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ABSTRACT


This paper discusses neutralistic posture strategies occurred in Fox News Sunday Interview with Chris Wallace aired on February 28th 2016. It is a qualitative research. The writer uses conversation analysis theory to find out the interviewer’s reason of using the strategies and the impacts of using them on the interviewee.

The analysis of eight selected data shows that Wallace uses all neutralistic posture strategies, namely embedding statements with questions, third-party attribution and mitigation. Apart from maintaining his neutralistic stance, Wallace has some underlying reasons to convey the strategies, which are: introducing a new topic, criticizing the IE, and defending himself when confronted by the IE. The impact of these strategies is the non-straightforward answers that the IE (Cruz) has provided. The IE resists IR’s line of questioning by producing dispreferred responses. Both the IE and the IR abandoned their institutional roles by producing non Q-A format, resulting in confrontation between the two participants. However, Wallace resolved this problem by justifying his action as having presented facts through factual statement and bringing back the news interview turn-taking framework using third-party attribution.
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List of Abbreviation and Transcription Convention

The following table explains transcription convention based on Gail Jefferson’s notation in Hutchby.¹

Abbreviation

IR : Interviewer
IE : Interviewee

Table of transcription key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[   ]</td>
<td>Overlapping talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Latching, no intervening silence between utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>Falling vocal tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Marked rising tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.hhh</td>
<td>Audible breath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underline</td>
<td>Stressed utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;words&gt;</td>
<td>Talk is slower than surrounding it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;words&lt;</td>
<td>Talk is faster than surrounding it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>° °</td>
<td>Degree signs indicate that the talk is quieter than surrounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>Timed pause less than a second, 5 milisecond. The second is located before the comma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑↓</td>
<td>Rising or falling intonation across a phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITALS</td>
<td>Speech markedly louder than surrounding it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sou:::nd</td>
<td>Colons indicate the stretching or extended a sound or a word. The more colons, the greater the extent of the stretching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sou-</td>
<td>A dash indicates cut off of a word during an utterance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Background of Study

Interaction is vital between humans, for the obvious reason that we each depend on one another. We are social beings and interact in everyday life. The most prominent way of interaction is manifested in communication. As one of spoken forms of communication, conversation can be regarded as the prevalent thing in daily life as a form of social activity. It is basically a two-way interaction between addresser and addressee. By such a process, we convey messages and it will be considered successful if it can be understood in a proper context. Both addressee and addresser should be able to actively respond to given signals when they are involved in conversation. The signals are not merely in verbal forms, but also carried out by nonverbal signs like body posture, eye gazing, and silences.\(^1\)

Conversation is not as simple as it seems to be; rather it is a complex thing that is fundamentally important to study. Firth, as cited by Coulthard, urged linguists to study conversation, for there we shall find the key to a better understanding of what language is and how it works.\(^2\) Study of conversation has received lots of attention not only from linguists, but also from sociologists. It has become an important and interesting subject as it can be shown to develop from of

---

\(^1\) Anthony J. Liddicoat, *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*, (London: Continuum, 2007), p.4

an approach that specifically focuses on speech in interaction called Conversation Analysis (Henceforth ‘CA’) that is pioneered by the sociologists Harvey Sack, Gail Jefferson, and Emanuel Schegloff in the late 1960s.

In some cases of interactions, there are several kinds of the organization on how the conversation is managed, either in a mundane conversation which is characteristically casual, or a formal institutional talk. Although many of institutional talks use the same organization of turn-taking system as the casual conversation, there are some interactions that apply very strict, specific, and systematic procedures to organize the turn-taking role. Such this procedure is to be found in a news interview.

The conversation in a news interview is different from that in a casual conversation. The differences are obvious in terms of the uneven distribution of turn taking and the strict allocation of rights and obligations amongst participants. In ordinary conversations, topics can emerge freely in various ways; participants are free to make diverse contributions to the subjects, each participant can initiate the turn to start the conversation; whereas in the news interview, participants are basically constrained.\(^3\)

Hutchby further described the basic turn-taking system for news interviews as a chain of question-answer sequences in which the interviewers are restricted to ask questions, while interviewees ideally, at least answer those questions.\(^4\) When delivering the questions, interviewers as the members of the

---


journalistic profession, should fulfill two broad professional norms, namely objectivity and adversarialness.⁵ The norm of objectivity requires the interviewers to be objective and unbiased in reporting news. By that, they are supposed to be impartial and are not allowed to deliver statements in favor of asking questions.

The second norm is adversarialness that refers to the extent to which journalists should work appropriately adversarial in the sense that they should actively challenge their sources rather than being mouthpieces for them.⁶ In other words, the journalists are not supposed to take the words of their sources for granted or naively restate them but instead they have to scrutinize or do further necessary investigations of their sources to ensure that they provide adequate answers as well as to find out whether their statements are true or not.

As Heritage pointed out, the two norms that the journalists aim to fulfill are obviously in tension with one another. By implication, when the journalists try to pursue the adversarial norm, things can be problematic, for they are inclined to produce opposing or evaluative statements in a way to challenge the interviewees, whilst at the same time such practice can compromise the neutralistic stance since it is vulnerable to being heard as non-neutral or taking stance.

One of the instances in which the journalist delivers evaluative opinion to counter interviewee’s position is to be found in Fox News Sunday interview that is aired on Fox News. In this program, Chris Wallace interviewed Ted Cruz about Super Tuesday. From the following excerpts, it can be argued that the interviewer (Henceforth IR) produced some contentious remarks in a way to challenge the IE.

---

1. IR: ↑Senator you: .( ) used to say that you viewed
2. urr (.) SuperTuesday and especially the races
3. in the so called< SEC Primary as a (. ) quote
4. firewa::ill for your campaign> but accordin to
5. the latest (. ) polls the only state you're
6. leading in a:re Arkans<s>a>s and your home state
7. ofTex↓as hh if you don't win in the ↓South (. )
8. onSu:per ↑day ↑aren't you in big ↓trouble<le?
9. IE (.4) hh We'll Chris what we've seen in these ↓Primaries
10. is the ↑first four states have narrowed the ↓field we
11. started with ↑seventeen candidates it's now much much
12. morenarr↓ow (. )...(continues)

There are two statements IR delivered in his turn 1) Cruz said he needed to
do well on Super Tuesday, and 2) current polls are predicting he will not do well.
These two statements put the IE at a disadvantage. All candidates want to say they
are winning so as to gather their momentum, because people are likely to vote a
candidate they think can win. IR’s statements challenge the IE as it portrays him
as losing and it is vulnerable to being heard as combative. The IR thinks that Ted
Cruz (IE) is in trouble and is not doing as well as Cruz expected to do. He is
trying to get Cruz to admit that.

To avoid the risks he may face for delivering these contentious statements,
the IR manages to appear neutral by sticking to his questioning role. This is
achieved by embedding the statements within a question. He ends it as a question,
making it easier for Cruz to disagree with the statements. By implication, his turn
is seen in its entirety as the activity of questioning (see detailed explanation in
Datum 1).

There are other ways that the interviewers can do to appear neutral in
their questioning activities. Clayman has identified strategies or techniques that
allow the journalists to maintain neutralistic stance namely, embedding statements within a question, attributing statements to third parties and mitigating. These strategies are often found in news interviews, given the notion that the IR wants to keep the balance of the journalistic norms they should aim. This research focuses on conversation analysis of journalistic neutrality in a Fox News Sunday Interview by Chris Wallace. The writer wants to do further analysis on Wallace’s reasons of using neutralistic posture strategies and the impacts of using them on the interviewee.

B. Focus of the Study

This study focuses on conversation analysis of journalistic neutrality in a Fox News Sunday Interview by Chris Wallace: Interview with Ted Cruz aired on February 28th 2016.

C. Research Questions

Based on the background of study above, the statement of problems are:

1. What are the interviewer’s reasons in using neutralistic posture strategies?
2. What is the impact of using the strategies on the interviewee?

D. Objective of Study

The purposes of the study are:

1. To know interviewer’s reasons in using neutralistic posture strategies.
2. To know the impact of using neutralistic posture strategies on the interviewee.

E. Significance of the Research

The writer hopes that the research will be:

1. Beneficial to theoretical development of conversation analysis concept.
2. Useful for those who want to do further research about conversation analysis in institutional settings.
3. Practically advantageous for those who have passion in broadcasting, especially in conducting news interview. The readers can get the ideas on how to be a good journalist and they can learn to design effective questions in a way to dig specific information from the interviewees.

F. Research Methodology

This research methodology includes some aspects, such as the methods of the research, research instrument, data analysis technique, and unit analysis.

1. Method of the Research

The data in this research are utterances from the interview between Chris Wallace and Ted Cruz. Thus, the writer uses the qualitative method. A research with qualitative method is a research with qualitative relied on verbal and non-numerical data as the basis of analysis and solving the problem appears. In addition, in this research, the writer also applies conversation analysis method.

---

2. **Data Analysis**

The collected data are analyzed using conversation analysis theory. It is also supported by the neutralistic posture theory from Steven Clayman.

The process of data analysis in this research involved the following steps, i.e.: (a) the writer looks for the video of interview between Chris Wallace and Ted Cruz (b) The writer watches the video and transcribes it orthographically using the notational conventions in CA. It is aimed to capture the details of talk in interaction as the conversation itself should be transcribed in detailed and precise manner (c) the writer uses the mentioned theories in analyzing the utterances to know Wallace’s reason in using neutralistic posture techniques and impact of using the techniques on the interviewee.

3. **Instrument of Research**

The instrument of the research is the writer herself. The writer analyzes the utterances in the interview using the mentioned theory of conversation analysis developed by Sacks et al. and neutralistic posture theory by Steven Clayman.

4. **The Unit of Analysis**

The unit analysis in this research study is the transcript of Chris Wallace interviewing Ted Cruz in Fox News Sunday aired on February 28th 2016.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter is aimed at reviewing the literature of items which are the most relevant to the study such as previous study, conversation analysis, questions in news interview, maintaining a neutralistic posture, and news interview.

A. Previous Study

Previous researches have investigated news interview focusing on the nature and practice of journalistic neutrality. The writer lists the two most relevant studies. First, the research conducted by Johanna Rendle-Short entitled “Neutralism and Adversarial Challenges in the Political News Interview”. The research discussed the various legitimate ways to challenge the interviewee within the Australian political news interview. The output of the research suggests that the Australian journalists tend to challenge the interviewees by challenging the content of the prior talk, by interrupting the prior talk, and by initially presenting their challenge as a freestanding assertion. However, the journalists work to ensure that their challenges are legitimate by conveying footing shift in that the interviewers (IRs) legitimize their challenges on behalf of the overhearing audiences, by converting unsourced statements into a question preface and by presenting their challenge as being in some way factual.

Second, a thesis by Katrien de Rajmaeker entitled “Neutrality in Political Interviews: Establishing a link between the interactional practices and underlying
motivations for achieving interviewer neutrality using CA frameworks”. The thesis discussed the link between the different techniques to maintain neutralistic posture and the IR’s motivations in using those techniques. The finding of the research suggests that the underlying motivation does not determine which techniques IRs use to maintain their neutralistic stance.

The two studies use CA frameworks, and so does this research. Both also shared the same topic regarding the practice of journalistic neutrality. The differences between this research and the two previous studies are located on the focus of the study and the unit of analysis.

B. Concept

1. Conversation Analysis

Spoken interaction is such a common activity that it has become one of the interesting areas for the research. From the late 1960s, interactional data became the object of analysis through the approach called “Conversation Analysis (Henceforth CA)”. CA actually emerges from the work of a group of American sociologists.\(^1\) The approach focusing on talk in interaction is strongly inspired by Ethnomethodological tradition developed by Garfinkel.\(^2\) Through the work of Garfinkel and Goffman, the development of CA arouse by establishing a concern for investigating the orderliness of everyday life.\(^3\)

---


\(^3\) *Ibid.*, p.4
According to Hutchby and Woffitt, CA is a systematic method to analyze talk that is produced in everyday situations of human interaction. Through the unfolding talk, CA aims to discover how the participants understand and interpret their actions.\(^4\) CA was initially applied only to conversation, by its founder Harvey Sack, Emmanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. However, it has developed and become applicable to analyze talk in institutional settings such as, interview, medical consultations, courtroom interaction, classroom talk and many other forms of institutional talk.\(^5\)

Hutchby summarizes CA in five principles. First, talk is designed to accomplish social actions. Second, talk has particular interactional contexts, and the way speakers talk depends on that context. The third principle explains that the orderliness of talk and interaction can lead us to find the systematic organization of conversation. Fourth, talk is sequentially organized. Through this principle, we can figure out how speakers take the turn and understand the contexts of interaction. Finally, the analyses of talk or interaction are best done by looking at the recordings of natural interaction.\(^6\)

CA has several features that are relevant for the analyses, such as turn-taking, adjacency pairs, preference organization and repair.

---


a. Turn-taking

Turn-taking is one of the basic facts in conversation. It is the change of roles between the speaker and listener.\(^7\) Turn-taking models begin with the idea that turns are distributed systematically among speakers.

Hutchby and Woffitt state that there are three noticeable facts in conversation. First, turn-taking occurs. Second, one speaker tends to talk at a time, and finally, turns are remarked by as little gap or overlap as possible among speakers.\(^8\)

There are two components of turn-taking. The two components are the turn constructional component and turn allocational component. Turns are constructed by linguistics elements, such as words, phrases, clauses, and sentences.\(^9\) Such this unit is called turn constructional unit (TCU). Any structural elements can function as a TCU. However, TCUs are context-sensitive. Thus, it can only be made in context.

Hutchby and Woffitt state that there are two features of TCU. First, TCU should have the property of projectability in that it gives an idea to the participants to predict what sort of unit it is and at what point it is likely to end. Second, it should lead the possible transition between speakers.\(^10\) The place where the transition occurs is called Transition Relevant Places (TRP). At this point, a

---


\(^10\) Hutchby, *op.cit*, p. 48
speaker’s talk is possibly complete and speaker change is a possible next action. However, the speaker change does not need to occur at these places.

The second component of turn-taking is turn allocation component. It deals with the distribution of turn in interaction. Sacks et al. divided the distribution of turn taking into two groups; either the current speaker can select next speaker to get the next turn, or the next speaker may self-select.

The form of turn-taking in a news interview is different from that in mundane conversation. In mundane conversation, the participants are free to make diverse contribution and anyone can initiate a new line of departure. However, in a news interview, the participants are fundamentally constrained. The interviewers (Henceforth IRs) are only allowed to produce turn that consists of questions, whilst the interviewees (Henceforth IEs) are only allowed to produce turn that consists of answers.

b. Adjacency pairs

Many turns at talk come in pairs. The paired utterances are called adjacency pairs. Adjacency pairs are the basic unit that constitutes a sequence in conversation. Liddicoat lists several features of adjacency pair. First, adjacency pairs are two turns produced by different speakers. Second, adjacency pairs are placed next to each other. Next, adjacency pairs are ordered which means that one turn comes first, and the other comes second. The first turn is intended to initiate

---

11 Liddicoat, *op.cit*, p. 61
12 Liddicoat, *ibid*, p.63
13 Liddicoat, *ibid*, p. 106
the next action, whilst the second turn is designed to complete the initiated action. Finally, adjacency pair is differentiated into pair-types which are first pair part (FPP) and second pair part (SPP). The first (FPP) initiates action, whilst the latter responds to the first. Here is an example of adjacency pair.

Amy : Hello.
Jean : Hi.\textsuperscript{14}

The action initiated by Amy is called FPP. The form of FPP is greeting. Jean response to the FPP is greeting. The form of adjacency pair performed by Amy and Jean is greeting-greeting.

c. Preference organization

Preference organization deals with the way participants contribute their actions in conversation. However, the term does not refer to the speakers or hearers’ psychology; but rather to the patterns of talk that carry out the actions.\textsuperscript{15} The FPP in adjacency pairs has alternative possibilities for (second pair part) SPPs. It can be preferred or dispreferred.\textsuperscript{16} Preferred seconds (SPPs) are unmarked and occur as structurally simple turns while dispreferred seconds (SPPs) are marked by various kinds of structural complexity.\textsuperscript{17}

Liddicoat stated that preferred actions are performed immediately, while dispreferred actions would normally be performed with delay.\textsuperscript{18} If the speakers need to produce dispreferred response, they need to do more conversational work.

\textsuperscript{14} Liddicoat, \textit{ibid}, p. 107
\textsuperscript{15} Liddicoat, \textit{ibid}, p. 110
\textsuperscript{16}Malcolm Coulthard, \textit{An Introduction to Discourse Analysis}, (UK: Longman, 1985), p. 70
\textsuperscript{17} Levinson, \textit{Pragmatics}, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 307
\textsuperscript{18} Anthony. J Liddicoat, \textit{An Introduction to Conversation Analysis}, (New York: Continuum, 2007), p. 111
that avoids the disruption of relationship with the recipients. Actions such as agreement, acceptances are preferred, while disagreements, rejections, declinings are dispreferred.\textsuperscript{19} However, it has to do with what precedes the turn. For instance, agreement of a prior self-deprecation would be dispreferred rather than preferred.\textsuperscript{20} Preferred and dispreferred seconds can be seen in two following examples from Atkinson and Drew in Levinson.\textsuperscript{21}

1) A : Why don”t you come up and see me some [times
B : [I would like to

2) A : Uh if you”d care to come and visit a little while this morning I”ll give you a cup of coffee.
B : hehh Well that”s awfully sweet of you,
((DELAY)) ((MARKER)) ((APPRECIATION))
I don”t think I can make it in this morning.
((REFUSAL or DECLINATION))
.hh uhm I”m running an ad in the paper and-and uh I have to stay near on the phone.
((ACCOUNT))\textsuperscript{22}

As noted in the excerpts above, the FPP in the first example is invitation and it receives an acceptance as a second part. The acceptance as the second part is in simple design and delivered without delay whereas the invitation in the second example receives refusal. The refusal is characterized by features of dispreferred second, such as delay, the particle \textit{well}, mitigated refusal by saying „I don”t think I can‟, and an account or explanation for the dispreferred second.\textsuperscript{23} So, the first example is preferred second, whilst the latter is dispreferred.

\textsuperscript{19}Liddicoat, \textit{Ibid}, p. 111
\textsuperscript{20}Liddicoat, \textit{loc.cit.}
\textsuperscript{21}Levinson, \textit{op.cit}, p. 333
\textsuperscript{22}Levinson, \textit{ibid}, p.334
\textsuperscript{23}Levinson, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 334
d. Repairs

Liddicoat defines repairs as a set of practices designed for dealing with the difficulties or problems that emerge in talk.\textsuperscript{24} As cited by Liddicoat, there are four types of repairs proposed by Shegloff, Sack, and Jefferson. They are self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other-repair. The first type occurs when the speakers make a problem during the interaction, they indicate the problems and they solve by themselves. The second type occurs when the speakers indicate the problems, but the recipients resolve them. The third refers to the recipients of the repairable item indicate a problem in the talk and get the speakers to solve it. The last occurs when the recipient of the troubled item indicate and resolve the problem.\textsuperscript{25}

Anna: oh so then he is coming back on Thur- on Tuesday\textsuperscript{26}

From the excerpt above, Anna initiates self-repair when she says “Thur”, she meant to say Tuesday. In that utterance, she identifies the troubled item and corrects it herself. Therefore, it is categorized as self-initiated self-repair.

2. Questions in News Interview

When it comes to the interviewer questions, there is a distinction between grammatical form of utterances and the meaning of those utterances when spoken in a particular context. Linguists use the terms declarative and interrogative to

\textsuperscript{24} Anthony, J Liddicoat, \textit{An Introduction to Conversation Analysis}, (New York: Continuum, 2007), p. 171
\textsuperscript{25} Liddicoat, \textit{Ibid}, p. 173
\textsuperscript{26} Liddicoat, \textit{Ibid}, p. 175
describe the grammatical form of utterances, whilst the terms of “statement” and “question” are used to name the actions which these utterance types normally accomplish in context. As stated by Schegloff, declarative formatted utterances can function as questions and interrogatively formatted utterances can perform many non-questioning activities, such as assertions, agreements, and accusations. This distinction between form and function is often a product of context. However, there are also interrogative formats which normally perform actions other than questioning. Consider these following interrogatives:

- Where did you leave your key?
- How could you leave your key?

These two questions have a different implication. It is obvious that the first question aims to seek the information, while the second one is designed to “criticize” or “accuse”. These differences are vital since the interviewers and interviewees should consider the grammatical form of the utterances or the content and the context of the utterances in a way to decide whether the questions should be answered properly, or resisted if it is an assertion or accusation.27

As cited by Clayman and Heritage, most of the major classes of questions identified by Quirk et al. are to be found in news interviews.

---

a. Interrogative questions

1. Wh-questions

IR: Senator Mitchell, what's your overview of the summit?²⁸

2. Yes/No questions (polarity questions)

IR: was it intentional not to call you?²⁹

3. Alternative questions

This question involves list construction and explicit differentiation of alternative propositions.

IR: If the prime minister were to drop Mister Benn would this be a political plus or political minus in terms of the coming election and votes (hhh) er generally.³⁰

b. Declarative + tag questions

a. IR: =she" s been no pushover has she. (declarative + tag questions)

b. IR: hhh an therefore the state of emergency is necessary. Fair?³¹

c. B-event questions

Apart from the interrogative syntax, interviewers make use of other resources to build their questions. One of them involves declaratives. Different from Quirk et al." s declarative questions which have been previously discussed, these declaratives do not necessarily rely on rising intonation for their questioning force. Labov and Fanshel (1977:100), Pomerantz (1980), Heritage (1985) have

²⁸ Steven Clayman and John Heritage, loc.cit.
²⁹ Steven Clayman and John Heritage, Ibid, p. 101
³⁰ Steven Clayman and John Heritage, loc.cit.
³¹ Steven Clayman and John Heritage, loc.cit.
termed these declaratives “B-event statements” which refers to the events that the recipient of the statement has privileged knowledge. These questions are varied, involving several scopes, which are:

a. **Statements addressing subjective sentiments of the IE.**

   It refers to interviewee’s subjective states, such as feelings, attitudes, or intentions and areas in which the IE has particular knowledge, expertise or authority. These declaratives function as question aiming to seek confirmation.

   IR: So in a very brief word David Owen you in no way regret what you did er despite what has (happened) in Brighton this week in the Labour party.

   IE: n-in no way do I regret it.  

b. **Hypothetical and future-oriented statements about the interviewee’s likely actions or policies.**

   IR: it’s not something you’re going to force on the Northen Ireland people.

   IE: er you can’t force ((continues))

   IE: n-in no way do I regret it.

   c. **Statements that summarize interviewee’s previous remarks.**

   IR: =.hhh So you’re suggesting there that the farm minister shouldn’t decide this all entirely amongst themselves, that it should be .hhh spread across the board amongst all ministers.

   IE: Exactly.=I’m saying that one must find some way…

---

33 Steven Clayman and John Heritage, *loc.cit.*
34 Steven Clayman and John Heritage, *ibid*, p. 103
d. Rising intonation questions

IE: So f- I: (.) see him as :uh f- (. ) doing several things first of all (. )
briefly .hh um: instituting a system where the national people" s
congress becomes a mor:e realistic parliament perhaps with
multipleslate elections to it .hhhh the rule of law: .hh u[h].

IR:→[Multiple slate multiparty?]

IE: ih-No: multiple multiple candidates. 35

3. Maintaining a Neutralistic Stance in Questioning

Journalists are supposed to remain neutral in their questioning. It is the
norm associated with profession that the IR should aim for objectivity in their
interaction with their sources. More specifically, Clayman states that the
interviewers (IRs) should (1) avoid assertion on their own behalf (2) refrain from
overt affiliation or disaffiliation from the expressed statement of interviewees. 36

Clayman further states that there are three procedures conveyed by the
interviewer to maintain neutralistic posture. They are embedding statement within
a question, attributing statements to third parties, and mitigating. All of them will
be discussed in the following section.

a. Embedding statements within a question

One of the ways to maintain a neutralistic stance is to preserve a question-
answer format. If the IRs restrict themselves to their fundamental task, that is to

---

35 Steven Clayman and John Heritage, *loc. cit.*
ask questions, the chance of risking a neutralistic stance is small. Since the IRs are only allowed to produce turns which consist of questions, they will have less ability to express opinions and agree or disagree with the interviewees. Even if they do need to make assertions, these are generally restricted to a single legitimate environment: prior to and in conjunction with a subsequent question.37

There are a lot of questioning turns that do not consist of simple questions. When the interviewers produce questioning turn, they often deliver statements, some of which even sounds evaluative. However, these statements are embedded with the questions, thus making it seen as the activity of questioning and not as a separate social action. The following excerpts exemplify this technique.

1. IE …I'm a journalist, and I think I've got some ideas
2. as staff aid, I've been that before, but a stage
3. manager's not one of my occupations.
4. IR Well you're not a journalist now.
5. What is your function there.38

As noted in the excerpts above, the journalist directly disputes the IE’s previous statement (line 4), and it is also obvious that the IR made an assessment “Well you’re not a journalist now”. However, the assessment that the IR was making is followed by a question that obtains the IE’s own perspective. The statement is not seen on its own right; rather, it is seen in its entirety as the questioning activity.

37 Steven Clayman and John Heritage, loc.cit.
b. Attributing Statements to A Third Party

The interviewers sometimes deliver evaluative statements when interacting with their sources. Such action violates the norm of objectivity, thus compromises their neutralistic stance. However, there is a procedure that enables them to produce statements while remaining to be neutral. According to Clayman, Interviewers often manage to distance themselves from overtly opinionated statements.\(^3^9\) This can be achieved by doing an interactional practice that Goffman has referred footing shift.

The concept of footing shift is actually derived from the work of a Sociologist Erving Goffman that focused on the nature of involvement in social interaction. Goffman made a clear distinction about the roles of speakership. He defines animator as the one who presently produces the utterances; the author as the one who originated the beliefs, sentiments and perhaps also composes the words, and principal as the one whose viewpoints is currently being expressed.\(^4^0\) Clayman adopted this concept to investigate how the news interviewers display the appearance of neutrality.

The following excerpts exhibit an instance of footing shift. The IR delivers assertion that the nuclear waste can be readily managed. The IR distances his statement from himself and attributes the viewpoint he expresses to “Doctor Yalow”.

\(^3^9\)Steven Clayman and John heritage, *op.cit.*, p. 152


1 JS: ...And if you look et- simply the record in
2 the low level waste field over the last
3 fifteen to twenty years... the record is not
4 very good (0.3) an' it doesn't give one a cause
5 for optimism.=
6 JRN: \(\Rightarrow\) You heard what Doctor Yalow said earlier in
7 \(\Rightarrow\) this broadcast she'll have an opportunity to
8 \(\Rightarrow\) express her own opinions again but she seems to
9 feel that it is an eminently soluble problem,
10 and that ultimately that radioactive material
11 can be reduced, to manageable quantities, 'n put
12 in the bottom of a salt mine.
13 JS: The p- the point that she was making earlier
14 about (. reprocessing of: the fuel rods goes
15 right to the heart (. of the way a lotta
16 people look at this particular issue...

As noted in the excerpts above, the IR was trying to counter the IE" s prior

statement. He makes a special point that indicates that the viewpoint he expresses

belongs to Doctor Yalow by saying “she seems to feel” (line 8-9). He also

refrains from endorsing or rejecting this viewpoint or commenting on the matter.

There is no interrogative form from his turn that suggests that he is doing the

activity of questioning. Therefore, the third party attribution plays important role

in this case to maintain neutralistic stance. The IE later validates and reinforces

the neutralistic posture by citing the same third party “the point she was making

earlier” (line 13).41

41 Steven Clayman, Question in Broadcast Journalism. Accessed on Dec 20, 2015
http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soe/faculty/clayman/Site/Publications_files/JOURNALISTIC%20QUE-
STIONING.pdf, p. 12

42 "Steven Clayman, loc.cit."
c. Mitigation

The final procedure that the journalists may employ to maintain their neutralistic stance is mitigation. Mitigation refers to the way in which the journalists produce an evaluative statement but mitigate it to make it sound less confrontional. This procedure is the least common among the three. Different from footing shift and questioning turn types, this procedure enables the IRs to openly express their own opinions, which is breaking the rules of neutrality. The IRs soften this rule-breaking. They can soften it in several ways such as by warning the interviewee and the listeners of what's ahead, by suggesting that it is going to be temporary (only one question), and by self-deprecating. Clayman states that in CA, mitigation technique is accomplished by producing an action projection, an utterance that projects the character of a following action in advance of its actual production. For example, instead of saying to an interviewee, "That's a bunch of hooey," the interviewer might say "I'd like to insert just one question from my personal view, remembering that I'm not an expert in X. To me, I have to say that sounds like a bunch of hooey." The first sentence mitigates or softens the second. But, as Clayman says, the interviewer is still breaking the rules. But the interviewer apologizes in advance and says it's just going to be one question. The following excerpts exemplify the mitigation technique.

---

As the excerpts illustrate, in (line 1) the IR says that he is going to “give vent to a little of my natural born cynicism” which means that he is going to express his emotion, specifically cynicism. Such utterance contains mitigating technique since he gives the warning of what is ahead. However, he also elaborates assessments that challenge the IE’s prior utterance. The use of mitigation technique is also marked when the IR says “a little of my…” (line 1) that suggests that the departure is only temporary, by that he orient to the need to resume his formally neutral stance even as they depart from it temporarily.

4. **News interview**

Conversation analysis has been successfully applied to the study of media talk. It has made central contribution to the general field of broadcast talk studies. Their focus has mainly been on interactional forms of talk. And news interview falls into that category. According to the Oxford Dictionary, the term „interview“ is derived from the French *entre voir* which means to be in sight of. Thus, it refers

---

44 Steven Clayman, *ibid*, p. 488
to a meeting of persons face to face, especially one sought or arranged for the purpose for formal conference at some points. Webster’s dictionary defined an interview as a conversation, or questioning, for the purpose of eliciting information for publication.\textsuperscript{46} By such definition the term interview obtained its primary modern meaning as a journalistic practice.

According to Clayman, the prototypical of news interview involves a distinctive group of participants, subject matter, and interactional form. He further argues that the interviewer is known as a professional journalist rather than a member of advocate or celebrity entertainer. The interviewees, on the other hand, are those who have some connections to the current events, either as primary actors, or as certified experts.\textsuperscript{47} In news interview, no audiences are actively involved in the interaction.

The news interview is different from ordinary conversation in some ways. Timberg stated that television news seems to appear as spontaneously interaction; nevertheless the conversations are always highly planned and structured.\textsuperscript{48} In line with that, Clayman added that the interaction in news interview is relatively formal and impersonal and should be completed in fixed time as well. As far as these special circumstances are concerned, special work is required to launch a news interview and bring it to a close.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{47}Ibid, p. 7
\textsuperscript{49}Clayman, \textit{op.cit}, p. 58
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH FINDINGS

A. Data Description

In this data description, the writer would like to describe and analyze the research data based on the research question. The data for my analysis consist of excerpts taken from a transcribed interview conducted by Chris Wallace aired on Fox News. From a ten minutes interview, the writer gathered eight question-answer sequences as the selected data. The data will focus on the interviewer and interviewee’s turns to find out the reasons and impact of using neutralistic posture strategies.

Here are the data collected from a ten-minute Fox News Sunday interview conducted by Chris Wallace:

Table. 1 Neutralistic posture strategies classification in the interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Neutralistic Posture Strategies</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>IR:</strong> Senator, you used to say that you viewed Super Tuesday … --But according to the latest polls the only states you’re leading in are Arkansas and your home state of Texas. If you don’t win in the south on Super Tuesday, aren’t you in a big trouble?</td>
<td>Attribution to the third party</td>
<td>0:17 – 0:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>IR:</strong> --But I want to put up some, I would think, troubling numbers for you from the South Carolina Exit Polls… <strong>IR:</strong> isn’t Donald Trump beating you senator, at your own game?</td>
<td>Embedding statement within a question</td>
<td>1:41 – 2:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IR:</strong> All right. I want to pick up on this question of the Supreme Court, because…</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation</strong></td>
<td>3:27 – 4:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR: --one of your big issues, one of your pitches to voters is you say that you are a consistent conservative and that you would appoint a strong conservative to the court to replace -- succeed Justice Antonin Scalia. You also say that George W. Bush made a mistake when he named John Roberts to the court back in 2005…</td>
<td>Attributed to the third party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR: --But Senator that’s not what you said when in fact Roberts was nominated to the Court back in two thousand five. I wanna put up an article a big article that you wrote…</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR: But, sir, when you said when you wrote in that article that John Roberts would &quot;carefully and faithfully apply the Constitution and legal precedent,&quot; I mean, it sounds like you’re saying more than just I’m falling in line with George Bush’s nomination. You didn’t have to write that article. You did.</td>
<td>Attributed to the third party</td>
<td>5:28 – 5:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IR:</strong> Sir, didn’t he also give money to you? <strong>IE:</strong> -- you cannot claim that you’re tough on illegal immigration. I’m sorry? <strong>IR:</strong> Didn’t he also give money to you?</td>
<td><strong>Embedding statement within a question</strong></td>
<td>6:25 – 6:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IR:</strong> Your campaign has been involved in a series of incidents that people are calling dirty tricks. I want to put up a list to them…</td>
<td>Attributed to a third party</td>
<td>7:36 – 8:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-- do you take personal responsibility for this series of incidents? What does it say about the culture of the campaign you’re running?</td>
<td><strong>Embedding statement with a question</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IR: Wait a minute. Wait a minute, sir. You personally -- you personally apologized to Ben Carson on a debate stage… Well, don't accuse me of something I didn't do. Two of those things you apologized for one and fired your communications director. Don't say this is the oppo file…

Factual statements

8:33 – 8:43

IR: Senator Cruz, we're flat out of time.

First of all, I don't think anybody is going to think I did an easy interview with Donald Trump. I asked him about plenty of things. If you want to ask him those questions, guess what? You'll get the opportunity at the Fox debate on Thursday.

Attribution to the third party

10:10 – 10:22

B. Data Analysis

This section provides a detailed discussion of the data. Thus, clarifying research objectives and answering research questions that the writer formulates.

1. Datum 1

The following excerpts illustrate how the interviewer uses embedding statements and attribution to a third party as a way of initiating a topic of discussion and criticizing the IE. Here, Chris Wallace interviewed Ted Cruz about the recent polls and Super Tuesday.

IR: Chris Wallace, IE: Ted Cruz

1. IR → a : >Sen<you: (.) u:sed to s:ay that you viewed
2. urr (. ) Su:perTu:esday: and >especially the races
3. in the so called< SEC Pri:mary as a (. ) quote
4. <firewa::ll for your campa:ign> but according to
5. the latest (. ) . hh polls the only states you’re
6. leading in a: re Arkansas and your home state
7. of Texas
8. → b . hh if you don’t win in the South (.)
9. on Su: per Tu: esday aren’t you in big trou b: le?
10. IE (. 4) . hh We: ll Chris what we’ve seen in these Primaries
11. is the first four states have narrowed the fie:ld we
12. started with seventeen candidates it’s now much much
13. more narrow (. ) . (continues)

Here, the IR’s turn (line 1-9) takes the form of two TCUs (arrowed a and b). The first TCU (arrowed a) comprises of two declaratives. Both establish a contrast between IE’s claim and the polls that say the opposite. As noted in the excerpts, he slows down some part of his utterances > Sen atoryou: ( . ) u: sed to
s: ay that you viewed urr (. ) Su: per Tu: esday and > and < fire wa:: ill for your
campaign> as indicated by ‖ to highlight the IE’s views on the subject matter, that is the IR is trying to emphasize IE’s views about Super Tuesday.

According to the IE, the races are like a firewall in that they would keep his competitors (Trump and Rubio) out of the race. Most of the southern states are very conservative. By that, he should have won easily. However, the inclusion of “but” implies that the following material is in contrast to that preceding it. The IR later juxtaposes the prior statement with the report to the contrary as he presented the latest polls. He stresses the words such as “polls” and the modifier “only” as in “the only states…”(line 5), making it clear to the audience that the likely result is against the IE.

In the first TCU (line 1-7), the IR has obviously made two statements, and it consists of information that is contentious to the IE. By these statements, the audience is instructed about two contrasting matters held by the IE. The
statements are a) Cruz said that he needed to do well on Super Tuesday, and b) current polls are predicting he will not do well. It is challenging as it has portrayed that the IE does not meet his own expectation on Super Tuesday.

This course of action is not consistent with news interview turn-taking framework considering that the IR is only allowed to produce turns that consist of questions. Departing from this role could breach a neutralistic posture. However, the IR manages to ensure that the neutralistic posture is maintained. His short in-breath in line 8 (arrowed b) is signaling that there is more talk to come. The IR then projects a further TCU consisting of a compound “if…then” structure that ends with a type of action—a question at the projected final component “aren’t you in a big trouble”.

By producing an interrogative TCU “if you don’t win in the south on Super Tuesday, aren’t you in a big trouble?” at the end of his turn, the IR changes the prior statements into a mere preliminary for the question that follows. This way, the IR reduces the risk of himself being interpreted as presenting viewpoints rather than asking questions for overhearing audience. As suggested by Clayman, although a single question makes up the entire of IR’s turn in most cases, there are some turns that go beyond this simple type. This turn type embodies a more complex design and usually takes a prefaced form involving additional statements that lead up to the question itself.¹ By that, it is acceptable to ask complex questions consisting of a statement plus question. Clayman calls this

technique _embedding statement into questions_ by which the IR produces contentious statements but embeds it within the questioning turn.²

As illustrated in the excerpts, the non-interrogative TCU (arrowed a) is an integral part of the questioning turn that the IR finally achieves. The preface thereby functions to supply background information that makes the question more understandable for overhearers as well as to introduce the topic of discussion, namely Super Tuesday. If stood alone without the prior statements in IR’s prior TCU (arrowed a), the question in interrogative TCU (arrowed b) would have not been clear enough and appropriate to ask, especially when it is raised as an opening question.

The statements in the appearance of preface that provides background for overhearers are actually used to constrain the agenda of question. As explained before, the preface contains information that is contentious to the IR, in that it tells about the IE’s expectation and bad results of polls on Super Tuesday. The preface per se tilts towards a “yes” answer to the subsequent question portraying that the IE is not going to win. Such portrayal is reinforced by the preference of organization of IR’s turn as the question (arrowed b) exploits the contrast (arrowed a) as a resource to make the IE agree with IR’s proposition.

The question “if you don’t win in the south on Super Tuesday, aren’t you in a big trouble?” is designed in such a way to project a –yes‖ response. Although it is in interrogative form, it is negatively formulated. There is

cue that the expected answer is affirmative. In other words, the IR expects that the SPP is in agreement with the trajectory established by the FPP; that the IE will respond saying something similar to “yes it is correct that I am in a big trouble if I don’t win”.

Another problem arises as to whether the IR really fulfills the activity of questioning since the IR embedded his assertions within a negative interrogative question. Heritage has demonstrated that the preference in a negative interrogative question is so strong that the questions formulated in this way are usually heard and interpreted by the IE as expressing assertion rather than merely asking a question that seeks for information. ³

If the negative interrogative question he embedded has a tendency to be treated as making assertion, it means that his neutralistic posture is at stake. To avoid this risk, the IR provides a second defense by a practice that Goffman calls footing shift. ⁴ In Clayman’s term it is called attribution to a third party. Criticizing the IE can be the reason why the IE uses this strategy along with the embedding statements strategy. The IR thinks that Cruz (the IE) is in trouble and is not doing as well as the IE expected to do (lines 4-7). All candidates want to say that they are winning so as to gather their momentum. The critics obviously put the IE at a disadvantage, and through the design of the question, the IR is trying to get the IE to admit that. As noted in the first TCU (arrowed a), both statements have

---
references. The first statement (lines 1-4) is carefully attributed to the IE, whilst the latter (lines 4-7) is attributed to the polls. The IR is able to criticize the IE and deliver his evaluative statements while hiding behind the IE’s statements and the polls. Thereby, despite having made evaluative assertions, this technique allows him to diminish the consequence he may face from interviewee’s reaction towards these assertions.

These techniques have an impact on the IE as the IE does not answer the question in terms of its action agenda. The IE does not provide definitive yes/no question, but rather delivers an evasive answer and thus resisting the question.

The IE responds to IR’s line of questioning by producing a dispreferred response. He initiates his turn with a brief silence (0.4) and audible breath followed by hesitation token well. By prefacing his turn with these delay devices, the IE presents his response in a position of disagreeing with the IR. As one of the candidates, the IE obviously does not want to be perceived as losing.

Apart from well and silence, the IE also uses address term when he says “(.4) .hhWe:ll Chris what we've see:n in these Primaries...” As suggested by Clayman, address term can be used to resist the agenda of the question. Recall that the IE is asked whether he will be in trouble if he does not win in the south. The question takes the form of reverse polarity. Furthermore, the IR quotes the polls to contradict the IE’s claim about the Primaries in the South in his prefatory

---


6 Steven Clayman, —*Address Terms in the Service of Other Actions: The Case of news interview talk‖*, (Discourse & communication Vol. 4, 2010), p. 163
statements, favoring a yes response for the subsequent question. IE responds to such question by producing a type that Raymond has termed ‘non-conforming response’, a kind of response that does not take the form ‘yes’ or ‘no’. And, he prefaces this non-conforming response with an address term.

It all makes sense considering that if he were to answer “yes”, he would disadvantage himself because no politician wants to be perceived as losing. However, if he were to answer “no”, he would need to establish the proof or evidence. Otherwise, it would just make him vulnerable to being heard as making unproven claim.

Rendle-short also argues that prefacing an address term in response to polarity question indicates that a non-conforming response will be forthcoming. By means of a non-conforming response, the IE can indicate that the IR’s polarity question is irrelevant or inappropriate. In this instance, by saying “(4) We’ll Chris what we’ve seen in these Primaries is the first four states have narrowed the field...and I think Super Tuesday will continue to do that”, the IE implies that it is too early to make a specific speculation about whether or not the outcome of the Primaries in the South will trouble him. Thereby, he is suggesting that the IR’s reverse polarity question is not something that he can provide a definitive answer yes or no.

---

8 Ibid, p. 104
Although the IE projects his turn in a kind of disagreement, he does not overtly contest the legitimacy of IR’s questioning turn. Despite the fact that the question is designed in a reverse polarity, with a preference for a yes answer, the IE does not treat IR’s turn as having made an assertion. He does not respond by overtly disagreeing with the IR. It is presumably because the IR has legitimized his challenge by attributing the prefatory statements to what IE himself has said and the polls. By that, he ensures that he is not expressing his own opinion on the subject.

In sum, there are two strategies conveyed in the extracts, namely embedding statements and attribution to a third party. The predominant reason of using embedding statement is to initiate a topic. As noted in the excerpts (line 1-7), the IR delivers statements, in which he explains the contexts. Without the antecedent statements, the question in line 8 would not have been appropriate to ask especially in the beginning of the interview. The IR also uses footing shift strategy as a way of criticizing the IE. The attached statements are intended to be critical for the IE. The impact of using these strategies is the evasive answer the IE has provided. It is marked by a dispreferred response which indicates that IE’s answer is not straightforward. Despite resisting the question, the IE does not jeopardize the IR’s neutralistic posture. It is presumably because neutralistic posture strategies the IR has deployed.
2. Datum 2

1. IR =But u:r - there are some problems in-in terms
2. of your support you're <running as a: Social
3. Conservative> and as a >political< outsider but I
4. wanna put up: hh some(.) I would think >troubling<
5. numbers for you: from the South Carolina Exit Polls
6. .hh Trump be:at you among E:vangelicals
7. self-described Evangelicals thirty: four percent to
8. twenty six .hh and among voters (. ) who say: they
9. want the next President to be from quote outside the
10. >political< establishment (. ) .hh they went for
11. Trump sixty three: percent to thirtee:n (. ) question
12. (. ) isn't .hh (. ) Donald Trump beating you Senator (. )
13. at your own game
14. IE (.2) Well you know a ↑Pri:mary is an extended
15. conversation>and and< ↑Donald Trump has told us
16. >many many< times in his own words he says seven
17. months ago: (.2) he was: a member of the
18. establishment

The IR begins his turn by latching and “but”, projecting a challenge to counter the IE’s prior turn. He then initiates a repair with a stretch sound u:r because the trouble he might have to produce the next element in his turn at talk.

A declarative statement he produces as the next element “- there are some problems in-in terms of your support” clearly challenges what the IE has claimed about his campaign. By starting his turn with latching and a marker “but”, the IR demonstrates his vigorous attempt to dispute IE’s prior line.

The challenge becomes more striking as the IR starts to elaborate it by conveying a version that Schegloff has termed an action projection.\(^9\) He worded his utterance with freestanding assertion –I would think followed by the phrase

“troubling< numbers for you (line 5)” which poses the challenge for the IE. He uses a first personal pronoun “I” which implies that he brings himself into the debate. At the first glance, this course of action harms neutrality since he delivers his own statement. However, as mentioned before, the utterance is designed to be an action projection. It is preceded by an explicit alert –“I wanna put up: hh some (.)” about the forthcoming action. In this case, the action projection seems to have been intended as a “pre-delicate”, for the IR indicates that he is about to present “troubling numbers”. By that, he is signaling that such action will lead into delicate or violative action.10 The IR also treats the challenge as a temporary departure when he says that he is only going to put “some” of “troubling numbers” for the IE. Thus, despite this rule-breaking, the IR softens his action by portraying it as a temporary action undertaken with caution. In Clayman’s term, this technique is called Mitigation.11

As noted in the excerpts, it turns out that the IR systematically conveys mitigation technique in accordance with footing shift. He legitimizes his turn by quoting the polls “from the South Carolina Exit Polls” right after he delivers a statement “I would think troubling numbers”. As a result, he converts his unsourced statement into a statement that has reference. This footing shift allows him to present his evaluative assessment on behalf of others. Here, the IE is again portrayed as losing since he does not seem to have enough votes compared to his main competitor (Trump). The possible reason of conveying mitigation strategy,
combined with a third-party attribution is to criticize the IE‘s previous claim. The IE opens the door for this question when he says “And the only campaign, the only candidate that has beaten Donald Trump, the only candidate that can beat Donald Trump is our campaign.” When the IE says “we can beat Donald Trump”, the listeners might think “if I were there myself I’d like to ask Cruz if the polls numbers support that.” Wallace as the IR should produce talk for overhearing audience. By that, he should properly be asking the questions that the overhearing audience (listeners, viewers) would like to ask themselves.

The IR also legitimizes his challenge by designing his turn to be recognized as the activity of questioning. The IR reaches his possible completion after presenting the polls. However, his turn is not heard as a possibly completed question. He then goes on producing another TCU which takes the interrogative form, thus converting the prior statements into a question preface.

An evasion from the IE is an impact of utilizing these strategies. The IE employs a dispreferred non-conforming response prefaced by silence and a hesitation token “well” to express disagreement. He then goes on producing a discourse marker “you know” followed by statements “↑Pri:mary is an extended conversation>and and< ↑Donald Trump has told us >many many< times in his own words he says seven months ago: (.2) he was: a member of the establish↓ment. As suggested by Andersen, “you know” serves to mark that the alignment is presumed from current speaker to current hearer.\(^\text{12}\) When prefacing his utterance with “you know”, the IE is suggesting that his view is shared by all

---

participants, and is therefore factual. In doing so, the IE is implying that he is not the only one who thinks that the primary is an extended conversation and Trump is a member of establishment.

By saying “↑Primary is an extended conversation↑” and ↑Donald Trump has told us many times in his own words he says seven months ago: (.2) he was: a member of the establishment”, the IE treats the IR’s polarity question as flawed, thus giving him an account for why he cannot give a definite yes or no response. He raises his pitch and stresses the word ↑Donald when attributing his statement “he was: a member of the establishment”. It is noticeable that the stressed pronoun he implies that the IE wants to emphasize that Donald is not a political outsider, thus rejecting the propositional content of IR’s question that says the opposite (in line 10). The repetition of modifier “many” ensues right after the verb told, which then suggests that he is upgrading the credibility of his statement.

As noted in line (12-13), IR’s question “isn’t hh (. ) Donald Trump beating you Senator (. ) at your own game” implies that Trump seems to be getting better statistics using the same strategy as the IE. The question suggests that both Trump and IE are trying to win votes to be the next leader of the Republican Party. One strategy is to appeal to the religious people; the other is to appeal to people who prefer a political outsider. Nevertheless, the IE disputes this proposition by saying that Trump is a member of establishment, and not a political outsider.

To conclude, the IR employs mitigation, third-party attribution and embedding statements. The reason of using these strategies is to criticize and
challenge the IE’s prior statements about his campaign. He prefaces his turn by latching and a discourse marker -but|| as a way of countering IE’s prior turn. The challenge is strengthened when IR produces freestanding assertion using the first pronoun -I||, and goes on presenting evaluative statements that disadvantage the IE. From those statements, the IE projects another challenge by a reverse polarity question that has a strong preference for agreement. By using a third party attribution, the IR is able to express his personal opinion and criticize the IE without risking his neutralistic posture. An evasion from the IE is an impact of utilizing them. Since the IE does not want to be perceived as losing, he resists IR’s line of questioning by producing a dispreferred response.

3. Datum 3

1. IR >Alright< I wanna pick up on >this question< of the
2. Supreme Court because one of you:r big issues one of
3. your pitches to voters .hh(.) is you: say: that you are a
4. consistent<Conservative .hh(.) and> that you would (.)
5. appoint a strong Conservative to the Court to s- replace
6. .hh(.) Justi- urr succeed Justice Antonin Scalia .hhurr
7. you: also say: that George W Bush made a mis↓take
8. when he:: named (.). John Ro:berts to the Court back in
9. two thousand <fi:ve> .hh(.) >take a look<
10. ((VIDEO CLIP))-omitted-
11. IR (.4) >But Senator that‘s NOT what you said when in fact
12. Roberts was nominated to the Court back in two
13. thousand five >I wanna< put up .hhurr an article u:rr (.)
14. a big article you wrote with the title The Right Stuff >this
15. is in two thousand fi:ve Roberts nominated into the
16. ↓Court you: wrote .hh<John Roberts should be a qu:ick
17. confirm> .hh as a jurist Judge Roberts’ approach .hh>will
18. be that< of his enti:re career (.). <carefully (.). faithfully>
19. applying the Constitution .hh(.) and legal precedent (.)
20. ↑this was a <lo:ng> article sir that you wrote for the
21. National Review and you certainly see:med at the t:me
22. (.). hhh (.). I: know you >said you wouldn’t have
nominated him but you seemed at the time to be an enthusiastic supporter of John Roberts
Well Chris it's true once George W Bush nominated John Roberts I supported the Republican President in his nomination that was a mistake in hindsight that was a mistake but let's be absolutely clear I would not have nominated John Roberts I would have nominated Mike Luttig who was my former boss on the Court of Appeals he was a proven Conservative who had decades on the Court defending Conservative principles and the difference was too many Republican Presidents aren't to spend the capital hh to nominate and confirm a principled Conservative hh I have spent my entire life fighting to defend the Constitution and Bill of Rights and when comes to the Supreme Court I will invest every bit of political capital hh to ensure that the Bill of Rights is there

The excerpts above also exhibit an instance of third-party attribution and mitigation. In line 1 the IR produces a token “all right”. As stated by Clayman, the interviewers often say this token just before they ask questions and begin a new topic. In the extracts above, the IR initiates a discussion about “supreme court” (line 1). It is clarified by the subsequent attributed statements that describe the context (line 2-9). However, there are two attributed statements that are contradictory. Thereby, introducing a topic is not the only reason for using these two combined strategies.

Criticizing the IE is another possible motivation. The IR tries to challenge the IE by showing his inconsistency in terms of the statements he was making. He initiates his challenge by saying “one of your big issues one of your pitches to voters” which he legitimizes through footing shift by quoting IE’s words in one of his presidential debates (line 3-9). The IR quoted the IE’s words of having said
that the IE is a consistent conservative, and that he would not have nominated John Roberts to replace a judge Antonin Scalia. He also legitimizes it by showing a video clip to the audience to prove that the IE really says that.

In line (11), the IR prefaces his turn by “but”, indicating that the contrasting materials will be forthcoming. IR’s utterance “But Senator that’s NOT what you said when in fact Roberts was nominated to the Court back in two thousand five…”, projects a further challenge which counter IE’s prior statement. The word “not” is uttered in a high volume in a way to emphasize the contrast.

The IR goes on elaborating the challenge which he legitimizes by putting a direct quotation from the IE’s article up on the screen, so that the audience can see the IE’s exact words. The article proves that the IE was actually supporting Roberts in 2005. When presenting the article, the IR delivers his own statement through a self-repair by _cut off_ (.) and the item “u:rr” when he says “an article _u:rr_ (.) a big article. Cut offs are usually deployed to initiate repair on some trouble source which has already been produced in the turn. Here, the IR cuts off after “u:rr” and adds a new element “big” to his prior element of his talk “an article”. He adds modifier “big” to accentuate the significance of the article the IE has written for Roberts.

Another assessment appears after the IR presents the article when he says “this was a <lo:ng> article sir that you wrote... (line 20-21). He stretches the word “lo:ng” and it is uttered slower <> than the surrounding talk. By doing so,
the IR is trying to highlight that the article that IE has written was really an actual support for Roberts. From these assessments, it is obvious that the IR has offered commentary on his own on the matter, and it is vulnerable to being seen as bias. However, the IR manages to diminish such charge by conveying a mitigation technique. Similar to datum 2, the IR produces an action projection when he says “>I wanna< put up .hhurr”. Such utterance functions to project the character of the subsequent talk.¹⁴ The IR gives an advance warning that his following talk might contain evaluative statements.

In his final TCU (line 20-24), the IR produces another challenge by making an explicit contradiction through a summary formulation/ B-event statement.¹⁵ The statements he delivers (line 11-21) have already placed the IE in a situation where he has to deal with 1) an embarrassing situation that his words cannot be believed, 2) the implication that he is inconsistent in his own views. IR’s formulation (line 21-24) simply proposes a stronger interpretation in the sense that it overtly states that the IE is an enthusiastic supporter of John Roberts, something that the IE is reluctant to admit.

In response to the IR’s challenging question, the IE produces a dispreferred response. He delays his turn with silence (.4), audible breath .hh, and a hesitation token “well” and an address term Chris (line 25). Although the IE asserts an agreement “(.4) .hh>Well< Chris it’s true once George W Bush

nominated John Robert...(line 25) in response to IR‘s assessment, his turn actually projects a disagreement as it is followed by a contrast conjunction “but”, indicating that the disagreement component will follow. Here, the IE treats an agreement component as a preface\(^\text{16}\), allowing him to explain the reason why it has to be spoken. In this case, it is obvious that in his prior turn, the IR has put the IE in a difficult situation to disagree with his proposition. Producing a strong disagreement is not a feasible option since the IR‘s statement is attributed to what IE himself has said and written, and it is therefore true. Conveying an agreement component in his first TCU enables the IE to clarify his viewpoints as well as to produce a self-defense.

As noted in (line 25-29), his utterance “it’s true once George W Bush nominated John Roberts I supported the Republican President in his nomination” tells the reason why he nominated John Roberts. He made an excuse that he was just following the President. Such utterance is subsequently followed by another TCU consisting of another excuse –*hh that was a mistake in hindsight >that was a mistake||*. The IE initiates a self-repair by adding the phrase “*in hindsight*” in the mid of his utterance and repeats the prior element of his talk “*that was a mistake*”. In so doing, he is trying to make it seems like he never agreed that Robert was a good choice. Thus, it gives the impression that he is downgrading the significance of his support towards Roberts, and portraying it as a mere mistake. After prefacing his response with a brief expression of

agreement, the IE continues his turn by producing a much more elaborated disagreement (line 28-40).

4. Datum 4

1. .hh and when it comes to the Supreme Court I will invest
2. >every bit< of political capital .hh to e:nsure that the Bill
3. of Rights is [there]=
4. IR [>B-but] sir [when you say:]
5. IE =[for the next] ↑genera[↓tion]
6. IR [>w-when]<
7. you wrote in that article that John Roberts would
8. <carefully and faithfully apply> the Constitution and
9. legal President .hh I mean it sounds like you were
10. saying more than just I’m falling in line with George
11. Bush’s nomination .hh () you didn’t have to write that
12. article you ↑did
13. IE (.4) Urri-it is correct I supported the Republican
14. >nominee: but< you know its-it’s interesting Chris
15. I noticed you didn’t ask Donald Trump about his saying
16. that his <s:i ster () .hh who is a Liberal radical pro-
17. abortion Clinton appointee:> ( several lines omitted)

These excerpts exemplify the case in which the IR’s neutralistic posture is in jeopardy. In (line 4), the IR starts his turn by “but” slightly before IE’s possible completion. However, IE’s turn is not actually complete at such place, and both speakers end up speaking in overlap. The IR attempts to persist in overlap while he is aware that the IE is still in mid-TCU. He deploys hitches by recycling his talk [>B-but] sir [when you say:][>w-when<] you wrote (line 4, 6) until he can speak in a clear manner and hold the turn. However, the problem does not last quite long as the IE reaches his actual completion (line 5). By starting his turn with “but” and overlap, the IR shows his readiness to contest IE’s prior turn.
The IR’s challenge takes the form of multi-TCUs. The first TCU contains a declarative “[>B-but] sir [when you say:] [>w-when<] you wrote in that article that John Roberts would <carefully and faithfully apply> the Constitution and legal Precedent” that reissues the IE’s inconsistency in his views. He slows down two intensifiers “carefully” and “faithfully” and the word “apply” in a way to emphasize that the IE’s support for Roberts.

When the IE claimed that he was just “falling in line” with the president, it seemed to be an actual support for Roberts at the time. It is challenging to the IE because the IR for the second time successfully shows that the IE is self-contradictive. This challenge is legitimized by footing shift as the IR has attributed his statement to the article the IE himself has written. The IE cannot deny it. The IR goes on challenging the IE in his second TCU. Similar to datum 3, He produces another summary formulation to legitimize his challenge –hh I mean it sounds like you were saying mo:re than just I'm falling in line with George Bush’s nomination”. Thus, the IR’s reason for using a third party attribution is to criticize and challenge the IE.

It is worth noticing that despite the fact that the IR has tried to appear neutral by attributing his assertions to a third party (in this case he attributed them to IE), despite the fact that he is using ‘evidence’ to shield his claim of ~the IE’s inconsistency‖ , the IR’s neutralistic posture is compromised as the IE tries to undermine it. In line 13, the IE’s utterance „,(4) Urri-it is correct I supported the Republican >nominee:” sounds responsive although his response in his prior turn remains as he says “I supported the Republican nominee”. He then goes on
shifting away from the topic as it is indicated by a discourse marker -but‖, and establishes a new topical agenda by registering a complaint, attacking the IR for not being impartial in terms of his choice of questions. He uses an address term, treating the IR’s turn as a personal attack.

5. Datum 5

1. IE ((several lines omitted)) hh<Donald has TOLD us> in the last debate .hh (.) he’s gonna cut deals >let me give you another example we saw in the last debate on-on immigration (.) hh
2. when I was leading the fight against the Rubio-Schumer Gang of Eight Amnesty Bill (.2) and-and togeth:her with millions of Americans >we defeated< Amnesty .hh Donald was FUNDING the Gang of Eight he gave over fifty thousand dollars (.2) to five members of the Gang of Eight .hh ↑if you had spent [<yea::rs>]=
11. IR [Didn’t he also] give money to you though [<sir>]=? =[supp]or↑ting
12. 13. IE OPEN border <°Democrats°>
14. IR =>Sir didn’t he [also give money to<you::>]?
15. IE [But you cannot claim] that you’re tough on >illegal< ↓<immigration> (.) [I'm sorry]?
16. IR [>Didn't he als-<] Didn’t he also give money: to you:?
17. 18. IE Oh l- ((break in recording)) >thousand dollars to my leadership pack which he tosses around (.) l-l-like candy: .hh>but listen< he:: has supported open border Democrats for decades he supported Jimmy Carter .hh over Ronald Regan he supported Jo:hn Carey: .hh over George W Bush he's contributed to Hillary Clinton .hhh to Chuck Schumer ((break in recording)) this is a man anyone who supports .hh radical Liberals like those (.2) does not care about Conservatives [Supreme] Court Justices=
19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. ((Several lines omitted)

Here, the IE raised an issue about Trump. He claimed that Trump was funding the Gang of Eight, group of eight senators who passed the immigration bill. In line 10, the IR starts talking within the IE‘s legitimate turn. By refusing to wait for TRP, he commits an interruption. The IR attempts to take the turn 3
times. He speeds up his utterance, producing verbatim repeats in his second attempt and recycling the prior element of his talk “\textit{Didn’t he also give money…}” in his third attempt until he is able to talk clearly. His challenge only consists of a single TCU “\textit{didn’t he also give money to you (line 10, 13, 16)}” that is basically a statement. The IR presents the statement in some way factual as he is certain that Trump gave money to the IE. The challenge is legitimized by phrasing his statement as a question, adding an auxiliary verb as a question operator “\textit{didn’t t}” in the beginning of his turn, thus inviting the IE to disagree. By doing so, the IR attends to the constraint that he should properly restrict himself to asking questions. Thus, the reason of embedding statement strategy in the excerpts is to criticize the IE.

6. Datum 6

1. IE Oh l- \((\text{break in recording})\) >thousand dollars to my leadership pack which he tosses around \((.)\) l-l-like candy; \(\text{hh}\) but listen< he:: has supported open border Democrats for dec\(\text{ades he}

2. IR \(\text{[Alright] I-I have [urr]}\)

3. IE \(\text{does not care about the Second Amendment}\)

4. IE \(\text{and doesn’t care about securing the border .hh because}\)

5. IE \(\text{those are the open border \(\text{h} o\text{v} \text{ers who}<\text{LED}>\).hh \(\text{The Gang of Eight and \(\text{indee}d\) you know it was striking after the debate \(\text{Chris} (.2) \text{Donald went on CNN and he was talking about his- his hotel down in Florida .hh (.w-where they \(\text{bring in foreign workers by the hundreds and they won't hire Ameri\text{cans} (.2) \text{and he said well \(\text{gosh:} \text{you can't find Ameri\text{cans} (.2) to work as \(\text{waiters and waitres\text{s}}\)}}\)) how utterly ridic\text{ulous there are millions}}\)
of Americans. who have worked and wanna work as waiters
21. and waitresses especially. (Senator)
22. [Senator]
23. IE = [in some] swanky: hotel in Palm Beach where they're tipping=
24. IR = [Senator I got one more]=
25. IE = [.hh with a hundred dollars]
26. IR = I [got one more question]
27. for you and ur:rr your cam<[aign]>=
28. IE = [>°Yeah°<]
29. IR = has been involved in a series: of incidents that people are
30. calling dirty tricks .hh I-I want to put up a list of them in
31. Iowa the Cruz campaign sent out Tweets .hh saying Ben Carson
32. was suspending his campaign that was false .hhh<urr:: the
33. campaign> put out ↑fly::ers accusing people of voting violations
34. that was false (. ) in South Carolina .hh a Cruz SuperPack
35. attacked Trump: .hh over (. ) the Confederate Flag and your then
36. (. ) Communications Director posted a link this wee:k. .hh (. )
37. accusing Rubio of disrespecting The Bible that was false
38. question. hhdo you: take personal responsibility >this was<
39. your campaign except for the Su:per Pack .hh>do you take
40. personal responsibility< for this series of incidents .hh and what
41. does it say about the culture of the campaign you’re “running”?
42. IE (.2) Urr:: (. ) C-Chris every accusation you raise there is incorrect
43. I- I apprecia:te you're reading the Donald Trump attack file on
44. ↑that

As this case illustrates, the IE appears to project a long turn (line 1-8). The
IR starts his turn, giving a warning by an item “all right” just prior to possible
completion, signalling the IE that he is going to close down the prior line and
begin a new topic. However, IR’s attempt to take the turn fails as the IE persists
by adding an increment and projecting a long turn with multi-TCUs. In his second
attempt, the IR enters his talk by using an address term “senator” at a point where
the IE was not yet finished. He begins his turn right after the IE produces the word
“especially” which projects further talk that will elaborate IE’s prior line. For the

---
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second time, his attempt fails as the IE continues talking. The IR goes on conveying perturbations in his third attempt by speeding up his utterance (line 24,26,27) until he is able to continue his TCU in the clear.

After securing the floor, the IR produces a declarative statement in his very first TCU (line 26-30), confronting the IE with issues about his campaign pulling “dirty tricks”. He then goes on producing several other TCUs, enumerating a list of incidents to support his claim while overtly commenting on that by saying “that was false”. It is obvious that the IR believes that these episodes occurred and that IR thinks that they were indeed dirty trick, lies and wrong. By mentioning series of incidents of the IE’s campaign, the IR asserts that the IE has shown not a single example, but a pattern of using unethical dirty tricks.

The IR’s declarative statements certainly sound adversarial. Not to mention the use of phrase “dirty tricks” which obviously has strong accusatory overtones. However, he distances himself from the contentious phrase and statements by presenting himself as speaking on behalf of the general public. He avoids any responsibility he may encounter from uttering these statements “I [got one more question] for you and your campaign has been involved in a series of incidents that people are calling dirty tricks” since he already allocated the principal to “people” in general and casted himself as a mere animator. This type of attribution allows the IR to legitimize and neutralize his challenge by portraying it to be presented for public interest. By implication, any attempt from
the IE to contest the legitimacy of this challenge is inclined to be interpreted as an offense for the public that the IR has represented.

Apart from footing shift or attribution technique, the IR also legitimizes his challenge by conveying an action projection. In this case, the action projection is pre-delicate, in that the IR marks the next projected action as delicate. He gives an advance warning “I want to put up a list of them” as he referred it to “series of incident” which he mentioned in his first TCU. This strategy allows the IR to overtly express his statements.

The IR adds two questions in his final TCUs as a way of neutralizing his prior statements. The questions take the form of polarity and WH question 1) hh do you: take personal responsibility >this was< your campaign except for the Super Pack hh do you take personal responsibility< for this series of incidents, 2) hh and what does it say about the culture of the campaign you “re °running”?

Both questions use demonstrative pronoun “this” which refers to a list of incidents the IR has mentioned as the antecedent (lines 30-38). This means the questions need the prior statements and cannot be taken in isolation. If left alone as questions, it would not have been understandable. The overhearers might get confused which series of incidents the IR is referring to. Through these questions, the IR is also able to reinforce the challenges that he has mentioned in his prior statements. These questions suggest two things strongly, 1) the obvious answer to of the second question is –it is an unethical culture in that playing ‘dirty tricks’ is the norm. 2) The first question as to whether the IE is responsible for the series of incidents the IR has mentioned. Did he tell his campaign to do those unethical
things? Did he know they were going on but turn a blind eye on them? The prefatory statements IR produces seem to have been intended to tighten the agenda of his questions rather than providing background for the overhearers. Datum 7 will explain how the IE responds to this line of questioning.

7. Datum 7

1. IE (.2) Urr:: (.3) C-Chris every accusation you raise there is incorrect
2. I- I appreciate you're reading the Donald Trump attack file on
↑that
3. IR >>Oh come on[<↓sir>]
4. IE >>Let me<< tell you our [campaign has been
6. through the high↑est]=
7. IR [you-you personally
8. apologise] YOU wait [a minute you- p- you wait a minute sir
9. you personally you personally]=
10. IE =[(inaudible 0:08:34)] [Chris let me end please don‘t
11. interrupt me]=
12. IR =APOLOGISE .hh to Ben Carson[on ((break in recording))
13. state].hh=
14. IE =((break in recording)) [Chris don‘t interrupt me]<
15. IR =you FIRED .hh your (.3) communications direc[tor don‘t say this
16. is an ↑ ↑o:p:o]=
17. IE [Chris please
18. don‘t interrupt me]
19. IR =file on our part ↓sir
20. IE (.3) Chris please don‘t interrupt me (.4) [our campaign from the
21. beginning] (.3)
22. IR =([Well I- I- I- PLE:ASE
23. don‘t say th- urr accuse me [of something I didn‘t do::]
24. IE [Go ahead Chris] I-let me know when
25. I'm allowed to answer
26. IR >>Well urr don‘t accuse me of doing< something I didn‘t ↑do:: t-
27. two of things you apologised for one .hh (.3) and you FIRED your
28. communications director don‘t say this is the ↑opo ↓°file°

The excerpts above illustrate how the IR defends himself when confronted by the IE. As noted in line (1-3), the IE treats the IR’s challenge as a personal
attack by initiating his turn with an address term “u:rr Chris”, by calling the IR’s statements as accusations and by issuing the counter attack “I- I apprecia:te you're reading the Donald Trump attack file on↑that, which departs from his institutional role in answering the questions. The IR reacts by latching, prefacing his turn with a particle oh signalling that the prior turn is problematic. The particle oh is then followed by a direct command come on, asking the IE to be more responsive in terms of answering the question. In lines (5-6) The IE initiates a defence for his position by producing a token request –[>Let me<] tell you our [campaign has been through the high↑est]=. Since the IR does not want to be left guilty as charged, he interrupts the IE’s ongoing response by providing a direct counter that he believes to be facts “[You-you personally apologise] YOU wait [a minute you- p- you wait a minute sir you personally you personally]=|| By that statement, the IR sanctions the IE for departing from his role in answering. As noted in the excerpts, the IR upgrades his talk in competitive mode by deploying perturbations and hitches, which clearly indicates that he has been challenged. While the IR aggressively talks in overlap to get the floor, the IE exhibits an instance of overlapping talk as a way of persisting to completion. He designs his talk in solo production mode by using neither hitches nor perturbations. His talk only consists of a single TCU “Chris please don” t interrupt me” resisting the IR’s
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accusation with a direct accusation of IR for having him interrupted. By that, he is suggesting that the IR abandons his institutional role as a questioner. This accusation becomes more pronounced in (line 24) when the IE sarcastically produces a go-ahead response “[Go ahead Chris] l-let me know when I'm allowed to answer” while simultaneously complains that he does not get a chance to speak. In line 26-28 the IR resumes his argument “Well urr don’t accuse me of doing< something I didn"t ↑do:: t-two of things you apologised for one” to defend himself. It is obvious that the interaction has turned out to be more conversational- like where each participant confronts each other departing from their institutional roles.

8. Datum 8

1. IE (.4) Chris (.) our campaign from the beginning has been the
2. highest level of integrity when others have engaged in personal
3. attacks and insults (.).hh we don’t respond in kind and you know
4. it was striking you just had Donald Trump .hh on the <air> you
5. >didn’t< ask him about the fact .hh that he: s:ent out a
6. <fabricated quote from Tom Coburn> (.3) urr (.) impugning my:
7. integrity .hh Tom Coburn and Senator Cobu>r came out and said
8. it< was an utter fabrication and yet Donald continued repeating
9. .hh what he knew to be false .hh he didn’t ask Donald Trump
10. about the robo calls that went out (.) from a white supremacist
11. group supporting Donald Trump .hh telling people do NOT vote
12. for a Cuban vote for Donald Trump .hh y-you know when it
13. comes to (.2) telling the tru::th and not telling the truth YOU
14. didn’t ASK Donald Trump about the fact that in the last debate
15. .hh I asked him TRUE or FALSE YOU sup↓ort (. so:cialised
16. medicine the government paying for your healthcare? ↑He said
17. false .hh (. and it's directly contrary to what he said for twenty
18. years on the record .hh listen Chris (. the FACTS matter I
19. u:nderstand .hh
20. IR Senator
21. IE [th-th-]that that there are (.) are (.) folks that don’t
wanna focus on the facts but listen to the voters. hh
about the truth they care about Donald [Trump’s record]=
[Senator Cruz=:z]
=of getting ((break in recording)) [inaudible 0:10:07] -s:-
Senator Cruz we’re flat out of time urr>first of all I don’t think
anybody is gonna think I did an easy interview with Donald
Trump I asked him about plenty: of things< .hhh if you wanna ask
him those questions guess what you’ll get the opportunity at the
FOX debate on Thursday .hh thank you () thanks for making time
for us on this very busy weekend ↑°sir° .hh

This case illustrates how the IR defends himself by closing the turn and
adopting a tribune of people stance after being attacked by the IE. As noted in the
excerpts (line 1-19), the IE appears to project a long turn in a way to restore the
image of his campaign considering that the IR has portrayed it pulling dirty tricks.
He then goes on attacking the IR’s professionalism, accusing him of being unfair in terms of his choice of questions.

The IR attempts to initiate a closing turn through an address term
“senator” (line 20) at a point where the IE has not reached his possible
completion. It is indicated by his audible breath .hh (line 19) that projects further
talk. However, his attempt fails as the IE adds an increment to his prior TCU,
recycling the element of his talk “[th-th-]that that there are () are () folks that
don’t wanna focus on the fact…” (line 21-23) so that he can talk clearly and pursue his attack on the IE.

In his second attempt for closure, the IR has become a little bit more
aggressive as he once again uses an address term as a way of getting the floor, this
time with a stretching sound calling IE’s name “[Senator Cruz=:z]” and he starts it
when the IE is still talking. In doing so, the IR alerts the IE that the IE’s TCU-in-progress should come to completion.

Despite having interrupted the IE, the IR softens his abruptness. Right after he mentions IE’s name, he let the IE complete his utterance. The IR also uses a time constraint “Senator Cruz we’re flat out of time urr (line 26)” as an excuse for having the IE interrupted. That way, he portrays himself as having done it because of the circumstances that he cannot control.

The IR delivers two statements to counter the IE’s accusation before arriving to his final closure. He legitimizes his first statement by footing shift as the statement “first of all I don’t think anybody is gonna think I did an easyinterview with Donald Trump I asked him about plenty of things (line 26-28)is attributed to people in general. He then projects another TCU containing a statement “.hhh if you wanna ask him those questions guess what you’ll get the opportunity at the FOX debate on Thursday”Such statement gives the impression that the IE in some way has departed from his role in answering the questions.
CHAPTER IV
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. CONCLUSION
In this chapter, the writer summarizes the results of her study, with reference to her research questions. In the data under discussion, the writer found that Wallace uses all neutralistic strategies, namely footing shift, embedding statement within a question and mitigation. Footing shift occur in almost all of Wallace turns which mean that most of the challenges have been initially attributed to the third party.

The writer also found that Wallace uses more than one strategy in almost all of his turns. This is presumably because the hostile environment that he intends to create. By combining the strategies, Wallace is able to construct challenges without jeopardizing his neutralistic stance. The IR has some underlying reasons for using these strategies, which are introducing a new topic, criticizing the IE and defending himself when confronted by the IE.

Wallace tends to use this embedding statement to introduce the topic and provide contextual information for the subsequent question. Third-party attribution and mitigation are used to criticize and challenge the IE. There are two instances where the IR uses third-party attribution strategy to defend himself when confronted by the IE. IR uses the concern of people in general to maintain his neutralistic stance.
The strategies that Wallace uses clearly have impacts on Cruz as the interviewee. Cruz tends to provide evasive answers or resists IR’s line of questioning. It is indicated by dispreferred responses which suggest that his answers are not straightforward. There are two instances where the interaction becomes more like a confrontation between the two participants. At this point, Wallace is accused of failing to maintain neutrality and he takes an initiative to defend himself by producing non-questioning turn (eg.7), however, he resolved this problem by justifying his action as having presented facts and bringing back the news-interview turn-taking framework through third-party attribution by using the concern of people in general.

B. SUGGESTION

The phenomenon of language in news interview has always been an interesting object for the study. This thesis has only been emphasized on the practice of journalistic neutrality, which specifically focuses on the reasons and impact of using neutralistic posture strategies, while there are other aspects that can be examined in news interview. For instance, the writer is intrigued by level of aggressiveness of the interviewer’s questions, yet she does not examine them in more detail, for it is not the main focus of the research. It will also be very interesting for the future researchers to explore the language in news interview by conducting a comparative research between Conversation Analysis (CA) and Discourse Analysis (DA).
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SEN. TED CRUZ, R-TEXAS, PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Good morning, Chris. Good to be with you.

WALLACE: Senator, you used to say that you viewed Super Tuesday and especially the races in the so-called SEC primary as a, quote, "firewall" for your campaign. But according to the latest polls, the only states you're leading in Arkansas and your home state of Texas.

If you don't win in the south on Super Tuesday, aren't you in big trouble?

CRUZ: Well, Chris, what we've seen in the primaries is the first four states have narrowed the field. We started with 17 candidates. It's much, much more narrow. And I think Super Tuesday will continue to do that.

You know, 65 percent of Republican primary voters don't think Donald Trump is the right candidate to go head-to-head with Hillary Clinton. He agrees with her on too many issues and he's too vulnerable to lose in the general election.

And the only campaign, the only candidate that has beaten Donald Trump, the only candidate that can beat Donald Trump is our campaign. And so on Super Tuesday, I hope and believe that conservatives will continue to coalesce behind our campaign.

Because if you're one of those 65 percent of Republicans that doesn't want to see Donald Trump as our nominee, doesn't want to see a blowout in November, then I
ask you to come support us and stand with us because that's the only way to stop Donald is to stand together behind our campaign on Super Tuesday.

WALLACE: But there are problems in terms of your support. You're running as a social conservative and as a political outsider.

But I want to put up some, I would think, troubling numbers for you from the South Carolina exit polls. Trump beat you among evangelicals, self-described evangelicals, 34 percent to 26 percent. And among voters who say they want the next president to be from, quote, "outside the political establishment," they went for Trump 63 percent to 13 percent.

Question, isn't Donald Trump beating you, Senator, at your own game?

CRUZ: Well, you know, a primary is an extended conversation. And Donald Trump told us many, many times in his own words, he said seven months ago he was a member of the establishment. You know, we saw the debate this past week. Donald laid out he is a Washington deal maker. And it is Washington deal that's have bankrupted this country.

If you want more Washington deals, Donald Trump is your guy. That's why Harry Reid said Donald Trump was his favorite Republican because Harry Reid said Donald will cut deals with us. We can work with him.

You know, we saw it in the debate. When Donald Trump took me on and said, listen, Ted, you have to be willing to compromise on the Supreme Court. You have to be willing to compromise on religious liberty.

Let me tell you, if you're at home, I give you my word as president -- I won't compromise away your religious liberty rights. I won't compromise away your Second Amendment rights.
Donald Trump is telling us he's going to sit down with Harry Reid and Chuck Schumer and give away Justice Scalia's Supreme Court seat and that means your Second Amendment rights are in jeopardy.

And it's worth remembering, Chris, Donald Trump is someone who supported Bill Clinton's national ban on firearms for some of the most popular guns in America. I think we need a president who doesn't cut deals with Democrats to give away our rights but rather stands with the working men and women of this country.

WALLACE: All right. I want to pick up on this question of the Supreme Court, because one of your big issues, one of your pitches to voters is you say that you are a consistent conservative and that you would appoint a strong conservative to the court to replace -- succeed Justice Antonin Scalia. You also say that George W. Bush made a mistake when he named John Roberts to the court back in 2005.

Take a look.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

CRUZ: I wouldn't have nominated John Roberts. Indeed, Governor Bush pointed out why. It wasn't that the President Bush wanted to appoint a liberal to the court. It’s that it was the easier choice.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

WALLACE: But, Senator, that's not what you said when, in fact, Roberts was nominated to the court back in 2005. I want to put up an article, a big article you wrote with the title "The Right Stuff". This is in 2005. Roberts nominated into the court.
You wrote, "John Roberts should be a quick confirm. As a jurist, Judge Roberts’ approach will be of that his entire career, carefully, faithfully applying the Constitution and legal precedent."

This was a long article, sir, that you wrote for The National Review and you certainly seemed at the time -- I know you said you wouldn't have nominated him -- but you seemed to be an enthusiastic supporter of John Roberts.

CRUZ: Well, Chris, it's true. Once George W. Bush nominated him, I supported the Republican president in his nomination. That was a mistake. In hindsight that was a mistake.

But let’s be absolutely clear. I would have nominated Mike Luttig, who was my former boss on the Court of Appeals. He was a proven conservative who had decades on the court defending conservative principles. And the difference was too many Republican presidents aren't willing to spend the capital to nominate and confirm a principled conservative.

I have spent my entire life fighting to defend the constitution and bill of rights and when it comes to the Supreme Court, I will invest every bit of political capital to ensure that the Bill of Rights is there for the next generation.

WALLACE: But, sir, when you said when you wrote in that article that John Roberts would "carefully and faithfully apply the Constitution and legal precedent," I mean, it sounds like you're falling in line with George Bush's nomination. You didn't have to write that article. You did.

CRUZ: It is correct. I supported the Republican nominee.
But, you know, it's interesting, Chris. I notice you didn't ask Donald Trump about his saying his sister who is a liberal radical pro-abortion Clinton appointee would make a phenomenal Supreme Court justice.

When it comes to Supreme Court justices, Donald has told nuts last debate he's going to cut deals.

Let me give you another example. We saw in the last debate on immigration, when I was leading the fight against the Rubio-Schumer "gang of eight" amnesty bill and together with millions of Americans we defeated amnesty, Donald was funding the gang of eight. He gave over $50,000 to five members of the "gang of eight".

If you spent --

WALLACE: Didn't he also give money you to, sir?

(CROSSTALK)

CRUZ: -- supporting open border Democrats --

WALLACE: Sir, didn't he also give money to you?

CRUZ: -- you cannot claim that you're tough on illegal immigration.

I'm sorry?

WALLACE: Didn't he also give money to you?

CRUZ: (AUDIO GAP) to my leadership PAC which he tosses around like candy.
But, listen, he supported open border Democrats for decades. He supported Jimmy Carter over Ronald Reagan. He supported John Kerry over George W. Bush. He’s contributed to Hillary Clinton, to Chuck Schumer.

This is a man -- anyone who supports radical liberals like those does not care about conservative Supreme Court justices --

WALLACE: All right. I have to --

CRUZ: -- does not care about the Second Amendment, and doesn’t care about securing the border because those are the open board he advocates that led the "gang of eight" and, indeed, you know what is striking after the debate, Chris, Donald went on CNN and he was talking about his hotel in Florida and they bring in foreign workers and they won't hire Americans.

He said, well, gosh, you can't find Americans to work as waiters and waitresses. How utterly ridiculous, there are hundreds of Americans who have worked and want to work as waiters and waitresses especially in some a swanky hotel in Palm Beach --

(CROSSTALK)

WALLACE: Senator, I’ve got one more question for you.

Your campaign has been involved in a series of incidents that are people are calling dirty tricks. I want to put up a list to them.

In Iowa, the Cruz campaign sent out tweets saying Ben Carson was suspending his campaign. That was false. The campaign put out flyers accusing people of voting violations. That was false.

In South Carolina, a Cruz super PAC attacked Trump over the Confederate flag and your then communications director posted a link this week accusing Rubio of disrespecting the bible. That was false.
Question, do you take personal responsibility -- this is your campaign except for the super PAC -- do you take personal responsibility for this series of incidents? What does it say about the culture of the campaign you're running?

CRUZ: Chris, every accusation you raised there is incorrect. I appreciate your reading the Donald Trump attack file on that.

WALLACE: Come on, sir.

(CROSSTALK)

WALLACE: Wait a minute. Wait a minute, sir. You personally -- you personally apologized to Ben Carson on a debate stage.

CRUZ: Chris, please don’t interrupt me.

WALLACE: You fired your communications director.

CRUZ: Chris, please don’t interrupt me.

WALLACE: Don't say this is an oppo file on our part, sir.

CRUZ: Chris, please don't interrupt me. Our campaign from the beginning --

WALLACE: Well, I mean, please don't say -- please accuse me of something I didn't do.

CRUZ: Go ahead, Chris. Let me know whether I’m allowed to answer.

WALLACE: Well, don't accuse me of something I didn't do. Two of those things you apologized for one and fired your communications director. Don't say this is the oppo file.
CRUZ: Chris, our campaign from the beginning has been the highest level of integrity when others have engaged in personal attacks and insults. We don't respond in kind.

And, you know, what’s striking, you just had Donald Trump on the air. You didn’t ask about the fact that he sent out a fabricated quote from Tom Coburn impugning my integrity. Tom Coburn, Senator Coburn came out and said it was an utter fabrication and yet Donald continued repeating what he knew to be false.

You didn’t ask Donald Trump about the robocalls that went out from a white supremacist group supporting Donald Trump telling people do not vote for a Cuban, vote for Donald Trump.

You know, when it comes to telling the truth and not telling the truth, you didn’t ask Donald Trump about the fact that in the last debate I asked him true or false, you support socialized medicine, the government paying for your health care. He said false and it's directly contrary to what he said for 20 years on the record.

Listen, Chris, the facts matter. I understand that --

WALLACE: Senator --

CRUZ: -- there are folks that don't want to focus on the facts. But, listen, the voters care about the truth. They care about Donald Trump's record of giving -

WALLACE: Senator Cruz, we're flat out of time.

First of all, I don't think anybody is going to think I did an easy interview with Donald Trump. I asked him about plenty of things.

If you want to ask him those questions, guess what? You'll get the opportunity at the Fox debate on Thursday.

Thank you. Thanks for making time for us on this very busy weekend, sir.