaming  
98 anybody else =  
99 Jo: = so wh[at]  
100 Pr: [**I**]**M** simply saying to you as far as i'm  
101 concerned (>0.2) i not only: (.) regret it (>0.2) i  
102 indicated my (>0.2) own beliefs in this matter  
103 (>0.2) yu when i resigned people didn't think it  
104 was enough to admit mistakes fine (.) i- if they

105 want me to get down grovel on the floor no  
106 N::ever uh because i don't believe i should (.) uhh  
107 (.) on the other hand uhh there are some friends  
108 who say just uh face 'em down there is a conspiracy  
109 to get you there may have been i don't know what  
110 the cia had to do some of their shenanigans and if  
111 you'd have to be told according to a book i read  
112 recently uh i don't know uhh what was going on  
113 in uhhh some republican some democratic circles  
114 as far as the so called impeachment lobby was  
115 concerned uhh however i don't go with the idea  
116 that ther- that what brought me down was a coup  
117 a conspiracy etcetera etcetera etcetera uhhh i  
118 brought myself down i gave them a sword (.) and  
119 they (.) stuck it in (.) and they twisted it with rage  
120 (.) and i guess if i'd been in their position i'd have  
121 done the same thing

Appendix 5: March 24, 1961 : New First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy interviewed by Sander Vanocur - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j3ZvIzL1JbI> – 4.37 mn to 10.19 mn

Jo = Journalist ; Fr = First Lady

- 1 Jo: you mentioned before: theodore roosevelt (.) bringing  
 2 an architect who was it uhm (.) [°Stanford Way°] (.)  
 3 Fr: St[anford Way ]  
 4 Jo: uhhmm (>0.2) that was really the LA:st first family  
 5 that had small children (>0.2) 'f its own in the white  
 6 house (>0.2) d'you find the white house is a very good  
 7 place to raise children ↑ how 's your LI:fe changed since  
 8 you've (.) [come he]re  
 9 Fr: [ well ] it is rather hard with children there's  
 10 so little privacy (.) i don't mind uhm (>0.2) for myself but-  
 11 uh but i think it's very hard with the:m (.) for instance i  
 12 wante(d) to take my daughter to the circus last week and i  
 13 decided .hhh (.) i just shouldn't because that would ruin it  
 14 for her (.) .hh i work so hard to make a little ballet school  
 15 a private thing that we could do together .hh (.) 'n there  
 16 were all the photographers waitin when we got there (.) so  
 17 it's a little hard  
 18 (.)  
 19 Jo: well (.) d'you really (.) hope mrs kennedy (.) that you can  
 20 achieve this aim (.) to keep (.) a private life (.) [ for ] your  
 21 Fr: [ .hhh ]  
 22 children ↑ is this really (>0.2) possible now that you're in  
 23 the white house  
 24 Fr: .hh well i hoped it was you rather discourage me (.) mister  
 25 vanocur but i hope it is and i'm gonna try very hard to do  
 26 that (.) .hh because otherwise (.) .hhhh how can i bring up  
 27 (.) normal children (.) if they can't be treated that way  
 28 (>0.2)  
 29 Jo: .hh do you think that caroline for example who's older than  
 30 (.) john junior uh has she been changed much by the  
 31 attention she's gotten  
 32 Fr: no: .hhh (.) because she's still too little (.) but some day  
 33 she's gonna have to go to school (.) and uh .hhh if she's  
 34 in the papers all the time that would affect her little  
 35 classmates and they'll treat her differently (.) that's what  
 36 i'm so anxious ↓ we always treat er the same but it's how  
 37 other people treat er (.) because they've read about her  
 38 Jo: are you going to send her to a school when she reaches  
 39 (.) kindergarten age  
 40 Fr: .hhh yes i will (.) uhm she must do all the normal things  
 41 she'd do normally (.) .hh but i'd rather hold my breath  
 42 about that day  
 43 (>0.2)  
 44 Jo: what do you conceive (.) is your role (.) as the first lady  
 45 and i mean your role mrs kennedy  
 46 (.)  
 47 Fr: of course i do have an official role as wife of the  
 48 president (.) .hh and i think every first lady (.) .hhhhh  
 49 should do something in this position to help the things  
 50 she cares about (.) i would hope that when i leave here

51 i will have done something (>0.2) to help in the- .hh to  
 52 make (>0.2) well (.) in the Arts where i whi- in which  
 53 i'm so interested (.) anything to do with children  
 54 Jo: d'you think that the first lady (>0.2) in this instance  
 55 yourself (>0.2) can play a role in influencing taste (.) in  
 56 this country (.) in the arts (.) in other fields  
 57 (>0.2)  
 58 Fr: .hh i suppose she can uh (.) people seem so interested in  
 59 whatever the f:- first family likes (.) that's what i think  
 60 one can lead one doesn't know whether one leads (.) in-  
 61 in the right direction now b- one hopes one does  
 62 Jo: well can you enjoy these things i wonder if you enjoyed  
 63 the ballet when you went to it new york city recently  
 64 Fr: .hh yes once the lights went down i enjoyed it enormously  
 65 Jo: but not before  
 66 Fr: (hehe) i' was rather exciting  
 67 Jo: but ON this question of the official hostess (.) a couple  
 68 of weeks ago (.) the president (.) entertained an important  
 69 (.) head of state from africa (.) uh prime minister nkrumah  
 70 (.) did you know before (.) that the president was going to  
 71 bring him over or was he (.) just like (.) many husbands (.)  
 72 prone to just drop in and say i have a guest (.) for tea  
 73 Fr: .hh well he promised me that i coul(d) meet him (.) the  
 74 president nkrumah .hhhh but the day went by and he never  
 75 seemed to appear so my daughter and i were on our way to  
 76 his office (.) when uh my husband (.) president nkrumah  
 77 came rushing back to a rather messy room where i'd been  
 78 unpacking books  
 79 Jo: huh was he expecting tea or formal [(.) (affair)]  
 80 Fr: [hhh no he] was  
 81 absolutely charming he sat down and laughed and  
 82 talked with us and told us about his own children (.)  
 83 .hh i was so glad to see that .hh he was so relaxed caus i  
 84 was rather embarrassed uhm (.) being surprised lik- like  
 85 that by my husban i'd expected that he would tell me a few  
 86 minutes before  
 87 Jo: non as your official role as a hostess (.) at the white  
 88 house (.) thi role as the first lady (.) and things that interest  
 89 you (.) if it's not presumptuous mrs kennedy what about  
 90 your role as a mother and a wife can one have a role as first  
 91 lady (.) we haven't had a first lady who's had young children  
 92 for such a long time (.) are you optimistic about fulfilling  
 93 this role in the same way you did before  
 94 Fr: yes i think it doesn't matter what else you do if you don't do  
 95 that part well (.) if you fail your husband and your children  
 96 (.) uhm .hhh that really is the role which means the most to  
 97 me though obviously i have a (>0.2) deep sense of  
 98 obligation for the others but that's the one that comes first  
 99 Jo: an' has it been more difficult ((tel)) honestly (.) to fulfill this  
 100 role  
 101 Fr: since we've been in the white h[ouse ↑ ]  
 102 Jo: [yes mam']  
 103 Fr: .hhhhh no my husband loves (.) a challenge and uhm  
 104 (.) i do to (.) he set me a good example (.) so (>0.2)  
 105 let's hope it works out

106 Jo: thank you very very much mrs kennedy it was most  
107 gracious of you to have us here  
108 Fr: thank you mister vanocur i enjoyed it

Appendix 6: Bush's final days – <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BRlyhszTVc0> – 1.28 mn to 5.40 mn

Jo = Journalist; Pr = President

- 1 Jo: do you feel in any way responsible (>0.2) for what's happening =  
 2 Pr: = .hhh >yihknow< i'm in the president doing this period of time but  
 3 i think (.) uhh when the history of this period is written people'll  
 4 realize .hhh a lot of the decisions (.) uh that were made on wall  
 5 street (.) .hh took place over (>0.2) >yihknow< a- a- a decade or  
 6 so beFOre i arrived in president DURING i arrived in president (.)  
 7 i'm SORry it's happening ov course obviously .hhh i don't like the  
 8 idea of people (>0.2) losing jobs or being worried about their four oh  
 9 one k's .hh ON the other hand the american people got to know that-  
 10 uh that we will safeguard the system (.) i mean we're IN and if we  
 11 need to be in more we WILL  
 12 Jo: but was there an uh- uh oh moment °and I° could probably use stronger  
 13 language than th[at when you thought thi]s really [(.) could be bad]  
 14 Pr: [yeah hehehe (.) .hhh ] [ WELL ]  
 15 (.) when you have >the secretary 'f the treasury and the chairman of the  
 16 fed< (>0.2) say if we don't act bo:ldly (>0.2) we could be in a depression  
 17 >greater (than a beat) uhh< a great depression that's an uh oh moment but  
 18 (.) the question is ↑is it worth it to save the system to SAFEguard the  
 19 system and i came to the conclusion along with other smart people  
 20 >that it is<  
 21 Jo: i found you to be an EXCellent (>0.2) POLitical (>0.2) Analyst (.) and  
 22 [>COMmen]tator<  
 23 Pr: [ hehehe ] whhy:: i try not to: [ hehehehehe ]  
 24 Jo: [>whadya think] 'f< the campaign↓  
 25 Pr: .hhh i thought- uhhh (.) i thought uh uh my candidate for president john  
 26 mccain had a TOUgh headwind (>0.2) .hh uhh (.) for two reasons one (.)  
 27 .hh rarely does the american peopl- Do the american people give .hh A  
 28 political party three ter:ms (>0.2) and >that in itself was difficult for him<  
 29 (.) obviously the economic situation made it awfully difficult for jo:hn  
 30 mccain to get a message ou(t) (.) .hhh and i felt that (.) uh barack obama  
 31 ran a very disciplined (.) uhhh uhhh campaign  
 32 Jo: given the conditions (>0.2) and the economy (>0.2) is there any way  
 33 john mccain could have won↑  
 34 Pr: .hhh (i)t's hard to see it (>0.2) in RETrospect (.) i think the >thing intresting  
 35 thing 'bout<the way people analyze campaigns (is that) they always look  
 37 at the negative si:de (.) uhh the positive side (.) from- from barack obama's  
 38 perspective 's he had a really good campaign (.)  
 39 (i mean) this guy (>0.2) i'm told raised a hundred and fifty million dollars  
 40 in ONE MONth (.) .hh uhh that meant a lot of people were FOR him for  
 41 president  
 42 Jo: was the election in any way (>0.2) a repudiation of the bush administration↓  
 43 Pr: .hhh i think it was a repudiation ov republicans:: (>0.2) uuuh- and uh and  
 44 you know i'm sure (.) some people voted for (.) barack obama 'cause of  
 45 me (.) uhh i think most people voted for barack obama 'cause they decided  
 46 they wanted him to be in their living room for the next four years explaining  
 47 policy now (ziz) they made a conscious choice to put him in as president  
 48 uhh[hh .hh]  
 49 Jo: [ bu: ]t BO:th  
 50 candidates wound up (.) criticizing you a IO:(t)  
 51 Pr: yeah well that's what happens when you're the incumbent during

52 a tough economic time but [ .hhhh ]  
53 Jo: [HURT↑]  
54 Pr: **NO::** not really i mean yea: i've been around politics a long ti:me i  
55 remember i was the guy in two thousand who **CAM**paigned for chan:ge  
56 (>0.2)  
57 .hh i **CAM**paigned for change when i ran for governor of texas  
58 the only time i **REALLY** didn't **CAM**paign for change was when i was  
59 running for reelection  
60 Jo: let's talk a little bit about (>0.2) eight years as being president (.)  
61 what were you most **UN**prepared for↑  
62 Pr: .hhhhh **WE**ll i think i was hh. unprepared for war  
63 (>0.2)  
64 Pr: >notherwords< i didn't **CAM**paign and said (.) please vote for me  
65 i'll be able to **HAN**dle (>0.2) **A-** uhh an att::ck (.) >i 'notherwords<  
66 i didn't an**T**icipate war uhhh presidents (.) one of the thing about  
67 the modern **PRE**sidency (.) is that (.) the unexpected will happen  
68 Jo: what **DON**'t the american people know about being president↓ (.)  
69 what would surpri:se them (.) the mo:st↑  
70 Pr: i think people look at the white house 'n say oh man what a  
71 miserable experience it is  
72 (>0.2)  
73 Pr: to be **PRE**sident  
74 (>0.2)  
75 >yihknow< there's a lot of noise  
76 a lot of criticism a lot of name calling >a lot of this a lot of that< (.)  
77 but some days we're not so happy some days happy (.) every day's  
78 been pretty joyous so  
79 Jo: that's the **SE**cond time i've heard you use the word joyful (.) about the  
80 presidency (.) and that might take people by surprise↓(. **E**:ven (.) in  
81 really **TOU**gh times ↑  
82 Pr: oh yea: .hhh i don't want people to misconstrue it's not i don't feel  
83 **JOY**ful when somebody loses their life nor do i feel **JOY**ful from  
84 somebody loses a jo:b (.) it concerns me: .hhh and uhh >yihknow<  
85 a president ends up (.) >yihknow< carrying a lot of people's gri:ef (.)  
86 uh in 'is soul (.) but the idea of being able to serve a nation you love  
87 (>0.2) uh is- is- uhh is's been joyful >'nuvwords< my spirits have  
88 never been down↓ (.) i have been sa::d ↓(>0.2) .hh but the spirits are up↑

Appendix 7: Bill O'Reilly interviews President Barack Obama before the Super Bowl - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9uzJYlbhH54> – beginning to 6.40 mn

Pr = President; Jo = Journalist

1 Jo: mister president thank you for doing this  
 2 Pr: great to be with you  
 3 Jo: really appreciate it (.) .hhh i wan(t) to get some  
 4 things on the record (.) hh. so let's beginning  
 5 with health care  
 6 Pr: yeah  
 7 Jo: october first it rolls out  
 8 Pr: right  
 9 Jo: immediately there a:re problems with thi computers  
 10 Pr: right  
 11 (.)  
 12 Jo: when did **YOU** know there were gonna be problems  
 13 with those computers  
 14 Pr: well i think we all anticipated that there'd be glitches  
 15 cause any time you got technology a new program  
 16 rolling out there gonna be some glitches .hh i don't  
 17 think (.) uh i anticipated or anybody anticipated uhhh  
 18 the degree of the problems with the website [an::d]  
 19 Jo: [right] so  
 20 you just didn't know when it rolled out that this was  
 21 going to [be a (.) problem]  
 22 Pr: [ well (.) i ] don't think- as i said i don't  
 23 think anybody anticipated the- the- the degree of uhh  
 24 problems that you'd had on healthcare.gov uh the good  
 25 news is is that right away we decided how we're gonna  
 26 fix it (.) it got fixed uh within a month and a half (.) uh  
 27 it was up and running and now it's working the way it's  
 28 suppo[ sed to ] and we've signed up  
 29 Jo: [((click of tongue)) .hhh ]  
 30 three million people  
 31 Jo: i don't know about that because uh last week there was  
 32 an associated press poll of people who actually went to  
 33 the website and only eight percent of them feel that it's  
 34 working .hh (.) well working (.) well (.) why didn't you  
 35 fire sebelius thi uh secretary in charge of this  
 36 Pr: yeah =  
 37 Jo: = because i mean she had to know after all those years  
 38 and all that money that it wasn't gonna work  
 39 Pr: you know my main priority right now is making sure  
 40 that it delivers (.) for the american people  
 41 [ an::d what we ' ve- ]  
 42 Jo: [>you're not gonna answer that<]  
 43 Pr: what what we've ended up doing is we've got three  
 44 million people signed up (.) **SO FAR** (.) we're about  
 45 a month behind of where we anticipated we wanted to  
 46 be (.) we've got over six million people who've signed  
 47 up for medic aid  
 48 Jo: yeah =  
 49 Pr: = we've got three million young people uhhh under the  
 50 age of twenty six who were signed up on their parents'

51 plan and so (.) (mm) what we're constantly figuring out  
52 is how do we continue to improve it ↑ how do we make  
53 sure that the folks who don't have health insurance can  
54 get heal[th insu]rance  
55 Jo: [okay ]  
56 Pr: and those who are under insured are able to get better  
57 health insuran[ce]  
58 Jo: [ i-] i'm sure- i'm **SU**:re that thi uh intent  
59 is noble but i'm a tax payer  
60 Pr: yeah  
61 Jo: and i'm paying kathleen sebelius's salary and  
62 [she screwed up]  
63 Pr: [°yeah (.) yeah°]  
64 Jo: and you're not holding her uncountab[le ]  
65 Pr: [yeah] WEll i- i  
66 promise you that we hold everybody up and down the  
67 line uncountable (.) BUt  
68 Jo: she still [ are ]  
69 Pr: [when] we're in- when we're midstream (.) bill  
70 that we wanna make sure that (.) our main focus is (.)  
71 HOw do we make this thing work so that people are  
72 able to sign up and that's what we've done =  
73 Jo: = alright (.) .hhh was it thi: biggest mistake of your  
74 presidency to tell the nation over and over (.) if you like  
75 your insurance you can keep your insurance  
76 Pr: oh:: (.) bill you've got a long list of my mistakes in  
77 [my presidency (but- but- but-) but this is- ]  
78 Jo: [no really for YOU: wasn't that the biggest one]  
79 Pr: this is one that (.) uh i regret ↓ and i've said i regretted  
80 in part because we put in a grandfather clause (.) in the  
81 original law saying (.) that in fact (.) you were supposed  
82 to be able to keep it (.) it obviously didn't cover everybody  
83 that we needed to and that's why we changed it so that (.)  
84 we further grandfathered in folks an::d many people who  
85 thought and originally when they got that cancellation  
86 notice they couldn't keep it are now  
87 [ keepin' it ↓ (.) SO:: ]  
88 Jo: [ it's in the past but isn't th]at the biggest mistake ↑  
89 Pr: well i- you know bill as i said (.) (wwe)  
90 Jo: you gave your en[emies a lot of fodder for it]  
91 Pr: [ you- you- you- ] you- you  
92 were very generous in saying i look pretty good uhh  
93 considering i've been in the presidency for five years  
94 and (.) i think part of the reason is (.) i try to focus (.)  
95 not on (.) the fumbles but on the next plan =  
96 Jo: = alright .hhh libya (.) a harr- house arm services  
97 testimony (.) .hhh general carter ham  
98 Pr: mm hm  
99 Jo: you know the general =  
100 Pr: = yeah =  
101 Jo: = security in africa  
102 Pr: °yeah°  
103 Jo: he testified it that on the day that the ambassador  
104 was murdered and the three other americans (.) alright  
105 HE told secretary panetta it was a terrorist attack

106 Pr: huhm =  
 107 Jo: = shortly after ham general ham said that (.) .hh  
 108 secretary panetta came in  
 109 Pr: ye[ah]  
 110 Jo: [to ] you  
 111 Pr: yeah  
 112 Jo: did he tell YOU: (.) secretary panetta it was (.) a  
 113 terrorist attack =  
 114 Pr: = you know what he told me was that there was (.)  
 115 an attack on our compound =  
 116 Jo: = he didn't te[ll- he didn't u]se the word terror ↑  
 117 Pr: [in bengahazi ]  
 118 Pr: you know hhh. eaha in- in the heat of the moment bill  
 119 what folks are focused on is (.) what's happening on the  
 120 ground (>0.2) do we have eyes on it (.) how can we make  
 121 sure our folks [ are secu:re (.) so: i i've ]  
 122 Jo: [yeah but i just want to get this on the record]  
 123 did he tell you it was a terror attack =  
 124 Pr: = bill and what i'm- i'm answering your question ↓ what he  
 125 said to me was (.) we've got an attack on our compound  
 126 w[e don't know ye]t- (.) we don't know yet who's  
 127 Jo: [no terror attack ]  
 128 doing it (.) UNderstand by definition bill when somebody  
 129 is attacking our compound =  
 130 Jo: = yeah::  
 131 Pr: that's an act of terror (.) which is how i characterized  
 132 it the da[y afte]r it happened so (.) thi-  
 133 Jo: [but the]  
 134 so the question ends up being (.) who in fact was (.)  
 135 attacking us  
 136 Jo: but it's mo[re than that though because of susan rice- ]  
 137 Pr: [ (.) and- and- and- but we (.) ] no: =  
 138 Jo: = it's more than that because if susan rice goes out and  
 139 tells the world that it was (.) a spontaneous  
 140 demonstr[atio]n  
 141 Pr: [ no ]  
 142 Jo: off a videotape ↓ but your- [you]r commander's and the  
 143 Pr: [bill-]  
 144 secretary of defense know it's a terror  
 145 atta[ck (.) just as an american i'm just confused]  
 146 Pr: [no BILL- BILL- BILL- and- and- i'm a]nd- and-  
 147 and i'm trying to explain it to you if you (.) want to listen  
 148 (>0.2) (and) the fact of the matter iz iz that people  
 149 understood at the time something (.) very dangerous was  
 150 happening (.) that we were focused on making sure that  
 151 we did everything we can- could to protect them (.) in the  
 152 aftermath what became clea:r (.) was that (.) the security  
 153 was lax (.) that not all the precautions duhh [that ] needed  
 154 Jo: [hhh.]  
 155 to be taken were taken (.) an::d both myself and  
 156 secretary clinton and others indicated as much (.) but  
 157 at the moment (.) when these things happen bill on the  
 158 other side of the worl[d people- people- tha]t's people  
 159 Jo: [ it's the fog of war ]  
 160 don't kno:w at the very moment exactly why

161 something like this happens and when you LOO:K (.)  
 162 at the videotape (.) of this whole thing unfolding (.)  
 163 this is not some (.) systematic (.) well organized  
 164 process you see: =  
 165 Jo: = it was heavy  
 166 we[apons used and that's- that's the thing heavy weapons (.) comin' in]  
 167 Pr: [ you- you- s:- what you s:- what you s: bill- (.) ]  
 168 Pr: bill listen i- i- i've gone through this and (.) [we] have  
 169 Jo: [ .hh ]  
 170 had multiple hearings on it what happens is (.)  
 171 you have an attack like this taking place (.) an::d you  
 172 have a [mix o]f folks who are  
 17 Jo: [ hhhh. ]  
 172 just trouble makers (.) you have folks who have  
 173 an ideological agen[da ↑ ]  
 174 Jo: [ alright ]  
 175 Pr: you have some who a:re (.) affiliated with terrorist  
 176 organizations you have some that are no[t (.) b]ut  
 177 Jo: [ .hhh ]  
 178 the **MAIN** thing that all of us have to take away from  
 179 this is our diplomats are serving in some very  
 180 dangerous places ↓  
 181 Jo: [but there's more- there's more than that though]  
 182 Pr: [and WE've got to- and we've got- and we've got  
 183 to make su:re (.) tha:t not only have we implemented  
 184 ALL the reforms that wer[e recom]mended by the  
 185 Jo: [ okay: ]  
 186 independent agenc[y] but we also have to make sure  
 187 Jo: [ i ]  
 188 that we understan::d our folks out there are in a  
 189 hazardous dangerous situa[tion (.) and we no- but no (wb) ]  
 190 Jo: [ >i think everybody understands that< mister president ]  
 191 Pr: actually not everybody does because wha[t ends up happening-]  
 192 Jo: [ i think they do ]  
 193 Pr: what ends up happening is we end up uh creating a: political (.)  
 194 agenda o[n something which democra]ts  
 195 Jo: [ .hh absolutely and that's that was my next question ]  
 196 and republicans should be unified and trying to figure out how  
 197 we're gonna protect peo[ple ((inaudible))]  
 198 Jo: [ i gott]a get to the irs but  
 199 [i just wa]nna say that there your- your detractors believe  
 200 Pr: [ okay: ]  
 201 Jo: that you did not Tell the world there was a terror attack  
 202 because your camP[AI:gn] didn't want that out  
 203 Pr: [ yeah ]  
 204 Jo: [ .hhh THAT's what ] they belie:ve =  
 205 Pr: [ bill think about ]  
 206 Pr: = and- and- and they believe it because folks like you  
 207 are telling th[em that (.) hahahahaha ]  
 208 Jo: [ no i'm not telling them that i'm asking Y]OU::  
 209 wheth[er you were told there was a terror attack and you ]  
 210 Pr: [and what i'm saying is- and what i'm say]ing is  
 211 that is inaccurate =  
 212 Jo: = alright =  
 213 Pr: = we (tt) revealed to the american people exa:ctly what

214 we understood at the time (.) the notion that we would (.)  
215 hide the ball (>0.2) for political purposes when a week later  
216 we all said (.) in fact there was a terrorist attack (.) taking  
217 place the day after i said it was an act of terror that wouldn't  
218 be a very good cover up [if that's what we were aimin fo ↓]  
219 Jo: [ alright (.) i gotta get ] to  
220 the i[rs ] 'cause i don't know what happened there and  
221 Pr: [yeah]  
222 i'm hoping maybe you can tell us

Appendix 8: Barack Obama on Tavis Smiley (2007) - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XXNGg38UcxU> – 3.19 mn to 8.57 mn

Jo = Journalist ; Pr = President

1 Jo: huhm let me- uh >lemme switch gears and jump right into  
 2 it< i got you for the- for the full show and i'm glad you're  
 3 [here ] on the west coast for a chang[e ]  
 4 Pr: [good] [good]  
 5 Jo: uhhm (>0.2) how do you respond a lot a lot- ov commentary  
 6 about it how do you respond (.) first of all i mean to say  
 7 congratulations i mean and i say this with all sincerity  
 8 because it is **MIND** boggling i mean even more mind  
 9 boggling you and dick cheney being cousins is the fact  
 10 that you have raised more money  
 11 Pr: mm hm  
 12 Jo: than Anybody  
 13 Pr: mm hm  
 14 Jo: democrat or republican running for office seventy ((hits  
 15 left hand palm with back of right hand while saying it))  
 16 five ((hits left hand palm with back of right hand while  
 17 saying it)) million ((hits left hand palm with back of right  
 18 hand while saying it)) dollars ((hits left hand palm with  
 19 back of right hand while saying it))  
 20 Pr: mm hm  
 21 Jo: you know ancestors are jumping up and dow[n screami]ng  
 22 Pr: [well yee::]  
 23 at the thought of you raising that kind of money ↑ =  
 24 Pr: = well especially because we've raised (.) more money (.)  
 25 in small INcrements  
 26 Jo: right =  
 27 Pr: = from small donors than all the democratic candidates  
 28 combined (.) so it's re- it's reflective of the grass roots  
 29 enthusiasm that we've been seeing in the campaign (.)  
 30 uh a:nd >yihknow< the challenge now for us is to make sure  
 31 that we get **KNOWN** (.) uh beyond that (err) enthusiastic BAse  
 32 of supporters (.) to the broader public and >yihknow< that's  
 33 obviously a big challenge uhh you know when you're  
 34 running a national race and you've only been on the national  
 35 scene (.) basically for (.) three and a half four years  
 36 Jo: what's your response to people who say he's raising money  
 37 Pr: uhm  
 38 Jo: but still **S:TU**ck in these polls  
 39 Pr: well look we always viewed (.) hillary clinton as the default  
 40 candidate  
 41 Jo: uhuh  
 42 Pr: i mean you and i both know that in- in the democratic party  
 43 (.) uh the clinton na:me (.) that's a good brand  
 44 Jo: uhmuhm  
 45 Pr: people like bill (.) they like hillary (.) uh (.) we always  
 46 knew going into this race that we were gonna be the  
 47 underdogs (.) a:nd the key for us always was that if people  
 48 knew **ME** as well as they knew **HER** (.) then we would win  
 49 (.) uh and the only way we could do that is to focus on the

50 early states we CAN'T run a national campaign (.) because  
51 we can't run even as much money as i've raised we can't .hh  
52 advertise all across the country so our (z) key strategy has  
53 always been we focus on iowa nevada south carolina new  
54 hampshire (.) that we talk to people about (.) not only health  
55 care and (.) education and energy and iraq all the things that  
56 people (err) you know all the candidates are talking about (.)  
57 Jo: uhuh  
58 Pr: but also talk about (.) (ye) who can bring the country together  
59 to so:lve these problems (.) uh who can overcome the special  
60 interests that stand in the way of solving these problems (.)  
61 who's gonna be straight with the voters and- and tell the truth  
62 a::nd (.) if we can deliver that message uhh in the early states (.)  
63 Jo: uhuh  
64 Pr: and do well (.) then i think that (.) that would translate into the  
65 national but we're not gonna see a change in the national polls  
66 Jo: uhhm  
67 Pr: until the verst- first vote are cast in iowa i mean those are just-  
68 (.) those are reflective of (.) uh the casual voter (.) the person who  
69 doesn't know >you you know< isn't watchin' uh uhhh >yihknow<  
70 the nightly news report all the time (.) who says yeah i sorta  
71 like clinton and obama i like him too but i don't know that  
72 nothing about him and that's our challenge we gotta close that gap  
73 Jo: two quick follow ups only after we have to move on i'm just  
74 reading this stuff everyday you of course are thi: guy you're the  
75 candidate how much truth the stories that we're reading that you  
76 are having to do some damage control where your supporters are  
77 concerned who are frE:tting your (.) wonderful answer  
78 notwithstanding fretting that if these numbers in the polls don't  
79 start to move the campaign's in trouble  
80 Pr: no:: you know (ll) listen (uhd) campaigns always go through  
81 ups and downs  
82 Jo: uhhm  
83 Pr: a:nd (.) you know what i've always said to (.) my folks is (.)  
84 you know if you're looking for the safe choice you shouldn't  
85 be (.) supporting a f- forty six year old black guy named  
86 barack obama  
87 Jo: [ hehehehehehehehehehehehehehehe ]  
88 Pr: [hehe to be the (.) next leader of the free worl]d i mean that's  
89 you know that's not where the smart money WENT  
90 Jo: yea:  
91 Pr: uhh you know especially when you're running against the  
92 dominant (.) political force in the democratic party over  
93 the last twenty years (.) people have gotten involved in our  
94 campaign because they belie:ve that (.) politics as usual  
95 business as usual is not adequate (.) uh it's not that they  
96 dislike some of the other candidates (.) they just think that  
97 if- if- let's take the example of health care  
98 Jo: uhuh  
99 Pr: if we can't (.) break the gridlock (.) between democrats and  
100 republicans but if we can't also can't overcome the  
101 insurance company drug company (.) lobbyists that have  
102 a lock on the debate in washington (.) we're not  
103 gonna get anything passed it doesn't matter >yihknow<  
104 whether john edward's or my plan or hillary's plan is

105 better and- and that i think people understand the  
106 second thing m::y supporters understand (.) uh the day  
107 i'm inaugurated (>0.2) this country looks at itself differently  
108 (.) and the world looks at america differently and if you  
109 believe that we gotta heal (.) america **A:ND** we got to  
110 repair (.) uh our standing in the world uh then i think my  
111 supporters believe that i am **A** messenger who can deliver  
112 that message around the world in a way that no other  
113 candidate can do  
114 Jo: they would look at thi world they would look at the us  
115 differently for what reason[s the reasons]  
116 Pr: [ WELL i- ] i think you  
117 know i- if you've got a guy named barack hussein  
118 obama  
119 Jo: uhuh  
120 Pr: uh that's a pretty good contrast of george w bush uhh  
121 to start with (.) somebody who's lived (.) in a foreign  
122 country (.) somebody who (.) know:s (.) uh what it's like  
123 to see family members in dire poverty (.) uh somebody  
124 who has a grandmother who lives in a village in africa  
125 without running water and- and without heat a::nd uh  
126 without indoor plumbing uh uh a village that's been  
127 devastated by hivh when i go to (.) africa i'm not speaking  
128 (er) you know as based on what i've read or what i hear in  
129 a hearing or what i:: (.) you know what i've seen visiting  
130 the am- uhh the ambassador's residence in nairobi (.) i'm  
131 speaking from experience in the same way that when i talk  
132 about uhh >yihknow< issues facing the inner city here in  
133 the united states i'm not looking at it from a distance (.) i'm  
134 speaking from somebody who's worked **IN** public housing  
135 projects and dealt with tryn to find ex felons uhh you know  
136 a- a better life for themselves and- and so (.) that experience  
137 i think gives me more credibility to talk about these issues

Appendix 9: President Obama talks ISIS, immigration, and midterm elections - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GHYjknhJyOI> – beginning to 8.04 mn

Jo = Journalist ; Pr = President

1 Jo: mister president thank you **SO**: much for joining us on  
 2 the sixtieth anniversary of face the nation =  
 3 Pr: = congratulations  
 4 Jo: it's a pleasure to have you =  
 5 Pr: = wonderful to have you here  
 6 Jo: thank you (.) .hhh i want to start with uhh hh. your  
 7 decision to basically **DOU**ble (.) the size of the  
 8 american force in ira:q (.) bringing up to about three  
 9 thousand (.) uhm (.) when you ordered the air  
 10 strikes three months ago you didn't seem to think  
 11 that was gonna be **NE**cessary uhh (.) what is- what  
 12 is this signal that uh what we've done so far hasn't  
 13 worked ↑  
 14 Pr: no actually (.) what it signals is a new phase (.) uhm (.)  
 15 a (.) first of all let's be clear ↓ isil is a threat not only  
 16 to iraq (.) but (.) also the region (.) a:nd ultimately  
 17 over the long term could be a threat to the united  
 18 states .hh uh this is (.) uh an extreme group of the sort  
 19 we haven't seen before but it also (.) combines terrorist  
 20 tactics **WITH** on the ground capabilities uh in part  
 21 because they incorporate a lot ov (.) saddam hussein's  
 22 old (.) uh military commanders (.) a:nd (.) >yihknow<  
 23 this is a threat that we(r) are committed not only to  
 24 degrade but ultimately destroy it's gonna take some time  
 25 .hh what we **KNEW** was that (.) phase one was getting  
 26 an iraqi government (.) tha:t (.) was inclusive (.) and  
 27 credible (.) and we now have done that (.) uh a:nd so  
 28 **NOW** (.) what we've done is rather than just try to (.)  
 29 halt isil's momentum ↓ (.) we are now in a position to  
 30 start going on some offense (.) the air strikes have been  
 31 very (.) effective i:n degrading isil's capabilities and  
 32 slowing the advance that they were making (>0.2) now  
 33 what we need is ground troupes (>0.2) iraqi ground  
 34 troupes that can start pushing them back  
 35 Jo: will these americans be: going into battle with them ↑  
 36 Pr: NO and the- so what hasn't changed is (>0.2) our  
 37 troupes are not engaged in combat (.) essentially what  
 38 we're doing is we are taking .hh **FOUR** training (.)  
 39 centers (>0.2) With coalition members (.) tha:t allow us  
 40 to bring in (.) iraqi recruits (.) some of thi (.) sunni tribes  
 41 that are still resisting isil (.) giving them proper training  
 42 (.) proper equipment (.) helping them with strategy helping  
 43 them with logistics (.) we will provide them close air  
 44 support (.) once they're prepared to start going on the  
 45 offense agAInst isil But what we will not be doing is  
 46 having our troupes do the fighting ↓ what we learned from  
 47 (.) the previous engagement in iraq (.) is that (.) our  
 48 military is always the best we can always (.) knock out  
 49 knock back any threat (.) but then when we leave (>0.2)

50 that threat comes back  
51 Jo: should we expect that more troupes may be needed  
52 before this is over  
53 Pr: >yihknow< as commander in chief (.) uh i'm never  
54 gonna say: never (.) but (.) what (.) >yihknow< the  
55 commanders who presented the plan to me say: is that  
56 we may actually see (.) fewer troupes over time because  
57 now we're seeing coalition members (.) starting to  
58 partner with us on the training and assist effort  
59 Jo: i wanna get back to foreign policy but i also (.) wanna  
60 ask you about what happened on tuesday  
61 Pr: we [got beat (.) hehehe ]  
62 Jo: [uhh (.) yeah hhh.]  
63 Pr: hehehe  
64 Jo: harry truman once famously said ↓ if you want a friend  
65 in washington get a dog and i:: though of that when i  
66 heard thi: (.) chief of staff of thi **DEMO**cratic leader  
67 of the senate harry reid SAY: and this is his quote the  
68 president's approval rating is basically forty percent  
69 what else mo:re is there to say (.) he's basically saying  
70 it was your fault (.) do **YOU** feel it was your fault ↑  
71 Pr: >well look< a- a- a- uhh (.) another saying of harry  
72 truman was the buck stops wi- (.) with ME the buck  
73 stops right here (.) at my desk and so: uh whenever  
74 as the head of the party it doesn't do well i've gotta  
75 take responsibility for it uhm i (thet) the message that  
76 i took (.)from this election and we've seen this in a  
77 number of elections successive elections (.) I::s people  
78 want to see this city work (.) and they feel as if it's not  
79 working (.) the economy has improved significantly  
80 there's no doubt about it we had a job's report (.) uhh  
81 for october that showed that once again over two  
82 hundred thousands jobs created we've now created  
83 more than ten million .hh the unemployment rate's  
84 come down faster than we could have anticipated (.)  
85 JUst to give you some perspective bob we've created  
86 more jobs in the united states than every other (.)  
87 advanced economy comBIned (.) since i came inta  
88 office (.) a::nd so we're making progress but people  
89 still feel like (.) their wages haven't gone up (.) their  
90 incomes haven't gone up (.) still hard to save for  
91 retirement still hard to send a kid to college .hh  
92 an::d then they see washington gridlocked and they're  
93 frustrated (.) an::d uhh >yihknow< they know one  
94 person in washington uhh and that's the president of  
95 the united states so: (.) **I'Ve** got to make this city (.)  
96 work better **FO:r** them  
97 Jo: **ALL** the presidents i-in modern history who have been  
98 (.) successful i mean uh in various ways uh lbj (.) fdr (.)  
99 ronald reagan teddy roosevelt bill clinton (.) they **ALL**  
100 seem to have a ZE::st for politics they- they liked the  
101 give and take they liked thi twisting of arms they liked  
102 the cajoling .hh they liked all the things that presidents  
103 do (.) but i don't sense (.) that you: have the same feeling  
104 uhh that they did **AND IT >MAKES** me wond(er)< uh do

105 **YOU** like politicians do you like politic[s (.) do yo]u  
 106 Pr: [yihknow (.)]  
 107 like this job =  
 108 Pr: = le(t)- lemme tell you bob uh I LO::ve this job an::d here's  
 109 i think a fair statement (>0.2) uh (.) if your name is barack  
 110 hussein obama (.) you- you had to have liked politics in  
 111 order to get into this office (.) and i- i- i wasn't born uh into  
 112 politics (.) an::d uhh wasn't encouraged to go into politics  
 113 (.) i got into politics because **I** believed i could make a  
 114 difference and i would not have been successful and  
 115 would not be (.) sittin' at this desk every day if i didn't  
 116 love politics uhhh >yihknow< the- the- the fact is that  
 117 (.) we wouldn't've gotten healthcare passed (.) i:f there  
 118 weren't a whole bunch a (.) arm twistin uhhh we would  
 119 not have (.) been able to (.) make progress on the deficit ↓  
 120 if i hadn't been willin to cut some deals (.) with  
 121 republicans uhm i- i think every president that you've  
 122 mentioned uhh would also say that (.) uhhmm while  
 123 they were in office (.) people weren't always as  
 124 complementarium as hhh. when they left hehehe =  
 125 Jo: = when hehe but wh- IS it what you thought it would be  
 126 Pr: >yihknow< here- here's one thing that i will say uhm  
 127 (.) that (>0.2) campaigning (.) and governance are two  
 128 different things (>0.2) i've ran two successful  
 129 campaigns (.) uhh an:d anybody who's seen me on the  
 130 campaign trail can tell (.) how much i love (.) just being  
 131 with thi: american people and hearing what they care  
 132 about and uhh what (.) yihknow how passionate i am  
 133 about trying to help them (.) uhm (>0.2) when you  
 134 start governing (.) there is a tendency sometimes for  
 135 **ME::** to start thinking as long as i get the policy right  
 136 (.) the:n (.) that's what should matter (.) an:d  
 137 >yihknow< people have asked (.) >yihknow< how  
 138 wh- wha- whadya need to do differently going forward  
 139 and i think you do that (.) gut check after every election  
 140 uhm an[d what and- (.) and- i ]  
 141 Jo: [what do you need to do differ]ently  
 142 Pr: think that one thing that i **DO** need to constantly  
 143 remind myself and my team ov is (.) IT's not enough  
 144 just to (.) build the better mouse trap people don't  
 145 automatically come beatin to your door uhm that we've  
 146 got to sell it (.) we've got to uh reach out to the other  
 147 side (.) and where possible persuade uhhh an:d i think  
 148 there are times there's no doubt about it where- uh  
 149 yihknow where i think we have no:t (.) been successful  
 150 in going out there (.) an:d lettin people know what it is  
 151 that we're tryin to do and why this is (.) the right  
 152 direction so- d- so there is a failure of politics there  
 153 that we've got ta- we've gotta improve on

## Appendix 10: Michelle Obama on life after the White House

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5nYVCPzDnBo> – beginning to 3.33 mn

Fr = First Lady Jo = Journalist

- 1 Jo: i'm curious as- if-there's still obviously a few more uh  
 2 years left [for the] second term (.) do you plan to move  
 3 Fr: [uh mm]  
 4 back home to chicago when it's done ↑  
 5 Fr: you know we're gonna see:: where the kids are (.)  
 6 because by that time malia will be in COLlege if you can  
 7 believe th[at and sa- (.) i know an]d  
 8 Jo: [wahou it goes by like that hun ↑((snaps his fingers))]  
 9 Fr: sacha will be in her sophomore year in high school [so we]'re  
 10 Jo: [wow ]  
 11 gonna let her make the choice [.hh and se]e where she's most  
 12 Jo: [oh wow ]  
 13 Fr: comfortable because they've made the sacrifice[s for] us to be  
 14 Jo: [yeah]  
 15 Fr: here already so we'll see ↑ we're gonna play it by ear  
 16 Jo: what do you miss most about civilian life  
 17 Fr: ((click of the tongue)) the anonymity .hh (.) you know being  
 18 able to (.) walk outside my door without security and staff  
 19 and (.) three cars and (.) you know there is (.) something to  
 20 be s[aid f]or bein' able t' walk around when no one knows  
 21 Jo: [yeah]  
 22 your name uhm so .hhh uh but it has been a privilege and an  
 23 honor to serve and it's beCAUse i'm in this role .hh  
 24 Jo: right =  
 25 Fr: = >you know< we give up a little anonymity but we get  
 26 to come to wonderful programs like this =  
 27 Jo: = right it helps so many peopl[e ]  
 28 Fr: [he]lps so many people  
 29 Jo: what advice do you have for the next first lady (.) or- or  
 30 for bill clinton should he be[come] the first gen[tleman ]  
 31 Fr: [uh uh] [uhm uhm]  
 32 is that what you would call him first gentleman  
 33 Fr: i think so [but m]aybe we'll see =  
 34 Jo: [right ]  
 35 Jo: = we'll see  
 36 Fr: hehe you know my advice would be to (.) be who you are  
 37 uhm that's the beauty about being the spouse of the w- w-  
 38 world leader .hh is that you can pick and choose your issues  
 39 uh that's why let's move is so im[port ]ant i'm- i'm so  
 40 Jo: [uhm uhm]  
 41 proud of everything that folks are doing to (.) come together  
 42 to make healthier environments for kids (.) and we're starting  
 43 to see some impact  
 44 Jo: and you made a video asking people to show you how they  
 45 get up [and move i tweeted you this morning i was a- a little boxing little dancing]  
 46 Fr: [ABSOLUTELY (.) yea (.) yea (.) thanks so much]  
 47 Jo: running with the dog wha- what's your favorite way (.) to move  
 48 Fr: you know i like to (.) mix it up uhm i [like to (.) yeah ye]ah  
 49 Jo: [keep the muscles guessing]  
 50 Fr: i like to play a little tennis i lift weights uhm i do a little

51 boxing when i c[an i tr]y to do a little yoga so .hh now that  
 52 Jo: [ okay ]  
 53 that i'm getting older i've gotta stay flexible =  
 54 Jo: = righ[t]  
 55 Fr: [s]o yoga stretching is really much more important  
 56 to me  
 57 Jo: >wha- what about< uh the president and your girls what's  
 58 their favorite way to move =  
 59 Fr: =(click of the tongue) you know everybody's got their  
 60 own things the president works out all the time he plays  
 61 a little basketball when he can he golfs when he can (. )  
 62 .hh the girls have their own sports malia's a tennis  
 63 player [uh s]acha's a dancer and sh[e pla]ys a little bee  
 64 Jo: [uhm] [okay]  
 65 ball so [.hh (. ) w]e make sure as a family that w[e always w-]  
 66 Jo: [ okay ] [Active family]  
 67 Fr: a very active family and we like to hike when we can on  
 68 vacations [ we ] do that as much as possible s[o ]  
 69 Jo: [yeah] [se]e  
 70 with my family too we like to be ver[y active]  
 71 Fr: [it's all in the fam]ily =  
 72 Jo: = it is on the family (. ) NOW of course everyone has guilty pleasures  
 73 Fr: uh uh  
 74 Jo: what is your favorite uh guilty snack mine's pop corn and  
 75 m&ms that's my go t[o]  
 76 Fr: [s:]::alt[y:: i: ] like salty  
 77 Jo: [salty or sweet]  
 78 chocolate (. ) yeah i like that combination [but i] love  
 79 Jo: [okay]  
 80 french fries (. ) by far  
 81 Jo: french fries [uh]  
 82 Fr: [oh] my god yeah i'm a (. ) sucker for  
 83 french [fries (>0.2) i am i'm ]  
 84 Jo: [oh you and my wife would get along great ]  
 85 Fr: i'm i'm a victim hehehe =  
 86 Jo: = when the president sneaks down to (. ) the  
 87 kitchen to get (. ) a late night snack (. ) what's he  
 88 munching on  
 89 Fr: he's salty nuts he loves any kind of nuts macadamia  
 90 nuts pecans  
 91 Jo: what do you know now that you wish you knew when  
 92 you first became first lady  
 93 Fr: it's hard to live in- with hindsight  
 94 Jo: uhm uhm  
 95 Fr: in this job because (. ) they're only forty four people  
 96 who have done it [right uh s]o there is a limited  
 97 Jo: [right hehe]  
 98 amount of advice that- that you can get (. ) i would  
 99 continue to make my- my family my priority (. )  
 100 when i think the president and i (. ) we try to make  
 101 sure that (. ) with all that we have on our plates that  
 102 (. ) our girls are- are f- front and center  
 103 Jo: uhm uhm  
 104 because we believe that we need to do that as a  
 105 nation for all of our kids as **YOU** very well know

- 106 Jo: yes [yes ]  
 107 Fr: [as a-] as a father of young ones =  
 108 Jo: = that's right =  
 109 Fr: = you're doing your part as we[ll (.) bein' ] a  
 110 Jo: [doing my part]  
 111 Fr: good husba[nd (.) alright and a good father]  
 112 Jo: [yes that's first ]  
 113 Jo: yes yes ex[actly]  
 114 Fr: [ well ] done (.) proud'a ya