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1. Introduction

0.1) well: I am (.1.2) the whole (.1. issue(.1. of the Danish cartoons
I think so I mean geezer was responsible
I didn’t made up that you know

This study is about the use of three Discourse Markers (henceforth DMs) in news interviews. It is an attempt to demonstrate how well, you know and I mean are employed in news interviews. It also shows what participants accomplish using the DMs as rhetorical devices.

Initial interest in discourse markers (DMs) dates back to 1970s. Robert E. Longacre (1976) is considered to be the first among many who examined group of words that seem mysteriously meaningless at the first glance. He considered them as salt and pepper that give flavor to the text (Longacre: 1976). In line with this analogy, using a plenty of DMs in talk make it taste salty and spicy; using them less than needed, then we have a unflavoured conversation. It has been suggested that skilful use of DMs in talk is important indicator of competency to determine native speakership (see Wierzbicka (1991), Lindsey (1998)). After all, it seems that having adequate amount of DMs in ordinary conversation is the reason that make it run smoothly and comprehensibly.

Observing any ordinary conversation might gives us some clues about the way DMs are employed by their users. The trouble with this kind of observation is that we may find ourselves in numerous contexts that is possible for a piece of conversation to happen. In return, this may lead to miss the chances to monitor DMs to their full capacity and disregard some of their potentialities in organizing discourse.

Limiting the examination to certain contexts seems to give more fruitful insights on DMs. The hypotheses here is that DMs are used more effectively in certain contexts like news interviews as they accomplish various interaction goals. However, it should be mentioned that uses of DMs in news interviews is not considered to be different from of ordinary conversations. Rather, I believe investigating them in news interviews illuminates many interactional values of DMs that are not attended for different reasons in ordinary conversation.
The main propose of this paper is to discuss the special cases of DMs in news interviews. It is distinctly occupied with how participants in news interviews use three DMs of *well*, *you know* and *I mean*. Accordingly, the following research questions are taken into consideration:

1. How the DMs *well*, *you know* and *I mean* operate in news interviews?
2. Do they display any interactional performance special to news interviews context?
3. Are there certain circumstances in which participants in news interviews tend to use *well* more often?
4. How different is the usage of *I mean* and *you know* and whether they can be used interchangeably?

The present paper is about three DMs in the news interview context. The selection of DMs *well*, *I mean* and *you know* is influenced by a variety of reasons for this study. To begin with the DM *well* is one of the most investigated DMs that has its origin in other types of word class\(^1\) and has not been studied properly in the context of news interview with prosodic and other contextual features. Among many, there are certain functions that make this DM important in news interviews. It is believed that the DM *well* is employed to minimize confrontation and face-threat (see Owen, (1981), Watts (1986)) and suggest insufficient answer (see Jucker (1993)). As for the DM *you know*, there exist many functions that deal with this DM. To list just a few, the DM *you know* is considered as a marker that indicates some sort of common assumption between interlocutors (see Schourup (1985)); as an indication to acknowledge the understanding of the other party (see Östman (1981)). Last but not least, the DM *I mean* like *you know* has a semantic meaning which influence the discourse function (see Schiffrin (1987) Maynard, (2013)). The DM *I mean* orients toward own talk where the DM *you know* orients towards the addressee’s knowledge (Schiffrin, 1987). Throughout this paper, the effort is to reach a combined view at DMs’ various functions along with consideration from intonation patterns. This will be done where it is believed that different features of selected DMs have the most inflated display i.e. the news interview context.

On the basis of this empirical research, I have presented three aspects in

---

\(^1\) Adjective/adverb
theoretical background. First of all, I give a modest description of DMs. Then I outline how news interviews are different from other genres in political communication. Finally, in this chapter, I present how conversation analysis (Henceforth CA) is an important approach and essential in this study to observe naturally occurring conversation. In the next chapters (3 & 4), I present methodology that I have applied and the short description of the data that is collected for this study. In the chapter (5), I start the analysis of the topic with relevant transcriptions of the collected data. The analysis part is divided into three general sections with their corresponding subsections. Finally, in the last chapter (6), I outline the result of the study of using the three discourse markers in the news interviews. Here, I conclude that the DM *well* is a critical rhetorical formulation that has potentiality to contain bodily conducts; that it is different from other response tokens; and that it is used strategically at the time of managing time, shifting agenda and evading the questions’ content. I also outline how various question types influence the next turn and how *well* acts differently in association with them. My conclusion on the DMs *I mean* and *you know* is that their ‘basic meanings’ is more crucial in news interviews than ordinary conversations. Finally, although they might seem to be having the capacity to be used interchangeably because of their similar syntactical characteristic, the properties of news interviews impose more weight on their proper usages.

2. Theoretical Background

In this chapter, I will briefly develop the theoretical background for the current study. Three aspects will be outlined as follows: (i) General description of DMs where I discuss several theoretical frameworks that have been utilized to study their functions; (ii) the news interviews as a distinct genre of news programs; (iii) an introduction of conversation analysis approach and *adjacency pairs* as one of the essential feature of CA.

2.1 Discourse Markers

There has been a growing interest to study discourse markers through many perspectives and approaches. Some scholars have studied DMs to explain the discourse coherence (see Schiffrin (1987), Lenk (1998)), others chose innovative theories like relevancy theory to analyze them (see Jucker (1993), Anderson (2001)),


and yet there has been consideration about the structure and the order of utterances by
the way of studying DMs (see Fraser (1999)). Such interests have lead to fruitful
discussion but they also have developed added complexities. First, there is no agreed-
upon terminology to address the DMs. Second, the function of the DMs has
undergone obscure explanation and finally the context where DMs appear has not
been investigated adequately.

First of all, It becomes a complex topic as the abundance of theoretical
approaches that have been employed to study DMs have led to the emergence of wide
variety of terminologies other than the term ‘Discourse Markers’. To name just a few,
Schiffrin (1987: 33) has done analysis by detailing different levels of coherence and
integrating them together to “bracket units of talk”. Her bottom-up analysis led to
formulates these elements for the first time into the term DMs. Some other scholars
like (see Schourup (1985), Kroon (1995) have defined distinct components to analyze
these elements. For example, Kroon (1995: 85) believes in order to examine the DMs
patently we should consider putting them into frameworks of “basic meaning”,
“discourse function” and “actual uses”. However throughout their discussion they
refer to DMs as ‘discourse particles’ instead. Yet, others have focused on the
pragmatic values of these elements. Their enterprise gave rise to terms like ‘pragmatic
particles’ (see Östman (1981)) or ‘pragmatic expression (see Erman (1987)). More
recent studies also found the terminology of ‘Discourse Markers’ for their studies.
Their theoretical perspective is considered to be innovative in order to examine the
DMs. For example, Miriam Urgelles-Coll (2010) used semantic and syntactic theory
and Ursula Lutzky (2012) employed a combination of historical and sociopragmatic
theories for the particular DM in their studies. All in all, different terms that are used
to refer to DMs stem from different features that in turn have yielded from various
theoretical perspectives.

Having said that, the functions that many of DMs supposedly carry out in the
discourse have also originated from various theoretical approaches. Their functions
cover expressions as vague as e.g. fillers or attitude markers and as specific as e.g.
topic changers or repair markers. However, there is no clear and understandable way
to observe the connection between the theoretical perspective, the given terminology
and the function that the DM is assumed to fulfill (cf. Jucker and Ziv: 1998).

Added complexity is the contexts in which the DMs stand out in the related
studies. The primary motivations for the number of studies mentioned above have
been certain DMs and their presumed features. It seems that the context is of secondary importance and many contextual elements have been either neglected or left with the minimum researchable importance. Ajimer (2002) identifies this shortcoming in Schiffrin’s phenomenal account on the DMs:

“Schiffrin’s study is restricted to a single text type and a particular group of people (interviews with American Jews in the neighborhood of Philadelphia) and does not account for the distribution of discourse particles over different types of text.” (p. 13)

However recent papers have addressed this imbalance between overemphasizing DMs at the expense of the text type and more specifically the context that they occur in.

Focusing on the syntactical aspects of the DMs seems to have the partial importance in studying DMs. It is believed that many DMs “proto-typically” occupy the sentence initial position (Urgelles-Coll, 2010: 23). They do not belong to any category that constructs any sentences and they can be easily omitted (ibid. 23). Urgelles-coll (2010: 24) provides an example to look into the matter more clearly:

(1)
a) That wasn’t much fun. Well, it is over and done with.
b) That wasn’t much fun. It is over and done with.

(1b) shows that the omission of the DM well does not make the second sentence ungrammatical. Additionally, semantically speaking there is no breach in the truth condition of the sentence either. Like (1a), in most cases, the DM is accompanied with a comma afterwards. However, the syntactical assumptions are not always the straightforward. In (1a), the comma can have an influence on the interpretation of the lexical unit well. Although well is in the beginning of the turn, it is arguable if it can be regarded as an adverb or a DM.

2 Discourse Markers (1987)
3 Some are: well in court (Innes B., 2010)well in American and German classrooms (Müller, 2004)like in telling stories (Tree, 2006) etc.
On the other hand, *well* is a DM by reflecting on the pragmatical assumptions associated with it in the given situation. Thus, having a comma after the *well* seems not to guarantee the syntactic label of *well*. In cases like this, we should consider paralinguistic features that accompany the sentences.

One of the contextual elements that can complement the insights from syntactical point of view is prosody. According to Aijmer (2002: 28), the hearer can rely on the contextual elements such as collocation and prosody to distinguish the suitable sense. She also believes that a separate tone unit along with the position of the lexical item can indicate if a lexical unit is a DM or not (ibid. 59). Therefore the assumption is that the syntactical clues along with prosodic aspects help us identify DMs:

“…as the natural links between intonational structure and pragmatic interpretation may become grammaticalised, a language might develop certain structures whose sole function was to guide the interpretation process by stipulating certain properties of context and contextual effects.”

(Sperber and Wilson, 1986)

As a result, the prosodic (intonation) and the syntactical (positional) characteristic of DMs are the features that help us distinguish the DMs more easily.

### 2.2. News Interview Context

News interview is one of the important parts of the news programs after traditional news narrative. It is “a familiar and readily recognizable genre of broadcast talks” (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 7). Among certain attributes of this genre, the significant and the most obvious characteristic is that the interviewer asks questions to make news (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 149). But the same simple action of questioning happens in the panel discussions, talk shows, press conference etc.

What makes a difference in this programming genre is the combination of “distinctive constellation of participants, subject matters, and the interactional form” (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 7). Unlike talk shows, the participants in the news interview context are professionals who hold credibility on the subject matter. The audiences are not present at the time of recording hence, they have no active role or direct influence on the topics of discussion or participants’ behavior. Unlike panel
discussion, there are always two participants involved in the discussion. While the interviewer (hence IR) is a lone performer in conducting the program, the interviewee (IE) makes progress under the IR’s authority. Moreover, the subject matter is formal and is in relation to the recent newsworthy events (Clayman and Heritage, 2002). Lastly, the interactional form of the news interview context is based on the principle that the “interviewers … are obliged to restrict themselves to asking questions, while interviewees … should restrict themselves to answering them.” (Clayman & Heritage, 2010: 216). All considered the news interview context is one of the formations of institutional talk that attracts many researchers across different disciplines to study its distinctive properties.
2.3. Conversation Analysis
Among many social activities that human beings conduct every day, conversation is the one with highest significance. Through conversation, or more generally in talk-in-interaction, we as human beings are involved in an exchange of thoughts, ideas and emotions. When we talk, we travel in a world beyond language where we tend to be cognitively and socially connected with other human beings. Conversation, thus, has unique complexities governed by a set of rules and practices bound with our linguistics, cognitive and social competencies. Attractive enough, many researchers from different disciplines have tried to tackle the complexities of conversation. Among many other perspectives on this matter, conversation analysis (CA) emerged to do the analysis of the conversation, which dates back almost half a century ago.

“Study of talk” is probably the simplest way of defining the CA (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008: 1). However, the study of “a bit of a world” is not an easy task. According to Sidnell (2010) every bit of talk has a unique character since it is “a product of several organizations which operate concurrently and intersect in the utterance” (ibid. 2). By “organization”, Sidnell (2010: 2) means “a set of practices” that every bit of talk deals with them to a certain extent. Including topics such as turn taking, preference, sequence organization, repair etc., these sets of practices usually operate simultaneously for the appearance of the end product i.e. talk. Therefore, CA is the study of talk by a systemically reflecting on the practices that are responsible for any talk to happen:

“An analysis of some fragment of talk may require attention to turn-construction and design, the orientation an organization of the participant’s bodies and movements, the sequential location in which the talk occurs, the deployment of practices of repair and directed gaze, and so on.”
(Sidnell, 2010: 267)

Among the fundamental ‘organizations’ of the conversation, the sequentiality will be stressed more than the others in this study. The nature of news interview context is the reason for this inclination. To start with, the sequentiality in a general sense means how utterances are considered organized and interconnected. The basic unit of talk is called Turn Constructional Unit (TCU). It refers to the stretch of talk-in-interaction where and when it is pragmatically, syntactically and prosodically considered
complete by co-interactants. Once established complete, there comes a potential slot for the next TCU to start. The interval between the two TCU is called Transition Relevance Place (TRP). The meaning of the stretch of talk crucially relies on the sequential positioning of the bits of talk together i.e. TCUs and TRPs. They gave the possibility of projection to the interactants.

Back to the context in focus, it has been discussed that the modal of the news Interview is based on certain type of adjacency pairs i.e. questions and answers (Clayman and Heritage, 2010). But it doesn’t mean that the every question in this paper is to be considered as question. The reason is that central to sequentiality in particular and crucial to CA in general, next-turn proof procedure is will be employed in this paper. This procedure in essence highlights the “recipient’s response” and serves as a “source of evidence for an analysis of the immediately prior turn” (Sidnell, 2013: 79). As such, although by the help of the syntax or prosody we could track down questions, this essentially still depends on the next turn i.e. how the recipient responds to the utterance.

The following example illustrates this basic tool in CA:

(2)
1 L: Isn’t he nice?
2 G: yup, isn’t he a gentleman?
3 L: oh my god, I like him.

The next turn proof procedure helps us to analyze the L’s turn by the help of G’s turn and so on. To state an obvious, the line 2 answers to the line 1 and the line 3 answers to the line 2. But both answers are specially designed to meet the pragmatic values of the situation. To start with, G answers to the assessment with ‘yup’. But she goes on to contribute her own assessment too. By doing such action, we notice that he treats his ‘yup’ as an insufficient response to the assessment. Another observation is that the G does not agree with the level of assessment provided with L in the first line. G, obviously, upgrades the assessment by uttering ‘a gentleman’ in the second line. Also, note that the response of the G is not a statement, it is a question. What happens next is even more significant. In the line 3, L projects the TRP and starts his own turn; however, it doesn’t seem that he treats the G contribution as a question. L designs her turn in line 3 unrelated to the grammatical format of G’s TCU.
In this example, both question in the lines 2 and 3 are in a yes/no format but are not treated as ordinary yes/no question. Despite the grammatical structure, the first question does more than an inquiry; it invites an assessment. The resource for such conclusion is the way that G designs her turn. Thus, the G’s turn serves as an analytical resource to understand how L’s question actually works. Moreover, in the third line, L doesn’t treat G’s TCU as an ordinary question let alone yes/no question. Whether L dismisses or ignores the question depends on the existence of the extended stretch of talk. But so far, we get to know that the turns are related to each other reflexively and can be exploited to analyze the prior turn.

3. Methodology

According to principles of CA, this essay is dealing with the naturally occurring data. Talk is socially organized (Sidnell, 2010) and the stretches of interaction in the current study displays a sense of order amidst the heated business of talk in the news interview context. As it follows, some general methodology principles are applied to examine the materials collected for this essay.

Among certain differences that the CA employs to study spoken language, its methodology to collect data is remarkable. The methodology has “remained remarkably consistent over the last forty years” in its core perspective though different projects or analysts might impose certain “methodological requirements” on it (Sidnell, 2010: 22). One unique characteristic of the CA’s methodology is that it acts as an “aide-memoire” and provides us with the recorded data of the interaction (ibid. 35). Its data initially consist of the spoken utterances extracted from situations like telephone conversations. In recent years, it includes high quality video recordings of as well as audio recordings of an interaction of wide verity of contexts. In the current study, all the data have been transcribed in accordance with transcription convention that has been promoted by Gail Jefferson (2004) and had developed since. A brief summary of the transcription convention is provided in the appendix 2.

The transcription aims to note every nuance in talk or somehow related to talk. It may accompanied by a pattern of intonation The process of transcribing might seem a complicated task but once done it provide us with wealthy amount of details and makes the conversation-analytic work more accessible.

For this means, I have used the software CLAN –Computerized Language ANalysis- for providing systematic representation of speech practices (Bernstein
Ratner and Brundage, 2013). The CLAN has the simple and reliable user interface and the ability to integrate to the second software that I used for tracking the intonation contour i.e. PRAAT. The PRAAT is handy tool for speech analysis with the ability to construct the acoustic values of speech signals (Lieshout, 2003). However, the transcription, no matter how meticulously completed, should be viewed as a “representation” of the data (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008: 70). Making use of computer software here and in general is for handling the data easily and shouldn’t be solely relied on and totally substituted for the actual video recording.

As its core principle, CA methodology entails that analysis should be inductive and not based on any theoretical framework (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008). This means that the analysis of the transcription of the data that will follow in the next chapter does not depend on any theoretical framework. Instead, the analysis will proceed in a bottom-up fashion relying on the participants’ own understanding and perspective of the situation. However, some scholars like Seedhouse (2004) take a further step and claim that the CA is not allowed to take the contextual details into account. This indicates that the description of the mechanisms that participants make use of during talk should be free from the contextual properties. Nonetheless this is not the case in what follows in the analysis section of this paper. Rather, the analysis in connected to the tenets of contextual properties of news interview. The contextual properties of this kind have been discussed by (Clayman and Heritage, 2002) in detail. They have argued in length how participants manage the inferential and sequential properties of interaction in the news interview context. Thus, while this paper remains faithful to the emic perspective of CA, the interpretation of the selected pieces of the interaction will be influenced or even supported by the properties of the news interview context.

During interaction turns are organized into sequences. Every social action comprises of unit of sequence organization that are called ‘adjacency pairs’ (Schegloff, 2007). The social actions happen orderly and the position of any sequence is a fundamental resource for understanding talk-in-interaction. This means that once one part of an action is performed, the other part is expected to take place in an orderly way. In the news interview, the IR performs (almost always) the questioning while expecting the IE’s response in return. Thus the IE is under the “normative obligation” by the constraint that question brings about (Stivers, 2013: 191). This kind
of exchange i.e. questioning and answering is the prominent social action in the news interview context and is the basis analytical tool for the current paper.

4. Data

The Data for the analysis consisted of short instances of 18 interactions between the IR and IE in the news interview context. Every transcribed interaction does not exceed the 3-minute time frame where the entire program is lead by two participants. The news items come from two prime time programs where English is the medium of communication; The BBC’s ‘Hardtalk’ and the ABC’s ‘Newsweek’. It should also be mentioned that while the host is a native English speaker, some guests come from different backgrounds and have English as a second language.

The selection of the data was on a random basis and the topics of the conversations can vary notably from one instance to another. However, since the programs are among the highly rated television items, many topics may seem familiar to most readers. All the data was collected from the website of the news programs where all the items were open to the general public.

The DM well has been discussed more than the other two DMs. The total number of cases that is employed to interpret the DM well is 14. Whereas the two other DMs have been discussed by the help of 4 cases.

There are two reasons for imbalance selection of the cases of the DMs. First of all, the DM well was the most repeated DM during the time of data collection. Then, the DM you know were the most numerous. Second reason is about the different nature of the DM well in comparison with the other two DMs. The DM well occupies the initial position in all the cases related to it. While you know and I mean could appear in the initial, middle or at the end of a turn and thus difficult to track. Since they have syntactical resemblance and refer to the interpersonal state of the interaction, the argument about them also necessitates that they be interpreted together.
5. Analysis

This chapter puts together a corpus of transcribed extracts and the related analysis in the context of news interviews. The analysis focuses on displays of DMs; how different participants utilize them; and what it can be said about their significance. It is divided into three main parts with some interrelated sections.

5.1. General Features of the DM Well

In news interview context the DM well is a marker of different tasks especially for the IE. To begin with, its time managing feature lets the IE to benefit from more seconds as he initiates his turn. An impending pause or contextual elements like a head movement or a smile might accompany it. Further, on account of unique characteristics of the turn-taking system in news interviews, the argument is that the DM well cannot be considered as an acknowledgement token as yeah or uh huh. And finally, its usage is significant in times of digression from the IR’s agenda. Whether it is used to shift or dismiss the agenda is worth looking.

5.1.1. Well and Extra Linguistic Features

When the IE uses well, it is not uncommon for well to be accompanied with non-verbal displays. For example, it can be a head-tilting to either sides, repositioning on a chair, featuring unexpected facial expression like smiling or diverting the gaze away from the IR. At that moment, less attention is seemingly granted to the speech flow by the audience as the accompanying act becomes more noticeable. In the case below, the IE puts two non-verbal conducts on view together with using the DM well:

(1)UK BBC Hardtalk 2010: Thailand Presidential Election
IR: Stephen Sucker   IE: Abhisit Vejjajiva

1 IR =here's'what'one very senio' Thai politician said ti me::
2 about you
3 he said the problem i:s (( IE is gulping))
4 IR miste' Abisit (.) neve' looks conf'rt'ble, (. ) when he is in a rice paddy.
5 (0.9) Well: ¿ (0.4) I don't know a[bout that]
6 IE → (0.9) [you know ] he’s sayin he is saying
7 IR

4 The data is transcribed based on the transcription convention provided in appendix
In this case, at the time of uttering the DM, the IE tilts his head, which had been rather motionless from the first moments of the interview, to the right to some noticeable extent. Beside this, a sinister, momentary smile is shaped on his face simultaneously. There, furthermore, exists a short pause after *well*, which is a common incidence after implementing *well* in the interview context (Schiffrin, 1987: 328). Hence, as we observe, the implementation of the DM is not the first and the only interesting action that happens here; two contextual factors and a pause are significant, too.

These two factors probably explain the reason behind the significance of the occurrence in the case above. The first and the general reason can be the unexpected content of the questioning. The IR starts an ambiguous way of setting an agenda; using a proverb. The IE seems to have a slightly difficult time (0.9) - counted in milliseconds- to relate what is exactly meant by the “senior Thai politician” and in exactly what situation he is considered to be “uncomfortable” (line 4). Alternatively, he may not be sure whether being in such a situation is favorable or not. As for the second reason, the adjacency pair, here, is not in accordance with the turn-taking system carried out in the news interview. It is an obvious example of deviance from the typical format of news interview; “the talk should be limited to questions and answers” (Clayman & Heritage, 2010: 216). The IR’s question is neither a simple w-question nor a yes/no question, at least not in a normal fashion, which the IE probably expects. Moreover, although the IR’s falling intonation indicates a possible completeness of a turn, it shouldn’t be considered as a potential TRP to initiate the next turn, because “questions set agendas for response” (Clayman & Heritage, 2010: 229). However, it can be regarded as a B-event-statement way of questioning. It does not interrogate but rather provokes the listener and bears certain implications for the
IE. It is obvious that the IR refers to the IE’s “subjective feelings “in a way that he himself needs some time to refine (Clayman & Heritage, 2002: 102). That also may explain the slightly high pitch level that well carries compared to the previous turn.

As stated, the usage of DM well accompanies the head movement and the facial gesture. The pauses before and after the DM together with different pitch level in comparison with the previous turn are also significant. In order to highlight other features of the DM well, the next chapter is devoted to the dissimilarity of the DM well and acknowledgement tokens in the news interview context.

5.1.2. Well and Minimal Response Tokens

The DM well in the news interview possess a feature which is different from what is defined as vocalizers or “continuers” (Schegloff, 1982) or tokens that show acknowledgement in selected turns (Jefferson, 1984). Acknowledgement tokens are also called “minimal response tokens” among which we can mention Uh huh, yeah, oh, I see as examples (Svennevig, 2000). As “continuers”, they are believed to act as means to pass the floor for other interlocutor to continue without interruption (Schegloff, 1982: 85-86). While as “acknowledgment tokens”, they act as indicators to display acknowledgment of previous turn ((Jefferson, 1984: 203).

According to Schegloff (1997: 33), they are mostly positioned in a special kind of turn named “quasi turns”. However, it should be mentioned that the comparison only includes the cases where both the DM well and the ‘acknowledgment tokens’ have a turn initial position and occur in the second position in the sequence.

It is problematic that the DM well fits into the category of such tokens, since as mentioned in previous example, well is not allowed to start a turn “until a recognizable question is completed” (Clayman & Heritage, 2010: 219). So as the IE passes all the potential TRPs, standing by alert for the other party’s question, he should not employ any tokens like uh huh, yeah, oh, I see whatsoever. This conduct includes well if it assumed to be a token of acknowledgement. The following example aims to clarify the distinction better.

Here, the IR speaks in a slow pace setting obvious transitional phases for the IE to take the floor. The IE passes all of the phases in silence and with minimal
contextual acknowledgment tokens such as nodding. At the end, the IR’s question, triggering IE’s turn, provides appropriate ground for IE to start his turn:

(2) UK BBC Hardtalk 2010: Thailand Presidential Election
IR: Stephen Sucker IE: Abhisit Vejjajiva

1 IR → now >I j's wann' ask you< do you regret?
2 → any of the things you have done.
3 → as a leader of your party,
4 → and a prime minister,
5 → with regard to red shirts,
6 → Your decision(.) to confront them,
7 → to take them on.
8 IE (0.9) well: ¿ if you look at two years that
9 I have been through

All of the sequences of the IR, here, are potential TRP points for the IE to start a turn considering the IR’s verbatim manner of speech (marked by arrows). Unlike in ordinary conversations, where the pace of interlocutor increases in order to “foreclosing the possibility of another self-selecting”, the IE, here, neither claims to take the floor by interrupting the IR nor indicates an obvious hint to be interpreted as continuer/acknowledgment token (Sidnell, 2010: 42). Therefore, the DM well is neither a token to acknowledge the turn/contents of the unit in this example nor is it a one to pass the turn as the IE continues along his turn. Similar to (1), well opens the next turn with a slightly higher pitch level. For that reason, the DM well seems to bear a similar function to the first case in a sense that it was utilized in order to buy
more time to answer the multi-segmented question; probably to put forward a prefaxed agenda to cover all parts of the questions.

On the IR’s side, it is also highly impermissible to practice any acknowledgement tokens. Other than being in contrast with the turn-taking system of an interview, any use of such tokens by the IR is taken as an indication of “approval or agreement with the IE” which is believed to be an obvious threat to the IR’s neutrality stance (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 156). The following excerpt seems to contain such a characteristic for the DM well on the side of the IR:

(3) UK BBC Hardtalk 2010: Racism
IR: Stephen Sucker IE: Geert Wilders

1 IR let’s talk about the [values] in tolerance.
2 → [yeah ]
3 yu said th- in the times newspaper
4 November 2004 quote
5 IE I believe we have ↑been far too: tolerant far too long.=
6 =yes and I meant by that
7 IE I belief that
8 We have been too tolerant to intolerant
9 and we should learn to start to
10 → bcome of course we should still stay tolerant to tolerant
11 but we should learn
12 to become intolerant e:m to be intolerant=
13 IR → =well[I am getting little confused here]
14 IE [I can ’ve and netherlands not happen maybe in few]
Here, as the first arrow indicates the implementation of yeah is an instance of a continuer; a quasi turn discussed in the previous case. Moreover, starting from line 8, the IE seems to make the IR confused with opposite adjectives and the negative senses of the sentences. He also cuts his sentence off in the middle as indicated above (the second arrow) and continues to input a self-repair; an attempt to make himself clear. Not clear enough for the IR though, the IR jumps in and expresses his state of incomprehension (line 13).

The DM well, far from being a continuer or an acknowledgement token, suits fine to be implemented in the beginning of the turn where the IR is, apparently, in need of time to conclude the IE’s assertion. However, since there is an overlap at the time of uttering well it is impossible to decide whether there is a pause after or before well unlike other examples. Therefore, there is less account for the DM well’s time-managing function. Instead, the DM well’s practice in this example seems to be for the interruption of the previous turn. If so, well gains more weight in having separate function than the so-called ‘minimal response tokens’. The interruptive performance of the DM well sets its role apart from the function of continuers/acknowledgement tokens; where their uses serve to run the turn-taking smoothly by virtue of quasi turn-placement, the DM well sets forth a whole new turn.

Jucker (1993: 451) believes that well “signifies that the most immediately accessible context is not the most relevant one for the interpretation of the impending utterance”. In line with this insight, well is argued to be implemented as a signal when
“coherence options offered by one component of talk differ from those of another” (Schiffrin, 1987: 127). This means that if the explanation of the DM well’s implementation should have something to do with the first portion of the talk, it seems problematic when well is not considered to be a continuer/acknowledgement token in the news interview context. In other words, there is an acknowledgment process happening before implementing the DM well. Then, the conversation proceeds with the second portion of talk. Therefore, we are facing a paradox with the acknowledgement process that is related to well; on the one hand, it appears to be a necessity about the acknowledgement process before or with well if as Schiffrin (1987) believes that the DM well mostly functions to create conversational coherence.

On the other hand, the DM well is not permissible in the news interview context in a sense close to yeah, uh huh, oh to be applied by the IE or the IR.

In order to find a solution for the problem, we need to pay more attention to the nature of the context of news interview and ordinary conversation at times of implementation of the DM well. There is an attribute about the time-managing feature of employment of the DM well in the news interview context, which is worth being brought out at this point. Schiffrin (1987: 110) believes that in ordinary conversation, the DM well “may accompany narrative abstracts” where the respondent “may have to interpret evaluative devices to understand the point of story in order to find the answer to the question”. The DM well is, apparently, practiced in the stage of paraphrasing. It seems that interlocutors use well in order to paraphrase and subsequently orient themselves properly towards finding the proper answer at the end of the turn. In doing so, they may ask for help to check the appropriateness of comprehension process of the question they have been exposed to by the other party. They are seemingly after approval to reach responses that satisfy the other party’s presupposition. To state the matter differently, both the DM well and continuers/acknowledgement tokens express the acknowledging process. While this is their similar function, its aim is different; well is used to evaluate coherence usually with following a long narrative while continuers/acknowledgement tokens are applied to coordinate the turn with least input afterwards.
Consider the following case from an ordinary conversation taken from Heritage (1998: 303) which concerns ‘the habilitation thesis’:

1 A Will he publish this as a book?
2 B → Oh yes.
3 (.)
4 B → Oh yes he will publish it as a book.
5 A → Uh huh
6 B It is obligatory in Germany.

The incidences of *oh* and *uh huh* are shown by arrows. Notice that there is no pause immediately after any of acknowledgment tokens. While *oh* follows a short answer in line 2, the second *oh* follows a full answer. For this specific case, Heritage (1998: 303) has made an observation for the use of *oh* by the speaker B. He believes that the B expects that the A knows the answer properly “by reference to self attentive’ cultural assumptions” in the first place. Furthermore, the *uh huh* is in line 5 is apparently practiced by the speaker B for the sake of smooth transition of turns.

The discussion here could be more fruitful if we replace both acknowledgement tokens with the DM *well*. To begin with, the assumption of having *well* instead of *uh huh* is problematic. The DM *well* by virtue of Jucker’s observation (1993) connects what comes before with what comes after. The *uh huh* lacks the forthcoming part and that being the case, *well* is not a suitable candidate to replace it. Moreover, the DM *well* could be assumed to be replaced by the *oh*. Then again, we reach to a different observation. The general account of using oh-prefaced responses for inquiries is that the answerer finds the question inapposite in terms of its reference, presupposition and context (Heritage, 1998). While the implementation of *well* is for the display of contrast between the presupposition of what comes before and what comes after (Jucker, 1993). In the case above, since both the answer and the question consist of same presupposition, the implementation of *well* would most probably required to follow something different than ‘he will publish it as a book’. Once more, the DM *well* seems to be an inappropriate choice to be replaced with the *oh*.

The recent case and the argument that followed it came from the setting of ordinary conversation. The assumption is that the difference between the so-called acknowledgment tokens and the DM *well* is extreme in the context of news interview
context. Apart from many different properties between the two contexts that probably support this assumption, one reason could be that the respondents are inclined to evade the proper answer when they are in front of a camera. The context of the news interview is provides us with an opportunity to examine this situation.

5.1.3. Well and Time Managing, Agenda shifting, Evading

In the news interview setting, the most suitable time for the IE to implement the DM *well* is when the IE wants to avoid the questions. The reason is that unlike ordinary conversations, in news interviews, the IEs are more or less aware of the content of the likely questions. They are even prepared for them and are able to respond at once. What they do not know is, in fact, the form of the questions and their degree of “adversarialness” (Clayman & Heritage, 2002: 15). Therefore, Schiffrin’s view (1987: 111) about inserting *well* as “a complementary technique for answer deferral” does not seem to be appropriate for the news interview context, as the premises of the two settings i.e. ordinary conversations and news interviews are different.

In order to compare the DM *well*’s foregoing behavior in ordinary conversation and to clarify its role in news interviews, the understanding of the employment of the agenda-shifting technique by the IE is crucial. Clayman and Heritage (2002) argue that one of the obvious strategies of the IE to evade questions covertly is to shift the agenda in a manner that his/her response fits the paraphrased version of the question which was done by the IE himself in the opening of his turn. The singular characteristic of the DM *well* in the news interview is that it is introduced at times of agenda-shifting as opposed to ordinary conversation where there are usually no beforehand motives for an agenda to shift. To clarify it further, consider that the DM *well* was observed as “a complementary technique” at the time between the delay portion of talk and the ideational core of talk in ordinary conversation to reach the proper answer (Schiffrin, 1987: 111). In the interview context, by contrast, the IE implements *well* in the beginning of the delay portion of talk. It might be a indication of agenda-shifting phase in an attempt to perhaps pursue one of the following two goals; to ignore the forthright view of the agenda; or to disconnect the “the matter-to-
be-pursued” with “the matter-that-was-inquired-about” (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 283). Two following examples illuminate further the preceding points.

In the following excerpt, the IE’s attitude against a controversial issue is under question. Here, Geert Wilders, the IE, is accused of polarizing Dutch society proclaimed by a third party; the leader of the Turkish community in the Netherlands:

(5) UK BBC Hardtalk 2010: Racism
IR: Stephen Sucker  IE: Geert Wilders

1 IR this program spoke to ayhan tunocer ee a leader of the turkish
2 community in the netherlands (. ) from islamic culture foundation
3 he said wilders is polarizing dutch society
4 has no idea to offer about living with Muslims
5 reality i::z that Muslims do live here we’ll always live here
6 you are simply polarizing
7 and infuriating with your proposals
8 jus’ (; infuriating] the muslim population.
9 IE [ hh ]
10 (0.1) well (. ) of course ehm I am not (. ) ee at th’ opinion of
11 polarizing at least that’z [ not my aim I am not pola-

Here, the IR sets up the frame of his question with the help of a prefatory statement quoting from a third party. Quoting the third party helps the neutral stance of the interview transform into a contentious air (Clayman and Heritage, 2002). Then, the IR accuses the IE of making the Dutch society polarized and the Muslim community infuriated. While there is no clear question addressing the IE directly, yet, he seems to
have no difficulties feeling the obligation to start his turn. Moreover, unlike the other cases, the pitch level of the DM *well* is not higher than the previous turn. Clayman and Heritage (2002: 154) believe the statements that are attributed to third parties “function as virtual questions”. There are two accusations hidden in the IR’s “virtual question” (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 154); firstly, the polarization of the Dutch society and secondly, the provocation of the Muslim community. The IE’s answer is remarkable as he addresses the first accusation and avoids the second one.

The occurrence of the DM *well* (2nd arrow) is in agreement with the example (1). In both cases, the IE takes his time to answer the third-party-statement inclusion in the IR’s prefatory turn. As we discussed earlier, IEs are to some extent aware of the WHAT part of the questions’ content; topical matters. Nonetheless, there is no way for them to know about the HOW part; the questions’ frame; the questioning style. Therefore, in times of referring to a third party by the IR, having had all the topics in mind, the IE seems to need more time to differentiate which topic is under question. This situation comes across as the most suitable time to employ *well*. In other words, quoting the third party puts forward an open-ended ground for the IE to proceed. However, the response should attend the questions’ content. The DM *well* is believed to be implemented while the IE takes time to make deal with the statement in a proper way.

Starting from the ‘third party attributed statement’, the friction in lines 10 and 11 of the previous case reaches its climax while both interlocutors grow heated in the discussion:

(6) UK BBC Hardtalk 2010: Racism
IR: Stephen Sucker IE: Geert Wilders

1 IR =if it wasn’t if it’s not your aim to [polariz ]e
2 IE → [y e a h ]
3 IR why did you publish the Danish cartoons
4 of prophet Mohammad on your website?
5 IE → (0.1)*well*: I am (1.2) the whole (. ) issue(. ) of the Danish cartoons
6 ehm (. )showed me and angered me that
7 d’europe is weak and d’europe is full of cowards( .) and
8 the danish people colleagues of
9 yours journalists are threatened ( .) their flags embassies are burnt
10 (continues for 3 more lines)
Then again, switching to an interrogative mode, the IR challenges the IE’s denial with evidence from his website (line 4). Under this apparently contradictory air, The IE draws attention to the consequential incidence of the Danish cartoons. He introduces his answers with details that made him angry and a narrative about the weakness of Europe, etc. All these details about the cartoons seem to be too much for the IR to handle (7 lines starting from line 6). At the end, as indicated in lines 11 and 12, there is a jumbled friction going on for taking the floor. Gaining the right to speak, The IR launches the last question dismissing all the details of IE’s answer by putting stress on his being Dutch.

Another occurrence of DM *well* (indicated by the 2nd arrow) happens as the IE, facing further blame, starts to set a new whole agenda. As it is shown, there is almost 600 Hz difference between the pitch lines around the DM *well*. Higher pitch level might be an indication of the irrelevancy of the question’s content from the answerer point of view. Requiring some seconds, the IE starts his lengthy anecdote with the incidents in Denmark not to deny but to justify his lines of thought in the political arena. However, the IR cannot tolerate shifting to a new agenda since he is the responsible person for the overall topics under question not the IE. Therefore, the
implementation of DM *well* is traceable not only by its time managing manner, but also by means of the IE’s attempts to shift or ignore the IR’s agenda. However, it is hard to relate one case study to assert any relationship regarding the high pitch differences of *well* such as this with the content of the conversation.

In the following case, the agenda-setting phase will be explained as the IE’s strategy to mitigate the topical perspective of the IR’s question. The IR sets an agenda by asking a general question; probably in the most expected way by the IE. The IE attends to this question as if he is going to give a speech about his future plans or reiterate some pre-packed political mottos. The IE prepares to respond by acquiring active stance using ‘I think’ in the beginning of his turn (line 3). However, the IR attacks his interactional stance by launching two simultaneous questions in a nagging mode starting from line 4:

(7) UK BBC Hardtalk: 2010: Thailand Presidential Election

IR: Stephen Sucker        IE: Abhisit Vejjajiva

1 IR how profound will the change be(.) in the next 4 5 years
2 if abhisit is prime minister of this country.
3 IE I think I will certainly tek ka tackle all the structural issues=
4 IR =including the military, [including the (military),]
5 IE [ all of-
6 → .hh *Well* 😊 ((smirking)) the military you know you mention that
7 it’s it’s funny because they have been very much dominating
8 in some of the security policies
9 for instance in the south during the (taxins) years (.)
10 ↑we change that
11 ↓they cooperated
What happens after IR’s sudden interruption into the IE’s turn is significant as three other elements co-functions along with the implementation of the DM *well*. The non-vocal contextual element; slightly smirking accompanies *well*. The other element is the IE’s response to the question under the disguise of agenda setting. The IE evades replying the question of “including the military?” straightforwardly (line 4). Instead, he refers back to his former time in the office starting after the implementation of *well* (line 6). He strays into the blurred territory of an incidence in past when he is narrating about the military’s security policies in south. Here, the agenda shifting serves best for the IE as an excellent way of camouflage. He avoids any responsibility for his potential assertion although he was quite ‘response-able’ to the topic of the question.

Glancing back again at the example above, we can observe the IE’s riposte is not achieved in an effortless fashion. The pitch level of the DM *well* is slightly arising but it is almost on the same level as the previous turn. Besides practicing the DM *well* and its accompanying elements, he has put three other elements to downgrade the significance of the military as a structural issue to be tackled in future. The IE uses “you know”, “you mention that” and “it’s it’s funny” (line 6). All three utterances come between the subject of the sentence; “military”, and the predicate; “been very much dominating” (line 6 & 7). The IE sets his own agenda starting from “because” by answering his own statement by saying “it’s funny” (line 7). By using the DM *well*
in a delaying function, he apparently uses other elements to mitigate the topic and ultimately bring forward his strategy to avoid the question’s main point.
5.2. Well and Question Types

To measure the grounds for the occurrence of DM well – and other DMs in general- a sensible mapping could be performing an autopsy on questioning types in the news interview context. The question-answer type of adjacency pairs incorporates the solid skeleton of news interview setting. However, different types of questions project different constraints on the later part of adjacency pair they are part of. Nevertheless, any claim on the existence of mutual relationship i.e. whether a tenable preference exists on a particular questioning type toward particular DM, needs a quantitative approach. However, such numbers will only provide a crude insight; an insight at the expense of losing context. Here, the one-to-one relationship will be described through 9 cases. The selections of the cases are based on the occurrence of the DM well in the subsequent turn.

5.2.1. Well and Wh-Questions

The first and the readily available question types are Wh-questions. Schiffrin (1997) and (Schegloff, 2009) have examined this format of questioning with regard to well from two different perspectives. According to Schiffrin (1987: 141) the “minimal coherent answer” is evident through the question types. Wh-questions inquire about a missing proposition while Yes/No-questions don’t lack propositions but rather limit the next turn to two courses of actions. Schiffrin concludes that the extent of range in choosing the answer for Wh-questions -compared to Yes/No-questions- may “require extra work for the respondent” (p. 141). Schegloff (2009: 103) on the other hand, believes that the Wh-questions in most cases request “straightforwardly some information or some action”. The implementation of the DM well regarding the wh-question receives different interpretations too. On Schiffrin’s account (1997), well is employed implying an incoherent answer while Schegloff (2009) suggest that well prefaces nonstraighforward answers. Under the light of these two perspectives, the assumption here is that the structure and the function of WH questions are also in some association with the DM well. They will be addressed in the next two examples.

The 6th case consists of a question with a Wh-structure in line 3. Simply structured and not ambiguous for the IE, the IR poses the canonical question of the interview in the Wh-format for which the IE is essentially on air (line 3 & 4)). What
comes next is that the IE, in a peaceful manner, begins to deploy his agenda that is overlapped and, accordingly, cut by the IR (line 13):

(6) UK BBC Hardtalk 2010: Racism
IR: Stephen Sucker IE: Geert Wilders

1 IR = if it wasn’t if it’s not your aim to [polariz ] e
2 IE → [ y e a h ]
3 IR why did you publish the Danish cartoons
4 of prophet Mohammad on your website?
5 IE → (0.1) well I am (1.2) the whole (.) issue(.) of the Danish cartoons
6 ehm (.) showed me and angered me that
7 d’europe is weak and d’europe is full of cowards(.) and
8 the danish people colleagues of
9 yours journalists are threatened (.) their flags embassies are burnt
10 (continues for 3 more lines)
11 IR we [I mean we know all that we know all that my question is to]

The positioning of well- along with other elements explained above- also have something to do with the question type. It has its ground in Juckers’ (1993: 435-452). claim about the DM well: In this light, the structure of Wh-questioning is like DM well existence (next turn). The is the general structure:

IR ASKS: If (previous context) why (impending utterance)?
          (uttered/assumed) (uttered)
IE REPLEYS: (previous context) well (impending utterance).
           (assumed) (uttered)

The previous context for the IR’s question is the accusations made by the IE about the subject of polarization (line 1). The impending utterance is the IE’s purpose in publishing the cartoons on the website. The IR includes both the context and the utterance together in his question. Bearing the same context in its structure (assumed), impending utterance in the answer starts after the DM well. However, the IR aims to minimize the distance between the previous context and the impending
utterance, and tries to make a close link between them. On the other hand, the IE fights against such linkages, and maximizes the distance by the help of the DM well.

As it is explained, the Wh-question appears in the same structure with the DM well but bears a contrasting function. The observation here is in accordance with the two perspectives mentioned earlier in the introduction to this section (5.2.1). The implementation of DM well maximizes the distance, which leads to the response seeming incoherent and nonstraightforward.

Here is another case to point out the relationship between the wh-question and the DM well again. It is taken from Clayman & Heritage (2002: 253):

(9) US ABC Nightline 6 June 1985: Nuclear Waste 1
IR: Unknown IE: Dr. Rosalyn Yalow

1 IR Continuing our conversation now with Doctor
2 Rosalyn Yalow. Doctor Yalow uh- ehh lemme put
3 it in very simple terms. If it’s doable, if it
4 is: easily disposable, why don’t we.
5 (1.0)
6 IE → Well frankly I cannot- (.) answer all these
7 scientific questions in one minute given to
8 me . . .

Like previous example, the Wh-question preceded the DM well. The IR is trying to draw a reasonable connection between the topic (“it” here refers to Nuclear Waste Disposal) and the subsequent missing action in due course. He sums up the previous context in two parts of being “doable” and “easily disposable” (line 3 & 4) to link to the next utterance, which is not accomplished at the time. Apparently, the gap is minimum for the IR and that could be the reason why he wonders “why we don’t” as an impending utterance (line 4). The IE, clearly, maneuvers to show no agreement regarding the IR’s remark by mentioning the time limit (line 7). The IE points out that there is more to say about the topic and the link between the previous context and the impending utterance is not simple. The structure of the Wh-question and the DM well in both turns from two parties are similar. Their function, though, are at odds.
5.2.2. *Well and Yes/No Questions*

In the previous case, we could change the IR’s question in a Yes/No format to better understand the difference between structures of Wh-questions compared with the structures of Yes/No-questions:

“if it’s doable, if it is easily disposable, ARE WE DOING IT?”

As Wh-questions augment the range for possible suitable answers, Yes/No-questions bluntly show preference toward two poles of positive and negative answer. While Wh-questions function to elicit specific information from the IE, Yes/No questions simply aim for positive or negative answers. Although the answers to Yes/No-questions might seem less complicated in comparison with the answers provided to Wh-questions, they are not less challenging. The first reason is that Yes/No-questions require a straightforward type of response. They have no middle ground and any positive or negative siding with or against *Yes/No-questions* might be subject to questions or even some consequent accusations after the interview. The second reason is that unlike Wh-format, this type of questioning has a trimming effect. They make the opinions organized and judgments clear. In the last case, for the sake of argument, the Wh-question was substituted with the Yes/No question. It is shown that the question could be reframed as ‘Are we doing it?’ instead. However the real question presupposes a negative answer to the imaginary question.

The following is an example that further illuminates the format of Yes/No-questions. The interview begins by a short video of Governor Romney’s speech as a preface to the interview. Benefiting from his sayings, the IR employs the Yes/No format for posing the first and the immediately subsequent question of the interview to president Obama’s senior consultant:

(10) **ABC This week 2012: US Presidential Election**
**IR:** George Stephanopoulos
**IE:** David Plouffe

1. IR is he right?
2. can the president argue unequivocally,
3. that the Americans are better off today,
4. than they were four years ago?
5. IE listen George, I think american people understand th’
6. we ah got into (.) terrible economic situation recession
(continues 59 seconds)
The IE neither confirms nor declines the question. He calls for attention by prefacing his answer with “listen” (line 5) and continues to establish a turn, which lasts 59 seconds. Within the whole long turn, the IR never interrupts the IE. Although he asks him to answer “unequivocally” in the first place (line 2), the IE clearly evades answering the question. As a consequence, the IR raises the second similar question, this time without any introduction;

1. IR  
   but yes or no,
2.  
   ‘r americans better off today than four years ago?
3. IE  
   listen George, you know (.) they did a good job
4.  
   over citing all the statistics everyone ‘z familiar with
5.  
   (continues 41 seconds)

Here again, through the second question, the IE's exercise of shunning the question is more noticeable. The answer to this question also begins with “listen” (line 3). What comes after is not as long as the previous one, but again it lasts 41 seconds. The whole turn includes commentaries about the US economy without a direct answer to the question. The IR goes for the third adjacency pair as below:

1. IR  
   so it sounds like y’ know a year ago
2.  
   the president told me
3.  
   I don't think americans are better off than four years ago
4.  
   you still can't say yes.
5. IE  
   (2.0) well; we’ve clearly improved George
6.  
   from the depth of the recession.
The IR persists on receiving a straight answer from the IE in the third attempt. But he asks this time providing more detail. His strategy is to unfold a piece of an event that has happened almost a year ago. For the IR, the answer is negative for the first 3 years of Obama’s presidency. The IR authenticates his claim by referring to the fact that the negative answer comes from the mouth of president himself. He then regulates his question regarding the last presidential year. The IR asks whether “the Americans are better off” during this time span. The IE, not surprisingly, refers to his front as a responsible side for post-recession improvements. To the IR’s dismay, the IE goes on again telling everything clearly escaping positive or negative answering.

The IE's answers the questions are smart practices for evading straight answers. Bull and Meyer (1993) have categorized the non-reply answers to the questions in Political Interviews. According to their typology, the first two evasions practiced here may possibly be part of a category named “make political point” and in turn belonging to the two subcategories of “External attack-attacks opposition or other rival groups” and “presents policy” (Bull and Mayer, 1993: 659). Similar characteristic of both types is that they do not acknowledge the questions. Instead, their long and wordy form obscures the intentions of the questions and avoids the main point.

The third evasion however belongs to none of the categories above. Unlike first and second questions, the last question follows well in the next turn. However, it is not in the Yes/No format. The IE's attempt to reply to the IR's statement involves acknowledgement. His response is a mild affirmative one. The short narrative about the president's earlier response to the enquiry and the IR's persistence on highlighting the Americans’ welfare during four years would be effective to make him acknowledge the question. Reminding Juckers’ (1993) impression of the DM well, this makes an appropriate place for the DM well to happen. The IE prefers, at last, to align his response to the IR's long ignored Yes/No framed questions and not to continue off-track anymore.

---

5 Note that the presidential election campaign starts in the fourth year of the current administration
6 Discussed in page 18
5.2.3. *Well* and Elliptical questions

While Elliptical questions are considered to be neutral, negative interrogatives do not function in the same way (Heritage, 2002). Elliptical questions do not hold up any biases against a next turn. On the contrary, negative interrogatives favor agreement in the immediate, subsequent turn. Bearing this difference in mind, note the following example where the question comes with a structure of elliptical question and the answer appears with the IE’s employment of the DM *well* in the next turn:

(11) ABC This week 2012: Pay roll tax extension  
IR: George Stephanopoulos  IE: Paul Ryan

1    IR    You j’st heard (.) eh jack (Lu) right there congressman say  
2    that congress should jus get ↑this payroll tax extension done,  
3    will they?  
4    IE    (2.0)*well* I think we wi::ll,  
5    but what we’re trying to do is simply(.)cut some spending  
6    to pay for it,  
7    >we gotta remember< goerge(.)that  
8    this payroll tax holiday(.)li lose hi money to  
9    social security trust fund  
10   and if you(.)extend this without paying for it  
11   by cutting spending then  
12   you are accelerating bankruptcy in social security.  
13   ↑that is all we want to do is to make sure  
14   that social security is left unharmed,  
15   while we extend this payroll tax holiday.
The program begins with a short video introduction about the topic. Then, the IR asks the IE the first question of the interview in the elliptical-questioning format. The introduction that comes before includes a firm proposition from a leading specialist in financial affairs. Note that the ‘question tag’ (will they?) and the DM well have a rising intonation. The IR then turns to the IE asking if the “congress”, not the IE in particular, will accept the extension. In the reply, the IR’s reference to the third party is given as “we” (line 15). As a member of congress, the IE legitimately includes himself in the third party reference (they) and answers with “we” (line 4). In doing so, he prefaces his reply with the DM well and appends a long explanation after (line 4). The inclination that makes the IE to give an extenuating answer (beginning with “I think”), as well as the presence of the DM well are significant in the IE’s turn.

Lakoff (1973) argues that answerers tend to preface their answers with the DM well when they sense that the inquirer fails to express sufficient information through verbal exchange. Here, the account for the presence of the DM well partly comes from the expectation of some details that the IR fails to fill in before asking the question. The insufficiency is hidden when the IR refers to the congress using third person plural excluding the IE. In so doing, the IR separates the congress’s eventual stance towards extending payroll taxes from that of the IE’s position on this matter. This is a professional practice held by the IR to keep a neutral approach presumptively beforehand toward the IE’s potential attitude towards the topic of the interview (Clayman and Heritage 2010: 126). The sound judgment would be that the
IE is in favor of extending the payroll taxes and the IR knows this in advance, nevertheless he should discriminate between the congress and the IE’s tendencies at this stage for the sake of the principles of the news interview context. The IE’s mode of reference, in return, is plural (we) which dismisses such a separation. Both cases being evidences of insufficiencies, apparently, describe the occurrence of the DM well.

While the presence of the DM well in the IE’s answer is seemingly associated with the insufficiencies in the context, any linkage between the elliptical question and the occurrence of the DM well seems to be irrelevant. Apart from that, the pitch level of the DM well is at the same level with the question. Having no propensity towards agreement/disagreement in its response, the elliptical question is apparently beside the point in explaining the DM well in the news interview context. However, the negative interrogative and declaratives with a rising/falling intonation do not hold the same bearing.

5.2.4. Well and Negative Interrogatives

The adjacency pairs, which consist of either the structure of negative interrogatives or the declaratives with a rising/falling intonation in the first turn and the DM well in the next one, gives a conflicting impression. The reason is that the DM well, on the one hand, has been categorized as one of the devices that usually accompany disagreement (see Pomerantz, (1984), Lam, (2006)). The negative interrogative and declaratives with a rising/falling intonation, on the other hand, favor agreement in the next turn (see Heritage, (2002), Gunlogson, (2001). The tendency towards agreement in both types of these question forms is apparently at odds with the appearance of the DM well in the impending turn. The assumption is that if a certain questioning type favours agreement more that disagreement, a DM that follows a question has something to do with a question. We explore further this matter along with examples.

In the following case, the subject matter of the discussion is the IE’s opposition to auto bailout. The IE’s opponent, Mitt Romney is also against the bailout. The IE formerly commented on his opponent’s opinion as “turning his back on workers of Michigan”. Having the same position towards auto bailout, the IE is accused of being disingenuous in his conduct:

(12) ABC This Week 2012: Pay roll tax extension
I am at the question of bailout. You also running an ad <in michigan where you suggested governor Romney TURNED HIS BACK (0.3) on workers of Michigan of course. ((noding)) refering to autobailout there. But you also are opposed.(.)to the auto bailout. So isn't it disingenous to charge th' Romney's turning his back on Michigan when you have the same position? well (.) we have the same position on that but we don't have same position on bailouts when I was in aa south western Pennsylvania.. (continues 40 seconds 14 turns) I didn't support detroit mitt romney supported his friends on wall street and then turn his back on the people of detroit now I say turn his back because he supports the concept th bailouts I don't that’s the difference between two approaches
The IE's answer consists of the DM *well* in the beginning which follows his distinction between his one-time opposition to the bailout and other instances of bailouts. At the end of his answer, he sums up and clarifies what he meant by “turn his back” (line 16). The IE states that his opponent, Mitt Romney supports the “concept of bailout” (line 17). He is, preferably, against such a concept of bailout.
The pitch of the question starts from a high level, sinks in the middle and rises at the end. The pitch of DM *well* happens in the lower level where the question ends and has a rising pitch in return. The content as well as the structure of the question puts the IE in a difficult position to disagree with the IR. Firstly, the IR asks whether the IE is in agreement with the statement or not. Answering in agreement in any way would confirm the IR’s statement of “this is disingenous” (line 8). Such an agreement places the IE in the same position as his competitor. In other words, if he had agreed to the IR’s assertion of “this is indigenous”, he would have contradicted his primary position. Secondly, the structure that the IR frames his question in also favors an agreement. Heritage (Heritage, 2002: 1428-1443) believes that negative interrogatives are not questions in the sense that they call for information, “in the sense of information seeking”. Having nothing to do with the information state, they are “beyond merely questioning” and are considered to make an assertion. The structure of the negative interrogative in a way pushes the IE to answer in the affirmative. In spite of this, disagreeing makes more sense but it needs clarification. As the negative interrogatives are not considered as questions but assertions, the DM *well* is a suitable way to answer in alignment with a disagreement. It can probably be claimed that the structure, which favors agreement, i.e. negative interrogative, is bypassed by the presence of the DM *well*.

Here is another case for the confrontation of the DM *well* and negative interrogatives. The IR asks about a general fact relating it to the topic under question. The topic is president Obama’s apology for the death of American soldiers in Afghanistan. The IE is against the apology:

(13) ABC This Week 2012: Pay roll tax extension
IR: George Stephanopoulos IE: Rick Santorum

1 IR but if it was a mistake,
2 isn’t apologizing <the (rightest) thing more to do?
3 IE *well* ¿ again it it iv it it suggest that there is somehow blame
4 that is somehow blame that that we did something(0.3)wrong
5 in the sense of doing it deliberate act wrong,
6 hh I think it sho:::ws (.) that we are e tha-
7 >I think< it shows weakness.
8 I think what we say is (.) look
As the IR clarifies it is considered a fact to apologize if there is a mistake. Yet, in this example, this fact is structured and fortified in the form of a negative interrogative. As a consequence, the question undertakes the boosted weight for agreement. There comes the DM well’s regulating performance, or at least it performs in a way to mitigate the assertion.

There is also a contrast between the pitch levels of the DM well and the preceding question types displayed in the last two cases. In case 12, the second part of the pair takes place slightly lower in the pitch level, whereas in case 13, the DM well occurs in the higher pitch level. In both cases, the question types end in rising pitch. These contrasting patterns give us the impression that the question types as such have no influence on the second pair’s starting pitch level.

5.2.5. Well and Declarative In Rising/Falling Intonation
Like Negative Interrogatives, this type of questioning favors agreement in the subsequent turn. In the following case, the IE is faced with a question with such a structure (line 6):

(14) ABC This week 2009: Foreign Affairs
IR: George Stephanopoulos IE: Hillary Clinton
Here, the IE’s primary subject is the other nations’ sense of insecurity if Iran goes nuclear. The IR however jumps into the IE’s turn, cuts her speech and asks an extraneous yet crucial question. The question consists of a highly important issue; Israel strikes any nation in the neighborhood before they can finish their nuclear program. The IE’s answer to this unrelated question is limited only to the DM well and the phrase “not only that” (line 7). This is significant as the IE continues her previous argument afterwards.

The structure of the question asked by the IR is a declarative but not with a rising intonation. Together with negative interrogatives, these structures are less suitable for the neutrality and impartiality conventions of the news interview context. Gunlogson (2001) believes that the rising and falling intonations have little to do with declaratives as questions. What leads the declaratives into the function of questioning, according to him, are sentence type, context and intonation (Gunlogson, 2001). But still, this kind of questioning, as mentioned before, favors agreement in the next turn.
According to Gunlogson (2001: 3), “declarative are unsuitable in contexts where the speaker is expected to maintain an attitude of neutrality or ignorance”. They have a covert tendency to endorse positive attitude. In contrast, the DM well has the same drive only in an opposite direction. The “not only that” part of the answer accords to an affirmative answer. In other words, although well softens the presupposition and regulates it, the structure in which the question is framed favors a more affirmative direction. The “not only part” (line 7) of the answer corresponds to that structure.

In the following case, the second question is not in a full declarative sentence but the turn is a phrasal TCU. It seems likely that this question has a similar bearing as a declarative with a falling intonation. Here, before addressing his question, the IR shows a fragment of Hillary Clinton’s speech in her democratic candidacy for the US presidency. The IE mentions a “full retaliation” from the US in her speech in case of any attacks from Iran against Israel. At the time of the inner party race for candidacy, Hillary Clinton could have had any claim but now that the election time has passed and she is no longer in a position to lecture her policies, she is supposed to follow the policies of Barack Obama, the president of the USA. Therefore, as a foreign minister of Barack Obama, she is obliged to the policies of the president. The Interview proceeds immediately by the question below:

(15) ABC This week 2009: Foreign Affairs
IR: George Stephanopoulos IE: Hillary Clinton

1 IR Is it US policy now?
2 IE I think it is umm (0.2)
3 IE US policy to the extent(.) that
4 we have alliances and understandings(.) with a number of nations
5 aaa they may not be formal as it is with NATO
6 but(0.2) I don't think there is any doubt in anyone's mind(.) that
7 were Israel(.) to suffer(.) a nuclear attack(.) by Iran
8 there would be retaliation
9 IR By the united states=
10 IE =We:::ll I think there would be retaliation
11 and I think part of what ahh is clear is
12 we want to avoid ei ei middle east(.) arm race which
13 leads to nuclear weapons
14 being in the possession of(0.1) other countries in the middle east
15 and we want to make clear that
there are consequences and costs

Following the first question, the IE obviously evades answering an important detail of the question; whether the US is to take part in retaliation? The IR goes on, interrupts the IE and sets forth that detail with the second question; “by the United States,” (line 10). The answer to the interruption is succeeded by the DM well. What comes after well is the reformulation of the same answer that the IE gave starting from line 2.

The second question is a shorter format of a declarative i.e. the syntactic piece to the prior sentence. Obviously, it is not a sentential TCU, however, it can be regarded as one. The full sentence could be “there would be retaliation by the United States,” Surprisingly, this is the exact declarative sentence that happens, but it is divided between two turns and two interlocutors. The IE finishes her second turn by “there would be retaliation” (line 8); her main clause is a shorten part of the declarative; the rest is added with the IR’s interruption; “by the United States” (line 9).

The former and the current cases are both practiced with the same pressure for agreement from the IR’s side. The structure of both questions has a built-in nature favoring agreement. The employment of the DM well seems to even out the balance.
5.3. General account for *You know* & *I mean*

Both of the DMs under study have been discussed comparatively due to some common structural features they share. Additionally, there was an intention to investigate whether these two DMs share any common features in their function and their structure. Nevertheless, they have been investigated by various, rather arguable pragmatic performances in different contexts. Firstly, in order to highlight such pragmatic performances in the news interview context, the focus of this study has been on the previously-known characteristics of the DMs. Secondly, the DMs’ interactional values are examined further in the light of the news interview context in order to see whether they can be implemented interchangeably.

The starting steps to investigate the DMs were taken by studying different functions and estimating the states and the feelings of the interlocutors. This is because unlike other DMs, the literal meaning of *I mean* and *you know* is recoverable (Fuller, 2003). According to Schiffrin (1987: 308), *I mean* has been suggested to “modify the speaker’s own ideas and intentions”. As for the DM *you know* she believes that it is used when there is a new state of information presented to the hearer based on the assumption of the speaker (p. 267). However, it is not a straightforward task to judge whether the ‘modifying’ process is happening on the side of the speakers when they use *I mean*, or how strong is the need for the speaker to anticipate the state of information ‘new’ and cut the utterance with *you know*. These kinds of observations lead the two investigators to draw different conclusions on the purposes the DMs are believed to serve. However, we can think of an approach that is able to be accountable for different perspectives. Östman (1995) called this perspective the ‘abstract meaning’, whereas Heritage (1984 and 1998) talks about ‘generic meaning’. This approach is a solid frame to interpret the contextual factors at the time of the occurrence of the two DMs. The effort, here, would be to cast a far and wide net on the news interview context on the basis of the two DMs’ so called “basic meaning”.
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5.3.1. The Basic Meaning of *I Mean*

The basic meaning of the DM *I mean* is proposed “to forewarn upcoming adjustments” (Schiffrin, 1987: 311). In the news interview context, both the IR and the IE have slim chances of being able to adjust what they have said. The common reason could be that the interviews’ usual time frame is usually not more than 25 minutes. While the IR is mostly inclined to stick to his/her own agenda, the IE usually tries to push his/her own arrangement in a limited time lapse. Moreover, As in most cases, they may not reach a common ground upon any given topic at the end. Thus, fixed time frames and institutionally fused preferences do not let them make any adjustments by using *I mean*. These reasons are rough observations to explain the lower rate of the existence of the DM *I mean* in news interviews.

The asymmetric nature of the news interview context (Heritage and Clayman, 2002) and the availability of agenda in advance offer different limitations for the IR from the ones’ of the IE. The IR begins and continues his initiative to ask the questions to reach the cutting edge of the argument. This, almost always, is pre-planned and to some extent pre-packaged. Therefore, there is no ground for the IR to use any adjustments for the questions s/he has already made. This means that the IR has already considered all possibilities to avoid any potential adjustments. For the IE, on the other hand, there is more space to use the DM *I mean* to forewarn adjustments, as the interviewees are the ones in the line of fire. Yet, it seems the implementation of the DM *I mean* has uncertain consequences for the IE in conversation. The IE might find himself accused of shying away or even ducking the questions addressed to him. Having said that, the *I mean*-prefaced utterances could also be regarded as the starting points where the IE initiates support the rationale in his response. Both consequences are valid and subject to the audiences’ monitoring.

In the following case, the IR puts his question in the course of the interview after a personal observation about the matter in the discussion. He comments on the kind of lyrics the other member of the band has made public and wonders how much of their content originated from the IE’s own life. Upon a question aimed at him, the IE responds in an unassumingly positive manner followed by the DM *I mean*:

(16) **BBC Hard talk 2013: Tony Lommi**

IR: Shaun Ley  
IE: Tony Lommi
What comes after the *I mean* is a clear launch of spacing out the IE’s position and of the other member’s regarding the question about the content of the lyrics. The spacing out happens as the reference to the writer of the lyrics takes two reformulations. The pronoun “he” (line 4) in the question takes the name “Geezer” (line 6) and then in referring to his role it becomes “the base player” (line 8). The extra linguistic knowledge about the IE’s role in the band, only a guitarist, is clarified by stating, “I
did the music” (Line 9). Furthermore, after bluntly stating that the “blame” should not be placed on him, the IE bursts into laughter.

According to Schiffrin’s analysis (1987: 296) there is a “modification” process present along with the usage of I mean through two channels; via “propositional information” and “speaker intention” (ibid. 304). Inside the limits of her view, the DM I mean, here, modifies the information state of the question pointed to the IE. Despite a mildly positive answer of “I think so”, additional information comes after the DM, which refines his answer more. On the other hand, on a larger scale, it goes beyond the propositional state of the utterance. The intention of IE, the speaker, is to let the responsibility and the blame be directed to the other member of a band. The IE’s action is “accountably inapposite” and he uses I mean as a device to “deflect attention from claims about self to experiences involving or belonging to others” (Maynard, 2103: 226). This can be associated with the second channel where it is claimed that the “speaker intention” is being performed. Therefore, as it stands, both channels are apparent and live to some extent. This observation is also applicable for the IR-other party involved in the news interview context.

The occurrences of DMs I mean on the part of IR are rare as mentioned before, although it is not impossible. In case (5), we encounter an incidence of this sort during the interview where the IR cut through the IE’s turn and brings up the previous question content by another combination of words:

\[
\begin{align*}
11 & \text{IR } \rightarrow \text{ we [I mean we know all that we know all that my question is to]} \\
12 & \text{IE } \rightarrow \text{ [listen they’ve threatened and I believe and as europe becau]se} \\
13 & \text{IR } \rightarrow \text{ you you as a dutch man you chose to put them on your website} \\
14 & \text{IE } \rightarrow \text{ when you tell me you don’t polarize the opinion} \\
15 & \text{IR } \rightarrow \text{ and em ee create new rifts inside your society,}
\end{align*}
\]

The IR’s attempt to take holds of the turn was with the help of DM I mean. The DM seems not to have anything to do with the pronoun “we”, but rather links the question on line 1 and 3 with the question starting at the end of line 11 (my question is…). The first question (line 1-3) does not consist of the IR’s own direct accusation. It asks for the state of information. The latter, however, pinpoints some aspects of the first question more sharply and includes a more hostile and direct accusation while it maintains the presupposition of the first question:
First Question (Lines 1 & 3)

……………..

presupposition (opinions are polarized)

The IR’s claim c-The reason to publish the Danish cartoons of prophet Mohammad on the website

Second question (line 11 & 13)

I mean prefaced structure

presupposition (opinions are polarized)

The IR’s claims a-That the IE is a Dutch man.

b- that the IE creates a new drift in society

The table shows the difference between the questions without occurrence of *I mean* in the next turn and with the occurrence of *I mean* in the next turn. The existence of *I mean* provides smooth outline for the adjustments (a & b) to occur. Once again, the “propositional information” is probably where the IR touches on the IE as a Dutch man (Schiffrin, 1987: 314). Additionally, the “speaker intention” could be linked to where the IR proclaims the IE creates new drifts in society (ibid).
5.3.2. The Basic Meaning of *You Know*

The DM *you know* accommodates two widely accepted basic meanings. Schourup (1985) believes that the core meaning of the DM *you know* has something to do with the intended speaker meaning and the hearer’s information state. The DM *you know*’s function is then to slide in the flow of conversation and to check the link. The checking progression carried out by the DM *you know* is toned down by the other basic meaning that is attributed to it. The basic meaning of *you know* by this definition is to “invite addressee inferences” (Jucker and Ziv, 1998: 171–201). Not to check the potential correspondence, this definition maintains that the DM’s role is to call for or provoke the addressee’s overall understanding from the utterance.

These two definitions take into account, to some extent, the literal meaning of the DM *you know* while both of them originate from single feature. The occurrence of the DM *you know*, probably, carries a certain portion of expectancy of knowing. After all, its literal meaning lures us to think this way. The feature that accompanies the DM is expectancy and *you know* is implemented whenever this feature urges within an utterance. The expectancy originates from the speakers’ intentions in their particular repertoire of conversation. Furthermore, the expectancy makes room for the listener to act accordingly. It probably acts as a marker for a listener to pay attention to the content of the turn by highlighting the *you know*-related portion of the current turn. Therefore checking the correspondence and inviting the inference meet in a common ground of expectancy as a feature of the DM *you know*.

The expectancy feature is different for various contexts where the number of parties in a conversation differs. Correspondingly, both the mentioned functions of the DM *you know* should be regarded differently. For example, in the news interview context there is always one absent party; the audience. Although they are absent, they have a canonical effect on two other present parties. Their absent existence adds an extra dimension for the interlocutors to attend to in the flow of conversation. This is different from the ordinary conversation that takes place between two parties without a third party’s influence. As an observer, we should probably take into account the third party in dealing with the DM *you know*. The reason is that the two functions of the DM *you know* have something to do with the other party; the DM *I mean* however is different in this sense from the DM *you know*. 

Having this feature of news interview in mind, both the mentioned functions of the DM *you know* and the expectancy aspect is different from ordinary conversation. First of all, the IR is considered as a spokesperson for the audience as they are not given an opportunity to inquire about any subject one by one. This may explain the rare use of the DM *you know* on the IR’s side. Then, we can conclude that the expectancy of knowing is at its highest. In other words the IE is familiar with the main idea upon which the questions are based. That is, since the IE knows, the expectancy is at highest. Accordingly, this leads to no urge for the DM *you know* to happen. Simply putting, there is no *you know* because the IE already knows the agenda more or less. Therefore, the IR rarely uses it. However, the story is different on the IE’s side. Neither the IR, nor the audiences are aware of what the IE would say in the course of the interview i.e. the IE and the audience know less. The IE is attentive to both parties and as the expectancy of knowing is at lowest, the IE might use the DM *you know* more often. In other words, the IR and the audience are the ones whose correspondence and inferences are checked and invited by the IE. Thus, the IR together with the audience knows little and the IE uses the DM *you know* more.

In the following case, the IR poses a question asking the validity of comparing the Thai presidential election with a massive test (line 1). The question is also garnished beforehand by commentary on Thailand’s recent history. The IE’s answer is positive one but it has a mild tone. He approves the analogy but leaves out the adjective “massive” demoting the similarity between the “election” and “test” (line 5). Moreover, the IE confirms the election as a test for Thai democracy. He then continues with what he thinks of democracy in the upcoming election. The occurrence of the DM *you know* takes place at this point:

(17) UK BBC Hardtalk: 2010:Thailand Presidential Election
IR: Stephen Sucker
IE: Abhisit Vejjajiva
In this case, having emphasizing the analogy, the IE responds with more explanation with the two sentences “the democracy is maturing” (line 8) and “that is resilient” (line 9). The DM you know follows the term “resilient” (line 9).

The IE uses the DM you know either for inviting the inference of the IR and the audience or for checking the correspondence between himself and the IR and the audience in relation to the term “resilient” (line 9). The expectancy of knowing then meets its meaning with this term. What comes after you know reflects on what the IE means by the term “resilient”. He refers to the fact that the IR has spoken about the history of Thailand in previous turns and that is the crucial notion about understanding the concept of being resilient.
5.3.3. You Know = I Mean?

There is an unfavorable preference in news interview contexts towards the usage of the two DMs of you know and I mean. The reason is that the DMs’ basic meanings are not in accordance with the characteristics of the news interview context. They are unfavorable tokens because news interviews are not as unplanned and unrehearsed as naturally occurring conversations. In other words, it is a justified judgment if we take for granted that the IEs have already considered most probable inferences already. This accounts for the less frequent use of the DMs. Also, it is remarkable that every statement in this context has more or less the same weight as the statements in the court. Then similarly, failure to properly illustrate the intended points has critical consequences and upcoming adjustments are not favored or even allowed. To a greater extent, the limited time frame is also responsible for reducing the proportion of adjustments. Reflecting on the considerations above, it is obvious that the news interview context is not a neutral ground for both DMs to occur.

Limited usage in the news interview context is common for both DMs. However, there is more to consider about any possibility of holding them alike with almost identical structure and functions along the utterances. Several observations will be addressed henceforth to clarify their similarities and differences.

To begin with, among other possibilities, the structures within which, any of the two DMs might occur are similar; they can be interchangeably substituted while the grammar of the utterance remains intact. The reason is that both DMs consist of two pieces: subject + verb. Despite this similarity, their interactive function are contrary to each other.

In the following case, the IR refers to the “idea” of the IE in line 7 and 8 that the “marriage is bad for women”. Before that, the IE’s idea receives commentaries such as “revolutionary” (line 5) and that has “explosive impact” (line 3). The commentary continues further by the IR where he says that women “actually should not be monogamous” (line 9). The IR’s turn ends with this commentary and the IE takes over the turn:

(18) UK BBC Hardtalk 2010: “Equality is not my game”

IR: Stephen Sucker IE: Germaine Greer

1 IR well interesting you say that I mean
2 one of the very (explain) I talked about
explosive impact
one of the very
in a sense revolutionary notions that
you you furthered in the book is the idea that
marriage is bad for women
marriage is bad for women and
they actually shouldn’t be monogamous
IE I didn’t make up that you know
you can read statistics it will tell you that
the happiness index goes
married men single women married women single men

The IE denies that she came up with the notion herself (notion that the ‘marriage is bad for women’). She points out the there are “statistics” (line 11) about the matter and that the “happiness index” supports her claim (line12).

In this rather short excerpt of conversation, both DMs get the chance to appear. As it was argued before, they can substitute for each other while the integrity of the sentence remains harmless.

(1) well interesting you say that I mean (2) I didn’t make up that you know
one of the very (explain) I talked about you can read statistics it will tell you that

However, the functions of the DMs are markedly different from each other. The DM I mean in (1) suggests that the speaker would modify what he meant by being “interesting”. The DM you know cannot replace the I mean because there is no call for inference from the IR and there is no ground for us to think that the IR expects the IE to know what he means by being “interesting” (line 1). While the DM you know in (2) invites an inference of the other converser and presents a feeling of expectancy for her answer “I didn’t make up that” (line 10). The DM I mean cannot substitute for I know since there are no adjustments followed by the DM I mean.
6. Summary & Conclusion

In the present paper, an effort was made to enhance our understanding of the discourse markers in the light of institutional interaction. In particular, three of DMs – well, you know and I mean – were selected within the context of the news interview for their structural and interactional features. In addition to singling out the certain text type, this study includes the intonation contour of the DMs and their accompanying turn. The major part of the study deals with the DM well while the two other DMs have been presented together in one section. The frequency of use of each DM in the news interview was the rationale for this choice.

Both the IR and the IE, while displaying their ordinary conversational competencies during the interview, have preplanned agendas for questioning and answering respectively. For this reason, both of them use DMs carefully if not wittingly to properly present their agendas with the maximum efficiency. The current study looked into the ways these three discourse markers have been used by the participants of the news interviews.

The discussion starts with the number of general features of the DM well. In the first part of this section, it is suggested that at the time of uttering the DM well, some extra-linguistics features e.g. gestures and postures have notable potentiality to occur. Although, this observation comes with the two cases, the goal was to underline the multimodal aspects of the discourse at the time of uttering the DM well. Then, the DM well is compared with ‘minimal response tokens’ (exclusively with oh and uh huh) in order to give a clearer picture of its occurrence in the context. In this section, it is suggested that well should not be categorized as a member of acknowledgement tokens; that it doesn’t contribute to the coordination of conversation as the other ‘minimal response tokens’ do. At the end of this section, the analysis moves into the features of the news interview context and investigates the importance of the DM well with notions of agenda shifting, time management and evading the question. The analysis revealed that well plays an important role; as a signpost to detect the occasions that the IE is trying to manage the time of reply; to shift the agenda of the interview; and to evade the questions’ controversial content.

For the second part of the analysis, the discussion continues with the presumed focus on the link between the DM well and the question types. Here, the argument is that each question type manipulates the interactional capacities of the answer. To start
with, while the Wh-question puts forward wide range of possibilities to answer, the same inclination is not true for Yes/No and elliptical questions. It is shown that while both Wh-questions and *well* are similar in bearing same contextual ground in the discourse, the context of DM *well* is assumed rather than uttered which is typical for Wh-question. It is also suggested that *well* acts as a tool for resistance when answers are limited to two extreme alternatives. Other than this, the negative interrogatives and the questions with rising questions reveal a tendency for the answerer to favor the positive reply in regard to the questions. The DM *well* is regarded as one of the ways to even out the imbalance. Given the context of the news interview, the finding of this study shows that the implementation of the DM *well* is a strategic rhetorical device that the IEs –and less frequently the IRs- deliberately put to use in order to neutralize the ‘adversarialiness’ of a limited and intense context of the news interview.

The last section of the analysis deals with the DMs *you know* and *I mean* simultaneously. The reason is that they have a syntactical similarity and that they both function in the interpersonal level. The starting point for the argument was their respective ‘core meanings’. It is discussed that the IR rarely uses instances of *I mean* because his/her agenda is pre-planned and is restricted to asking questions. On the contrary, the IE uses *I mean* more frequently as more time allocated to his/her speech. Besides, it is highlighted that *I mean*-prefaced utterances are the locus where the rationale of the response is positioned. Equally significant aspect for *you know* is the relationship between its occurrence and the ‘concept of knowing’. I argued because of limited knowledge of the audience and the IR towards the IE’s replies in advance, *you know* exists very often within the IE’s utterances.

Given the syntactical similarity between *I mean* and *you know*, it is discussed whether they can be used interchangeably and if so what the consequences would be. The analysis shows that the *I mean* is tied to the next portion of utterance while *you know* is backward looking. As such, the integrity of the utterance could be damaged in case they are replaced with each other in a highly contentious context of news interviews.

All things considered, it might be concluded that the analyzing the manifestation of some lexical units in new interviews has more to offer than to examine them in ordinary conversations. They could be explored how participants use them strategically to their limits to achieve covert interactional proposes.
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### Appendix 1: List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Conversation Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>The Interviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>The Interviewee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCU</td>
<td>Turn Constructional Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRP</td>
<td>Transition Relevance Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Transcription Notation

The transcription notation used to transcribe in this paper is as follows:

[word] the left-side bracket indicates the starting point of overlap

word] the left-side bracket indicates the termination of overlap

= equal sign indicates there is no silence between utterances

(1.0) the number between parenthesis indicates the length of pause between utterances in tenth of seconds

(.) the full stop in parenthesis indicates a rather short pause smaller than two tenths of a second

WORD the word or phrase in upper case are uttered considerably and exclusively louder

>word< the utterance is pronounced quicker in pace

< word > the utterance is pronounced slower in pace

(word) the word or phrase is not transcribed with certainty

(( )) The transcriber’s added description to the event

·hh an inhale

(hh) laughter

hh an aspiration that is hearable

↑ rising pitch

↓ falling pitch

, the comma indicates the continuation of intonation

¿ upside down question mark indicates the intonation between rising and continuation

? the question mark indicates the rising intonation

. the full stop indicates the falling intonation

: the colon indicates that the preceding sound is in the state of stretching

- the hyphen after word or a part of an utterance indicates sudden cut-off

→ refers to specific line of transcription
Appendix 3: Transcriptions

Group 1: well

(1) UK BBC Hardtalk 2010: Thailand Presidential Election
IR: Stephen Sucker IE: Abhisit Vejjajiva

1 IR =here's what 'one very senio'' Thai politician said ti me::
2 about you
3 he said the problem is (( IE is gulping))
4 IR miste' Abisit (.) neve' looks comf'rt'ble,
5 (. ) when he is in a rice paddy.
6 IE (0.9) Well: (0.4) I don’t know a[bout that]
7 IR [you know ] he’s sayin he is saying

(2) UK BBC Hardtalk 2010: Thailand Presidential Election
IR: Stephen Sucker IE: Abhisit Vejjajiva

1 IR → now ¿ I's wann' ask you< do you regret?
2 → any of the things you have done.
3 → as a leader of your party,
4 → and a prime minister,
5 → with regard to red shirts,
6 → Your decision(.) to confront them,
7 → to take them o:n.
8 IE (0.9)well: if you look at two years that
9 I have been through

(3) UK BBC Hardtalk 2010: Racism
IR: Stephen Sucker IE: Geert Wilders

1 IR let’s talk about the [values] in tolerance.
2 → [yeah ]
3 you said th- in the times newspaper
4 november 2004 quote
5 I believe we have ¡been far too: tolerant far too long.=

62
IR: Stephen Sucker  
IE: Geert Wilders

1. IR  
   this program spoke to ayhan tuncer ee a leader of the turkish  
2.   community in the netherlands (.), from islamic culture foundation  
3.   he said wilders is polarizing dutch society  
4.   has no idea to offer about living with Muslims  
5.   reality i::z that Muslims do live here we’ll always, live here  
6.   you are simply polarizing  
7.   and infuriating with your proposals  
8.   jus’[infuriating] the muslim population.  
9.   [ hh  ]  
10.  IE  
    → (0.1)well (.), of course ehm I am not (.), ee at th’ opinion of  
11.  → polarizing at least that’z [not my aim I am not pola-

(6)UK BBC Hardtalk  2010:Racism  
IR: Stephen Sucker  IE: Geert Wilders

1.  IR  
   =if it wasn’t if it’s not your aim to [polariz ]e  
2.  IE  
   → [y e a h ]  
3.  IR  
   why did you publish the Danish cartoons  
4.   of prophet Mohammad on your website?  
5.  IE  
   → (0.1)well: I am (1.2) the whole (.), issue(.), of the Danish cartoons  
6.   ehm (.),showed me and angered me that  
7.   d’europe is weak and d’europe is full of cowards(.), and  
8.   the danish people colleagues of
yours journalists are threatened (.) their flags embassies are burnt
(continues for 3 more lines)
we [I mean we know all that we know all that my question is to ]
[listen they’v threatened and I believe and as europe because all]
you you as a dutch man you chose to put them on your website
when you tell me you don’t polarize the opinion
and em ee create new rifts inside your society,

(7)UK BBC Hardtalk: 2010:Thailand Presidential Election
IR: Stephen Sucker  IE: Abhisit Vejjajiva

1 IR how profound will the change be(.) in the next 4 5 years
if abhisit is prime minister of this country.
2 IE I think I will certainly tek ka tackle all the structural issues=
3 IR =including the military, [including the (military),]
4 IE [ all of-
5 → .hh Well ; ((smirking)) the military you know you mention that
it’s it’s funny because they have been very much dominating
in some of the security policies
for instance in the south during the (taxins) years (.)
we change that
they cooperated

(6)UK BBC Hardtalk 2010:Racism
IR: Stephen Sucker  IE: Geert Wilders

1 IR =if it wasn’t if it’s not your aim to [polariz ]e
2 IE → [yeah ]
3 IR why did you publish the Danish cartoons
of prophet Mohammad on your website?
4 IE → (0.1)well; I am (1.2) the whole (. ) issue(.) of the Danish cartoons
ehm (. )showed me and angered me that
d’europe is weak and d’europe is full of cowards(.) and
the danish people colleagues of
yours journalists are threatened (. )their flags embassies are burnt
(continues for 3 more lines)
we [I mean we know all that we know all that my question is to ]
Continuing our conversation now with Doctor Rosalyn Yalow. Doctor Yalow uh- ehh lemme put it in very simple terms. If it’s doable, if it is: easily disposable, why don’t we.

Well frankly I cannot- (. ) answer all these scientific questions in one minute given to me . . .

is he right?

can the president argue unequivocally,

that the Americans are better off today,

than they were four years ago?

listen George, I think american people understands th’ t we ah got into (. ) terrible economic situation recession (continues 59 seconds)

but yes or no,

‘r americans better off today than four years ago?

listen George, you know (. ) they did a good job

over citing all the statistics everyone ’z familiar with (continues 41 seconds)

so it sounds like y’ know a year ago

the president told me

I don't think americans are better off than four years ago

you still can’t say yes.

(2.0) wall; we’ve clearly improved George
from the depth of the recession.

(11) ABC This week 2012: Pay roll tax extension
IR: George Stephanopoulos  IE: Paul Ryan

1 IR You j’st heard (.). eh jack (Lu) right there congressman say
2 that congress should jus get ↑this payroll tax extension done,
3 will they?
4 IE (2.0)well I think we wi::ll,
5 but what we’re trying to do is simply(.).cut some spending
6 to pay for it,
7 >we gotta remember< goerge(.).that
8 this payroll tax holiday(.).li lose hi money to
9 social security trust fund
10 and if you(.)extend this without paying for it
11 by cutting spending then
12 you are accelerating bankruptcy in social security.
13 ↑that is all we want to do is to make sure
14 that social security is left unharmed,
15 while we extend this payroll tax holiday.

(12) ABC This Week 2012: Pay roll tax extension
IR:George Stephanopoulos  IE: Rick Santorum

1 IR I am at the question of bailout.
2 >you also running an ad <in michigan where you suggested
3 governor Romney TURNED HIS BACK (0.3)
4 on workers of Michigan of course
5 IE ((noding))
6 IR refering to autobailout there.
7 but ↑you also are opposed(.).to the auto bailout.
8 So isn’t it indigenous to charge th’ Romney’s turning
9 his back on Michigan
10 when you have the same position?
11 IE well (.). we have the same position on that but
12 we don't have same position on bailouts
13 when I was in aa south western Pennsylvania..
14 (continues 40 seconds 14 turns)
15 I didn't support detroit
16 mitt romney supported his friends on wall street and
17 then turn his back on the people of detroit now
18 I say turn his back
19 because he supports the concept th bailouts I don't
20 that's the different between two approach

(13) ABC This Week 2012: Pay roll tax extension
IR: George Stephanopoulos  IE: Rick Santorum

1 IR but if it was a mistake,
2 isn't apologizing <the (rightest) thing more to do?
3 IE we:ll ¿ again it it iv it it suggest that there is somehow blame
4 that is somehow blame that that we did something(0.3)wrong
5 in the sense of doing it deliberate act wrong,
6 hh I think it sho::ws (. that we are e tha-
7 >I think< it shows weakness.
8 I think what we say is (. look
9 aa what what happened here was wrong(.)
10 but it was it was not something that was deliberate and(.)
11 we’re we you know we take responsibility fo’it
12 it was unfortunate but to apologize (.)
13 I think launches credibility somehow that it was more than that

(14) ABC This week 2009: Foreign Affairs
IR: George Stephanopoulos IE: Hillary Clinton

1 IE Part of what we have to(0.2) make clear to Iranians is that(0.1)
2 their pursue of nuclear weapons
3 will actually trigger greater insecurity,
4 because right now many of the nations in the neighbourhood
5 as you know very well
6 IR Because israel strikes before they can finish?
7 IE (0.2)We:ll ¿ but not only that I mean other countries
Is it US policy now?
I think it is umm (0.2)
US policy to the extend(.) that
we have alliances and understandings(.) with number of nations
aaa they may not formal as it is with NATO
but(0.2) I don't think there is any doubt in anyone's mind(.) that
were Israel(.) to suffer(.) a nuclear attack(.) by Iran
there would be retaliation
By the united states=
=We:::ll Î ¿ I think there would be retaliation
and I think part of what ahh is clear is
we want to avoid ei ei middle east(.) arm race which
leads to nuclear weapons
being in the possession of(0.1) other countries in the middle east
and we want to make clear that
there are consequences and costs

not a particularly cheerful perspective
not in a sense of cheerful message to put out
((gasps))
did he[reflect]
[well ]
how you felt about your life off the (stage).
I think so I mean geezer was responsible for the most of the base player base player responsible for most the li lyrics. I did the music side so and ((smiling)) I don’t say the blame for that (laughing)

(17) UK BBC Hardtalk: 2010: Thailand Presidential Election

IR: Stephen Sucker IE: Abhisit Vejjajiva

1 IR thailand’s recent history’s been disfigured by military coups, by political violence
2 would you accept that this coming election is a massive test of thailand’s commitment to democracy?
3 IE it is the test for thai democracy and I am confident the country
4 prove to the rest of the world that democracy is maturing
5 that is resilient, uhhhhmm you know
6 you talk about the history of thailand, having troubled political times

(18) UK BBC Hardtalk 2010: “Equality is not my game”

IR: Stephen Sucker IE: Germaine Greer

1 IR well interesting you say that I mean one of the very (explain) I talked about explosive impact
2 one of the very in a sense revolutionary notions that
3 you you furthered in the book is the idea that
4 marriage is bad for women
marriage is bad for women and they actually shouldn’t be monogamous.

IE I didn’t make up that you know you can read statistics it will tell you that the happiness index goes married men single women married women single men.