

Grammar and Institution: Questions and Questioning in the Broadcast News Interview

John C. Heritage and Andrew L. Roth
Department of Sociology
University of California, Los Angeles

In both speeches and interviews, speakers convey information and express opinions. In speeches, these activities are accomplished through direct monologue, unmediated by interlocutors. In news interviews, they are very largely done as responses to questioning.¹ Questioning handles the main interactional and institutional tasks charged to modern news interviewers. First, and most centrally, interviewers are obliged to elicit interviewees' information and opinions for the benefit of overhearers (Heritage, 1985; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991). Second, in most Western societies at least, interviewers are specifically not authorized to argue with, debate, or criticize the interviewee's point of view nor, conversely, to agree with, support, or defend it. Instead, interviewers must maintain what Heritage and Greatbatch (1991) termed a

Andrew L. Roth acknowledges financial support from the Edward A. Dickson Fellowship in Journalism Fund at the University of California, Los Angeles. All work in coding, analyzing, and writing this article was equally shared between the first and second authors. We thank Steve Clayman, Gene Lerner, Elinor Ochs, Anita Pomerantz, Robert Sanders, Manny Schegloff, Marja-Leena Sorjonen, and Sandy Thompson for their comments on earlier drafts of this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to John C. Heritage, Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles, 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1551.

“neutralistic” position vis-à-vis their interviewees. Questioning is a central resource through which this stance can be maintained (Clayman, 1988; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991).

This article aims to explicate questioning as an activity that, in large part, constitutes the news interview as a social institution. Starting from an interest in substantiating the claim that the news interview is primarily a question-driven form of interaction, we explore the nature and extent of interviewer questioning in news interviews. Examining the main features by which an analyst might code interviewer turns at talk as questions or not, we first consider the significance of grammatical form in the production of questioning actions. Subsequently, we embed these considerations in a broader analysis of the dynamics of news interview questioning. This entails a treatment of the institutional assumptions and relevancies that news interview participants demonstrably rely on as grounds for inference and action. We conclude with a discussion of grammar as a situated resource in the production and recognition of social action.

The relevance of questioning for the news interview is not only an analytic problem for students of interaction, it matters in the first place for news interview participants. This can be seen clearly in the following case, in which then-Vice President George Bush crossed swords with CBS news anchor Dan Rather. Here and throughout, we refer to the interviewer and the interviewee as IR and IE, respectively.

(1) (Bush-Rather:3)

- 1 IR: You said tha' if you had known this was an arms for
 2 hostages sw₁ap, .hh that you would've opposed it. .hhh
 3 IE: Yes
 4 IR: You also [said thet] that you did NOT KNOW thet y-
 5 - IE: [E x a c t]y (m- may- may I-) may I
 6 - answer that.
 7 (0.4)
 8 IE: (Th uh) right (-)
 9 - IR: [That wasn't a] question. = it w₁as a statement eh-
 10 - IE: Yes it was a
 11 - statement [and I'll answer it. Thuh President] =
 12 - IR: Let me ask thuh question if I may first
 13 IE: = created this program, .h has testified er stated
 14 publicly, (-) he did not think it was arms fer hostages.

Here, at each of the arrowed points, both the IR and the IE assert their respective rights to speak by explicitly invoking the relevance and normativity of news interview questioning and answering. Bush begins (lines 5-6) with a request to “answer” the IR’s initial statement. Bush’s utterance orients to the institutional roles of IR and IE by requesting permission to answer the IR at a point where an IE would normally withhold talk but a conversational participant would simply proceed to talk without requesting to do so. The IR’s response—a defense of his right to continue (line 9)—rests on the implied claim that his turn at lines 1-2 and 4 has not yet reached a question and suggests that it is therefore not complete. The IR resists interruption, but he does so specifically by invoking his *institutional* right as IR to ask a question and not the ordinary interactional right to complete an utterance in progress. Subsequently when Bush insists on “answering” the statement (lines 10-11/13-14), the IR continues to resist (line 12) with an explicit appeal to be allowed to “ask the question . . . first.” Cases such as (1) evidence the utterance-by-utterance orientation of the parties to questioning as a normatively prescribed course of action for interviewers.² Notably, in this case, that normative prescription is invoked by the IR as a resource for, rather than a constraint on, his action.

While examples like (1) point to the evident normativity of questioning as a feature of news interview interaction, they show only a single case of it in progress. Although it might seem obvious that news interviews progress as sequences of interviewer questions and interviewee answers (Heritage, 1985; Greatbatch, 1988; Clayman, 1988, 1989; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991), without quantification the claim is contestable. Addressing this need, previous research on the news interview involved “informal quantification” (Schegloff, 1993) in which terms like “generally” or “massively” were used, based on long experience with data corpora, to describe the distributions of types of turns among IRs and IEs. Thus, for example, Heritage and Greatbatch (1991, p. 103) asserted that:

The fact that news interviews *overwhelmingly* proceed as sequences of IR questions and IE answers . . . constitutes *massive* evidence for the existence of a Q-A preallocated turn-taking system for news interviews that is distinctive from conversation. [italics added]

Although such informal distributional claims were quite common, formal quantification never constituted a primary focus in these early

studies. Indeed, to have made formal distributional evidence a primary focus of research would have entailed subordinating initial descriptive analyses of news interviews' normative organization to the altogether different undertaking of coding turns at talk.

Although many conversation analysis (CA) research interests in the news interview can and will be pursued without any move toward more formal quantification of interactional data, some interests cannot. In relation to the news interview, for example, individual case studies cannot evidence the parties' cumulative orientation to questioning across an entire interview, across different interviews involving different IRs and IEs, across different numbers of IRs and IEs, and across different topics, broadcast formats, news cultures, and societal boundaries. Demonstrating these requires quantitative evidence. This article focuses, in part, on ways of coding and formally quantifying questioning in the news interview and describes some advantages and limitations of these procedures. As we hope to show, coding can generate important observations on the role of grammar in interaction. These observations both elaborate and transcend the simple quantitative considerations that originally motivated the coding exercise.

THE BASIC CLAIM TO BE EVALUATED

Our objective is to evaluate the claim that the news interview is normatively organized as a question-driven form of interaction. This claim implies that IRs normally attempt to question IEs and that IEs normally produce turns at talk as responses to IR questions. It also implies that, while some departures from the norm may be tolerated or "let pass," such departures may, as in (1), be specially accountable or the objects of protest or conflict. Thus, we evaluate the claim that IR turns will generally be structured so as to arrive at a sentence or other turn constructional unit that does questioning, and that IEs will tend to wait until such a unit is complete before beginning a response. It is obvious, therefore, that our primary focus must be on IR-IE turn-transfer because we are claiming that turn-transfer in the news interview is organized by reference to the IR's production of questioning actions. Put another way, we are looking at the extent to which the final units of IR turns accomplish questioning. Leaving aside, for the moment, the

complexities of unitizing IR turns at talk, we first of all need to consider how "questioning" in the news interview is recognizably achieved.

GRAMMAR AS A RESOURCE FOR CODING QUESTIONING

In trying to establish criteria for determining whether an interviewer's turn at talk does questioning, investigators will first seek coding criteria that are valid in terms of features "demonstrably relevant to the parties themselves" (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Second, they will search for criteria that can be reliably implemented.

Grammatical form, it would seem, meets both these criteria. The vast majority of turns at talk embody some aspect of grammatical form.³ And with regard to questions in particular, there is a long-standing presumption among students of language that grammatical form, specifically, the interrogative sentence type, is the *prima facie* basis for determining whether an utterance accomplishes questioning (Schegloff, 1984, p. 34). Moreover, grammatical form presents itself as a source of a finite set of coding categories. These categories can be implemented reliably because they require a minimum of subjective interpretation on the coder's part and, in particular, do not require reference to the speaker's "intentions." In brief, it seems reasonable to begin by attempting to look at the actions performed in turns at talk by reference to their grammatical form.

Coding Questions Using Grammatical Resources

What does it look like to build and operationalize a coding framework for questioning based on grammatical form? The answer is by no means simple. It extends somewhat beyond the reach of most conceptions of grammar. In what follows, we take a distinguished grammatical analysis of English questions and use it to develop a coding framework that addresses the minimum level of interactional detail necessary to make any attempt at coding questioning worth the effort involved.

Though there is some disagreement among linguists generally about

the specifications of grammar and its use and, more specifically, about the precise array of linguistic forms that can be appropriately described as "interrogatives," we take as our starting point the analysis developed by Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik (1985), which is based on recorded data from the Survey of English Usage. Though more reduced treatments can be found both in the linguistics literature and in various studies of questions from related disciplines, we regard this study as a reasonable starting point for the project undertaken here.

A review of our data base⁴ shows that most of the major classes of questions identified by Quirk et al. are to be found in news interviews.

Yes/No questions. Usually formed by placing the operator before the subject (Quirk et al., 1985, pp. 807-810).

(2) (NW:30.9.81:John)

- 1 -- IR: Was it intentional not to call you?
 2 IE: Well i- (.) I don't think it was mali::gn, = but it
 3 was intentional in the sense that . . .

(3) (Nightline 7/22/85:5) ((IE = Reverend Alan Boesak))

- 1 IE: . . . I do not think that anyone in South Africa can
 2 say: .hh that he or she is uh- is safe from any
 3 action by this- from thuh side of thuh- of
 4 thuh government.
 5 -- IR: tch .hh Are you willing (.) personally to renounce
 6 thuh violence (.) in that country
 7 (0.6)
 8 IE: .hh Yes I will. I mean I have said so . . .

Tag questions. Consisting of an operator and subject (in that order) placed after a statement (Quirk et al., 1985, pp. 810-814).

(4) (NN:1991:Gould --simplified)

- 1 IE: .hhh Because although Missus Thatcher constantly
 2 says how tough she's going to be: (.) .h and indeed
 3 she does: us:e the language which an:tagonizes
 4 everybody in Europe. =
 5 -- IR: =She's been no pushover has she.

In the following case, the IR deploys an "invariant tag" (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 814).

(5) (Nightline 7/22/85 --concerning South Africa)

- 1 IR: Reverend Boesak () Ambassador Beukus makes thuh
 2 point (.) that you can't have any discussions you
 3 can't have any progress in South Africa until thuh
 4 violence stops. .hhh An therefore thuh state of
 5 emergency is necessary. Fair?
 6 (0.4)
 7 IE: tch .hhh Well: I would agree with the ambassador in
 8 thuh sense that you cannot h.hhh have discussions or
 9 negotiation 'til thuh violence stops . . .

Declarative questions. Characterized by final rising intonation (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 814)

(6) (MacNeil/Lehrer 2/3/92)

- 1 IE:hh And this ru:thless cowardly army overthrows
 2 (.) thuh first democracy that this country's ever
 3 had. (.) Our ally our fighter against
 4 commun i s m.]
 5 -- IR: [But the administration doesn't approve of that?
 6 IE: .hh NO but uh: we were thuh first and I was proud of
 7 the administration to- to fo:rc:e an embargo, . . .

(7) (MacNeil/Lehrer 2/3/92:6) ("OAS" = Organization of American States)

- 1 IE: . . . We've talk:ed about it and it's been
 2 discussed > no:t beca:use
 3 -- IR: You have- [You have] discussed it
 4 -- within the OAS?
 5 IE: It's been discussed as: uh- a theoretical
 6 possibility . . .

WH- Questions. Formed with one of the following interrogative words: *who, what, which, when, where, how, why* (Quirk et al., 1985, pp. 817-823).

(8) (NW:30.9.81:John - about Labour party policy)

- 1 - IR: What is the likelihood in your view of a Labour
- 2 manifesto at the next election containing the firm
- 3 commitment to unilateralism .h that the party here
- 4 at Brighton wants.
- 5 IE: I don't think that that at the moment i- i- i- is a
- 6 likely e:r u::r: result.

(9) (MacNeil/Lehrer 12/4/89:1) ((IE = Sen. George Mitchell)

- 1 - IR: .hhhh Senator Mitchell, what's your overview of thuh
- 2 - summit from President Bush's point of view.
- 3 (.)
- 4 IE: It was positive. . . .

Alternative questions. Involving list construction and explicit differentiation of alternative propositions (Quirk et al., 1985, pp. 823-824).

(10) (WAO:14.2.79)

- 1 IR: If the Prime Minister were to drop Mister Benn
- 2 - would this be a political plus or a political minus
- 3 in terms of the coming election and votes (hhh)
- 4 et generally.
- 5 IE: .hhhh (.) I think it would be: a political minus in Labour
- 6 Party terms:s.

(11) (MacNeil/Lehrer 7/22/85:2) ((IE = South African ambassador Herman Beukus - on the South African state of emergency))

- 1 - IR: D'you believe we're talking a matter of days or weeks
- 2 - or months for thuh state of emergency. =
- 3 IE: =.hhhh It would very much depend hh on uh: the: radicals
- 4 who are very much behind hh those scenes of violence
- 5 that we've seen

In these data fragments, the IR's turn consists of a grammatically formed question. We henceforth refer to these five classes of grammatically formed questions as "interrogatives."²⁵ With this nucleus of IR

interrogatives, we could perhaps go forward to simply code points of speaker transition between IR and IE and determine the proportion of those that occur at or after the end of IRs' interrogatives. In that way, we would achieve a first approximation of the role of grammatical form in the parties' recognition of questioning as an activity.

However, that approximation would be inadequate for our purposes in two ways. Coding questioning in the news interview involves dealing with utterances rather than sentences. The conception of grammar used to code IR turns at talk must be able to accommodate the fact that many IR turns (1) are *subsentential* in their construction and (2) accomplish the pragmatic force of questioning without taking interrogative form as we have operationalized it from Quirk et al. (1985). To accommodate these two features of news interview interaction, any defensible effort at coding questioning in the news interview must rely on extensions to the grammatical nucleus described below. In the following two sections we consider both pragmatic and turn-constructual extensions to the grammatical nucleus that augment its utility as a framework for coding IR questioning.

Pragmatic Extensions Beyond the Grammatical Nucleus

Directives as Question Substitutes

A first set of extensions handles IR utterances that accomplish the pragmatic force of questioning without taking the form of interrogatives. An initial and highly restricted subset of these involves imperative utterances that can nonetheless accomplish questioning (Schegloff, 1984). Cases (12) and (13) involve directives (Searle, 1976) that function as question substitutes.

(12) (Nightline 6/3/85:1)

- 1 IR: Well, no question that 'e tabled it, 'n in fact when I
- 2 hear:: Richard Viguerie saying that uh one uh thuh
- 3 reasons he likes having ya in that job izzat ya know
- 4 thuh media's true agenda.

- 5 -- .hh Tell us about it.
 6 (0.4)
 7 IE: tch .hhhh Well uh:::m () as director o' communication
 8 I suppo:se I'm not supposed tuh get induh any
 9 combat with 'uh media, but lemme state what my views
 10 are on that uh .hhhh Ted . . .
- (13) (MacNeil/Lehrer 12/4/89:5)
- 1 IE: . . . On the other hand we have yet to face up (.) to thuh
 2 kinds of questions that Henry quite correctly raises.
 3 .h Sometimes they are better not raised in a public (fora).
 4 -- IR: Like what. Give me an example.
 5 IE: W1- thuh future of Germany hh and . . .

These cases are infrequent in our data corpus and restricted to U.S. data, mainly to a single IR (*Nightline's* Ted Koppel).

B-Event Statements

A second and much more substantial subset of cases involves declaratives. These, in contrast with Quirk et al.'s declarative questions, do not necessarily depend on final rising intonation for their questioning force; instead they embody what Labov and Fanshel (1977, p. 100; see also Pomerantz, 1980; Heritage, 1985) have termed "B-event" statements. B-event statements are declarative utterances in which the speaker formulates some matter as one to which the recipient has primary access. At the minimum, such an utterance makes a recipient's confirmation or denial relevant in the next turn. Although B-event statements do not depend on intonation for their questioning force, a substantial number are done with final rising intonation.⁶

B-event statements are diverse and variegated, embracing a variety of mental predicates such as sentiments, knowledge or expertise, opinion, experience, and intentions. The following types are common in our data base: (1) case 14, statements addressing subjective sentiments of the IE; (2) cases 15-16, statements that invoke the IE's opinion; (3) case 17, statements that invoke the gist or upshot of the IE's earlier remarks; (4) case 18, statements that formulate specific IE experiences; (5) case 19, hypothetical or future-oriented statements about courses of action with which the IE may be associated.

Statements addressing subjective sentiments of the IE.

(14) (NN:29.9.81)

- 1 -- IR: So in a very brief word David Owen you in no way regret
 2 -- what you did er despite what has (happened) in Brighton
 3 -- this week in the Labour Party.
 4 IE: n- In no way do I regret it. =

Statements that invoke the IE's opinion.

(15) (MacNeil/Lehrer 12/4/89:8)

- 1 -- IR: You agree Senator that whether anybody likes it or not
 2 -- Central America is a shadow in all of this?
 3 IE: .hh Well of course e::h it's important to our interests
 4 -- and . . .

(16) (*Nightline* 10/15/92:6)

- 1 IE:hh we think it's gonna become a race between Clinton
 2 -- and Perot, .hh and we think Perot is gonna win.
 3 -- IR: An- and you're saying that thuh president is gonna be out
 4 -- of this?
 5 (0.5)
 6 IE: I think so.

Statements that invoke the gist or upshot of the IE's earlier remarks.

(17) (UK Today KGB:1)

- 1 IE: It's not true. Thuh spying (.) goes on. On both sides.
 2 -- But particularly ah strangely enough on thuh Russian
 3 -- side. . . .
 . . . (7 lines of IE talk omitted)
hhh And those two military and K.G.B. organizations
 11 -- they have about .hhh three thousand officers (.) of
 12 -- intelligence abroad. In Britain and Germany and France,
 13 -- in the United States and so on. .hhh
 14 -- [So is- so you are
 15 -- IR:

- 16 — saying that basically nothing has happened since (.)
 17 — thuh cold war came to an en:d, and we're supposed to be
 18 — friends with Russia?
 19 IE: Ah: not- I'm not saying that. Something has happened. . . .

Statements that formulate specific IE experiences.

(18) (MacNeil/Lehrer 10/23/92:7)

- 1 IR: .hhhh Do thuh Vietnamese say to you: (.) General Vessey.
 2 <There are n:o Americans alive in our country. >
 3 IE: Yes.
 4 (0.2)
 5 1- IR: They look you 'cross thuh table and [s::ay (it)] =
 6 IE: [E x actly.]
 7 1- IR: = unequivocaly, [.h h h h h h]
 8 IE: [.h h h h h h] And they say come and look?
 9 2- IR:
 10 IE: Y:es. That's what they say.
 11 3- IR: >N::ow you- they say come and look at our records.
 12 IE: (°Yeh°) Now they say come and look at our records.
 13 4- IR: And you have nothing. up 'til now:: .hhh that you
 14 can point to:: duz- to indicate anything to thuh
 15 con::trarily.
 16 IE: [.hhhh Well what we have is the evidence from
 17 thuh PAST.

Hypothetical or future-oriented statements about courses of action with which the IE may be associated. In the following case, the design of the IR's turn as a B-event confronts the IE with two hypothetical "alternatives":

(19) (Newsnight/Blunkett:2)

- 1 IE:hh if we don't get that, then I think some of us
 2 have to sa:y, in- in all credibility .hh that we would
 3 want Britain to be able to remove those weapons .hhh
 4 independently, unilateraly if that's the way
 5 | In uh- | In uh-
 IR:

- 6 IE: you'd like to put it. =
 7 IR: =In other words, I don't understand the logic of
 this:, uh Mr. Blunkett, if things are going well, and
 8 a- the, the atmosphere of international detente continues
 9 (.) you're quite happy to negotiate the weapons away,
 10 but if things (.) go badly, and I assume by that you
 11 b- mean some kind of return, to some kind of cold war
 12 atmosphere, then you'll (.) give them away anyway.
 13 | Well I: I
 14 IE:
 15 I'm not talking about giving anything away, . . .

In order to discriminate B-events from other declarative utterances, investigators must analyze IRs' utterances for their content. This entails treating a whole range of real-world knowledge, together with the parties' relative rights of access to it, as a necessary part of the coding task that extends beyond the domain of grammar per se.⁷

In sum then, by incorporating pragmatic extensions to a nucleus of grammatically defined interrogatives, our coding scheme will capture aspects of questioning that stand in a very close functional relationship to the grammatical categories with which we started but that are not interrogatively formed questions in a technical grammatical sense.

Turn Constructional Variations From the Grammatical Nucleus

The second, and more ramifying, aspect of questioning that must be addressed has to do with turn construction. We are, of course, dealing with turns at talk occurring in real time. Once we move from the grammarian's world, where sentences are the unit of analysis, to an interactional one, where utterances are situated in sequences, a further set of considerations arises. Whereas we started with a restricted sense of grammar as simply a tool for coding utterances, with this set of considerations we shift to the interactional properties of those utterances and, in particular, to how they are constructed as turns at talk that are embedded in sequences of actions.

First, in dealing with talk-in-interaction, the sentence can no longer be treated as the unit of analysis. Instead, utterances constitute the units of analysis and these are built from lexical items, phrases, and clauses and sentences (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Ford & Thompson,

in press). Sacks et al. (1974) referred to these as "turn constructional units" (TCUs). These units are the building blocks of turns at talk and are deployed within a system that normatively organizes the production and allocation of those turns. Within this system, which has a bias toward single TCU turns in ordinary conversation, a turn at talk may nevertheless consist of more than one TCU (Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff, in press).

At the least—and this is a highly selective gloss of complex findings on the organization of turn construction—we will have to address IR turns at talk that: (1) are *subsentential*, (2) are subject to intersection by another speaker's talk, and (3) comprise more than one TCU.

Questioning With Lexical and Clausal/Phrasal Forms

IRs do not rely exclusively on sentential TCUs to do questioning. In certain forms—especially those that involve rising intonation—subsentential units (i.e., lexical, phrasal, and clausal TCUs) do this work.

(20) (Newsnight/China:2)

- 1 IE: .hhhh So f: I: (:) I see him as: uh f: (:) doing
- 2 several things first of all (:) briefly .hh um:
- 3 instituting a system where the national people's
- 4 congress becomes a more realistic parliament perhaps
- 5 with multiple slate elections to it .hhhh the rule of
- 6 law: .hh u:rh:.
- 7 -- IR: ¹Multiple slate multiparty?
- 8 IE: ih- No: multiple multiple candidates . . .

(21) (Nightline 6/6/85:6)

- 1 IE:hhh but I hu- observed uh too frequently: thuh
- 2 nuclear regulatory commission .hh when faced with
- 3 a conflict in protecting thuh public. .hh versus
- 4 protecting thuh financial health of thuh nuclear
- 5 industry. .hh too frequently. .h shu- uh shunted
- 6 asi:de. .hh their responsibilities to thuh public.
- 7 (0.6)
- 8 -- IR: For: what reasons. Political reasons?
- 9 IE: .hhh I think a lot of it is political re:asons . . .

(22) (U.K. Today:KGB:2-3) (On spying by post-U.S.S.R. Russia))

- 1 IE: . . . and because it was an ideological: sta:te it
- 2 was getting its ideology philosophy and the desire to
- 3 control and to influence over the whole world. That's
- 4 why the spying was really dangerous for the West.
- 5 Now .hhh thuh K.G.B. and G.I.U. spying it is more
- 6 of a nuisance rather of a strategic (:) threat.
- 7 -- IR: Because there isn't really any longer (:) a Russian
- 8 ideology in thruh sense of the old Communist
- 9 IE: ¹The ah nor-
- 10 ideology.
- 11 ¹The ah nor- Communist or any other i:deology and
- 12 because they lost their spirit . . .

Intersected TCUs

The realization of a turn at talk in the news interview as a question is a contingent achievement (Clayman, 1988; Greatbatch, 1988; Schegloff, 1988/89; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991). There are fundamental ways in which IEs contribute to the achievement of IRs' turns at talk. Most obviously, IEs regularly withhold talk until the IR's turn is recognizably complete (i.e., in intonational, syntactic, and pragmatic terms; cf. Sacks et al., 1974; Ford & Thompson, in press). In a substantial minority of cases, however, IEs begin speaking before IRs reach such a point, resulting in overlapping talk. Overlapping talk presents a problem for coding. Specifically, is the TCU in progress, or is the prior completed TCU to be treated as implicative for, or the object of, the IE's ensuing talk? There is no easy programmatic answer to this problem. Rather it must be addressed on a case-by-case basis. In some cases, for example, when a TCU is repeated, this issue is not highly material. In others, it matters in a most pointed fashion.

Case (23) is one where this issue matters, though at first it may seem to take us far afield from matters of coding. Here, we offer a detailed single case analysis of an exchange between a British news interviewer and then-Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. This example provides some illustration of the range and extent of analysis that may have to be done in order to code an intersected turn at talk adequately.

We focus on explicating Thatcher's overlap of the IR's question at lines 7-8.

(23) (WAO/Thatcher:3)

- 1 IR: ... People judge ah-politicians by their to:ne .hhh their
 2 style (.) you know that's a fact of politics .hhh and
 3 the wo:rry and Edward Heath certainly has pointed this
 4 up-.hhh ah- the worry is that (.) what you perhaps mean
 5 by .hh your commitment to Eu:rope and winning the
 6 argument in Europe .hhh smacks in who- his words of .hh
 7 authoritarianism. .hh eh-Do you reject all that?
 8 .H H H H H A b s o l u: t e
 9 nonsense. I have in fact taken off a lot of the controls
 10 which Ted had on under his government. .hhh In other
 11 words we've gone precisely the other way. .hhh Really
 12 if all they've got to wo:rry about is iv-we-i-is one's
 13 style .hhh what they don't like is one being a fighter
 14 and succeeding.

At first sight, it would appear that Thatcher is not responding to the question at all. Instead, she could be seen to be responding directly to the criticism of "authoritarianism" (line 7), which the IR has carefully attributed to former Prime Minister Edward Heath (lines 3 and 6). At this juncture, the IR has not yet come to an interrogative TCU, though his short inbreath (line 7) does project a further TCU. It is at just this juncture that Thatcher takes a prolonged and markedly aspirated inbreath (line 8), which also projects an initial "responsive" TCU. Though her inbreath starts at roughly the same time as the IR's, her talk begins later than his and, significantly, just after the IR's "Do you" (line 7), projecting a "question."

Thatcher thus places the start of her talk with notable precision, at just the point where the grammar of the IR's TCU-in-progress projects a recognizable type of action – a question – but before the question's substance is fully available. By beginning to talk in overlap with the IR's projected question, the IE conveys her vigorous rejection of the suggested criticism. Moreover, although the question's substance is not yet available, the IR's prior remarks (a reported criticism) project (by preference considerations) that the question begun with "Do you" will

culminate in an invitation to deny the reported criticism.⁸ That projection is confirmed by the initial sound of the IR's "reject" (line 7). In this context, Thatcher's stretched enunciation of "absolute" (line 8) overlaps, competes with, and outlasts the remainder of the IR's question. It thereby provides for the key element in her rejection of that criticism – "nonsense" (line 9) – to emerge "in the clear."

We can now observe that Thatcher's extended turn-initial in-breath served strategically in making such a "strong" response possible. The inbreath, in overlap with the IR, projects a response before any question has emerged but is not in itself a response. Indeed, it provides an account for why a response, although projected imminently, is as yet unspoken. An inbreath can be drawn out, within reason, to the point in the IR's talk where the IE's start would be most advantageous. Thatcher's inbreath is thus accomplice to the design of a response whose combativeness is achieved through a small manipulation of the news interview's turn-taking organization, resulting in overlapping talk that is responsive not to an actual question, but rather to the fact that questioning is now recognizably underway. Thatcher's initial TCU thus both competes with and ultimately responds to the question.

As noted earlier, there is no programmatic solution to the coding of overlapping talk. Nevertheless, it can be handled with a measure of reliability so long as treatment of such instances takes into account the positioning and construction of *both* the IR's and the IE's talk, as in example (23).

IR's Multiple-TCU Turns

As stated earlier, our central interest is in determining whether questioning is the fundamental condition under which IR-IE turn transfer occurs. It is this interest that mandates our focus on the final TCU of IR's turns. However, in our data base, about 50% of IR turns consist of two or more TCUs (cf. Clayman, 1988; Greatbatch, 1988). This raises the issue of how multiunit, as opposed to single-unit, turns can be categorized and coded on a systematic basis. These complex turns may include both interrogative and noninterrogative TCUs and these in various orders of occurrence. In coding terms, the issue arises as to whether our focus on the final, turn-transitional TCU is justified when IRs may deploy interrogatives that do not yield immediate

turn-transfer, though IEs markedly respond to these interrogatives subsequently. In short, does our focus on turn-transition obscure our view of IR questioning?

One empirically grounded response to this issue stems from Sacks's (1973/1987) work on the "preference for contiguity" in ordinary conversation. Recipients of multi-TCU turns at talk, he observed, regularly respond first to the *final* TCU of the prior turn, thereby treating it as the sequentially implicative component of that turn. A review of our data base confirms that a preference for contiguity generally holds in the news interview as well. Examples of this preference's operation can be clearly seen in cases such as the following:

(24) (WAO:13.3.79)

- 1 IR: .hhh er What's the difference between your Marxism and
- 2 Mister McGarhey's Communism.
- 3 IE: The difference is that it's the press that constantly
- 4 call me a Ma:rxist when I do not, (.) and never have
- 5 (.) er er given that description of myself. [.hh I]
[But I]'ve
- 6 a - IR: heard you- I've heard you'd be very happy to: to: er
- 7 a - .hhhh er describe yourself as a Marxist.
- 8 a - Could it be that with an election in the offing you're
- 9 b - anxious to play down that you're a Marxist.]
[er] Not at
- 10 b - all Mister Da:y. =
- 11 c - = And I:'m (.) sorry to say I must disagree with you, =
- 12 c - = you have never heard me describe myself .hhh er as
- 13 d - a Ma:rxist. = I have o:nly . . .
- 14 d -
- 15

Here, the IR's turn at lines 6-10 takes the form of two TCUs: a statement (arrowed "a") followed by an interrogative (arrowed "b"). Although the statement directly challenges the IE's previous assertion (lines 4-5) that he has never described himself as a Marxist, the IE not only waits for the IR turn to come to a question, but also responds to the last, interrogative TCU (arrowed "c") before turning to rebut the earlier challenging statement (arrowed "d").

Similarly in (25), the IE - the campaign manager of a left-leaning British Labour politician who is competing for the party leadership - is confronted with two interrogative TCUs in succession. The first (line 1) is a "yes/no" interrogative that asks about whether he will quit if the vote is lost. The second (lines 3-6) is an "alternative" question (see also Sacks, 1973/1987, p. 63), the first component of which stands in a contrastive relationship to the earlier interrogative (from "are you going to quit" to "are you going to go on"), whereas the second component addresses a related issue concerning whether the "left" campaign has reached its "zenith."

(25) (DLP 4:Lansman:1-2)

- 1 a - IR: If you do lose, are you going to quit.
- 2 (.)
- 3 IR: Is that um- <(uh) what I want to know is, >
- 4 b - are you <going t' go > on:: with this campaign,
- 5 c - or is that the- th' zenith of the- (0.2) of
- 6 th' le:ft.
- 7 IE: °.h° U::h, (.) <what. is-> hhhh I mean I- (.)
- 8 I sincerely hope <it isn't > th' zenith <o' th'
- 9 left an:- certainly we w'l go on: campaigning,
- 10 .hh because, I mean.

Here, the IE constructs his response entirely from resources made available in the second of the IR's TCUs (arrowed b and c) and, moreover, deals with the last component of that TCU first (arrowed c, concerning the zenith of the left), before returning to deal with the component that preceded it.

And again, in the following case (26), the IE (Democratic Congressman Charles Rangel) begins a response (arrowed a, at line 6) to the IR's prior interrogative (lines 1-5) but withholds an intonationally projected continuation in the face of the IR's intersecting talk. After a first possible completion point (at *it*, line 7) of the IR's intersecting, declarative TCU, the IE produces a next response (arrowed b, line 9). That response is revised to display a "fit" to the IR's most recent utterance (lines 8-9), where that fit involves the design of the IE's second response as a preferred next to the IR's most recent, negatively polarized statement.

(26) (MacNeil/Lehrer 2/3/92:5)

- 1 IR: Are- are you saying that it's within tuh discretion
 2 of the State Depart:ment or tuh president or::
 3 immigration (.) ser:vice .hh to kind'v interpret the
 4 existng law more generously: until tuh situation
 5 is settled there, < if they chose to? =
 6 a- IE: = There's no question about:t it,
 7 IR: { They DOn't have tuh do it
 8 {tuh way they (do th-)}
 9 b- IE: {OF CO U R S E Not::} an- an- an- let's look
 10 at it this way. Uh there was a time you know

A similar revision can be seen in (27), in which, at line 8, a British IE (Labour shadow cabinet minister John Silkin) revises his initial answer, at line 7, in response to the postpositioned addition to the IR's turn at line 6.

(27) (DLP 9/27/81 Silkin:1)

- 1 IR: And here is John Silkin in- to give his first interview
 2 on that .hhh first ballot result .hh which eliminated
 3 him .h from the second ballot. .hhh uhm (.) How well
 4 did you do d'you think?
 5 (.)
 6 IR: Be**tt**er than you expected?
 7 - IE: (Well thi-)
 8 - IE: Better than I expected originally.

The fact that the preference for contiguity normally prevails in news interviews suggests that our initial focus on turn-transition as the criterial basis for coding questioning is not in any way misplaced. Indeed, it captures the way IEs typically parse the ordering of TCUs in IRs' multi-TCU turns.

In consequence, IR interrogatives that do not yield IR-IE turn-transfer and IR-IE turn-transfers that occur after IRs' noninterrogative TCUs will not be counted as instances of IR questioning. In the following case, for example, the IR's interrogative (arrowed a) is immediately followed by a declarative TCU (arrowed b). Here, the IE is an internal critic of the ruling British Conservative party.

(28) (Newsnight/Gilmour:1)

- 1 IE: . . . my own belief is that there- that there will be
 2 changes because I regard the present policies as quite
 3 unsustainable.
 4 a- IR: But won't you have to consider threatening to vote
 5 against the government, =
 6 b- =that's surely what (.) what all the critics now have
 7 to face.
 8 IE: We::ll I don't know, no I- I think the: the we're still
 9 at the (.) stage of the intellectual argument which
 10 I think .hh we're winning, . . .

In cases such as (28), the IR's turn would be not coded as a question.⁹

Distributional Analysis I

In this discussion, we have in effect constructed a protocol for coding interviewer turns at talk in order to determine whether turn-transfer occurs in response to questioning. Our conception of questioning began with a nucleus of strictly grammatical criteria elaborated by Quirk et al. (1985) for the treatment of isolated sentences. Because our data are interactional, we were compelled to consider an additional set of phenomena that, though related to grammar, transform and situate its relevance for interaction. Having done this, what are the results of applying this protocol to our corpus of news interviews?

Table 1 summarizes the quantitative findings. As can be seen, most IR-IE turn transitions occur at places that involve IR questioning, and the vast majority of these rely on core grammatical resources.

The first three categories of Table 1 clearly show that core grammar, as defined by Quirk et al., is a significant resource through which the parties, via turn transition, recognize questioning to have been accomplished. In the U.K. data base, 70.3% of IR-IE transitions occur in response to TCUs that do questioning in these three ways; in the U.S. data base the figure is somewhat lower, 54.3%. When augmented by the pragmatic and turn constructional considerations raised in the immediately preceding discussions, these figures rise substantially. In the U.K. data base, 81.9% of IR turn-final TCUs accomplish questioning through one of the first five practices identified in Table 1. In the U.S.

TABLE 1

Percentage of Turn Constructional Unit Formats Occurring at IR-IE Turn Transitions in the News Interview

	U.K. ^a	U.S. ^b
Syntactic questions ^c	62.9	49.7
Tag questions	3.7	3.4
Declarative ^d questions	3.7	1.2
Q-Substitute	0.0	2.5
B-Event ^e	11.6	8.3
Other ^f	18.1	34.9
	100.0	100.0

^an = 330. ^bn = 324. ^cThe "Syntactic Question" category includes the major classes of questions described by Quirk et al. (1985) as yes/no questions, wh- questions, and alternative questions. ^dMost of the cases in this category consist of sub-sentential (i.e., phrasal or clausal) query-intoned TCUs as included in our pragmatic extensions, p. 10ff. ^eThe "B-Event" category includes both query intoned and nonquery intoned cases. Consequently, the declarative question category is smaller than it might otherwise be. ^fThe "Other" category includes IR statements, receipt tokens, repair acknowledgments, address terms, and the like. We consider the components of this category and their significance in detail later.

data base, by comparison, the figure remains lower: 65.1% of IR turn-final TCUs accomplish questioning. Put another way, turn transfer from IR to IE occurs in response to TCUs that do questioning in these ways in 81.9% and 65.1% of cases, respectively. The role of grammar in organizing the recognizable production of questioning, though far from universal, is certainly prominent. This is so especially for the British data, whereas U.S. interviews appear to be somewhat more anarchic than their British counterparts.

The figures reported in Table 1 do not, of course, capture every instance in which IRs produced an interrogative TCU. In 63 cases, equally divided between the U.K. and the U.S., IRs followed an interrogative TCU with another interrogative (cf. (25) above) or, as in (31), with a postpositioned statement.

(29) (MacNeil/Lehrer 2/3/92:2) ((concerning Haiti))

- 1 I- IR: .hhh How do you know:: that the others who are going
- 2 back, some of whom claim: that they do (fr ih-) face
- 3 persecution aren't right.
- 4 S- For instance this:: thuh U.N. high commissioner
- 5 .hhh spoke today of continuing reports of serious
- 6 human rights abuses en' violence by security forces.

- 7 IE: W'll, there's no question that there are (0.3)
- 8 human rights abuses by: (.) thuh government in
- 9 Haiti: . . .

Here, the IR follows his interrogative (lines 1-3) with a declarative (lines 4-6). The IE does not respond to the interrogative TCU (i.e., turn transfer does not occur after the interrogative at line 3) but rather waits until the IR completes a next TCU before responding. Notably, the IE frames his response in terms of the IR's most recent declarative reference to "human rights abuses." Here we simply note that although not all IR interrogative TCUs generate IR-IE turn transition, in about 90% of cases they do. We are currently investigating IR interrogatives that do not yield turn-transition.

We began by examining the extent to which IRs' "questioning" and IEs' responding are organized through the grammatical and pragmatic aspects of TCU design. It is clear that a very substantial majority of IR turns incorporate grammatical interrogatives and that these "overwhelmingly" (90%) yield turn transition to IE response.

The results reported in Table 1 give us a gross overview of the extent of IR questioning when that is defined in terms of grammatical form. They show that (augmented) grammatical form is certainly a significant feature of turn organization and transfer in news interview interaction. In particular, they strongly support the claim (Greatbatch, 1988; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991) that turn-taking in the news interview is "largely organized" in terms of IRs' production of interrogative TCUs that recognizably do "questioning."

In the remainder of this article, however, we ask whether grammatical form (even when augmented) can capture the range of interactional and institutional relevancies which inflect news interview conduct. In what follows, we examine two orders of organization unaddressed in the previous section: (1) a range of IR activities convergent with questioning that are not done through the grammatical forms described in Table 1, and (2) the extent to which IRs deploy "questioning" through turns as a whole, rather than simply through interrogative TCUs. The first of these considerations unpacks the "Other" category in Table 1 and explores a range of institutionally specific ways in which questioning can be recognizably launched in the news interview context. The second raises much more fundamental issues about what questioning consists of in the news interview and the dimensions and dynamics of IR questioning. We

discuss this latter set of issues in terms of what we will describe as "question delivery structures."

"NONQUESTIONING" FORMS AND THEIR INSTITUTIONAL RELEVANCE

Whereas thus far we have used grammatical aspects of interviewer TCUs to determine whether they constituted questioning, we turn now to a broader consideration of the systemic character of news interview interaction. In doing so, we build on the general conception of questioning already described but now treat it as part of a wider range of conduct concerned with questioning and other facets of turn organization in the news interview. This involves reviewing the contents of the "Other" category in Table 1.

The "Other" category contains a diverse range of interactional objects that are not formulated as interrogatives and, at first sight, do not seem to do questioning. Numbers of them, however, in the ways that they are designed with respect to the institutional constraints on IRs, accomplish activities convergent with questioning. They do so to the point that, as we illustrate, their interactional relevance in the news interview context is inseparable from questioning. We describe certain types of phrasal/clausal and declarative sentential TCUs that, within the institutional relevances of interview conduct, are produced by IRs and oriented to by IEs as *de facto* questioning. Further, we explore the convergence between questioning and related procedures for managing turn transition and turn allocation. Specifically, we review four kinds of IR activity:

- (i) increments (Lerner, 1989; Ford, 1993; Schegloff, in press),
- (ii) third-party attributed statements (Goffman, 1981; Clayman, 1988, 1992; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991),
- (iii) nonattributed statements, and
- (iv) time and speaker management (Greatbatch, 1988; Clayman, 1989, 1991).

Increments

After bringing some TCU to grammatical, intonational, and pragmatic completion (Sacks et al., 1974; Ford & Thompson, in press), an IR may formulate further talk as a continuation of the prior TCU, thus

"re-opening" the unit (Ford, 1993, p. 103). Such utterances are heard as continuations of prior TCUs rather than as TCUs in their own right, in part because they do not "start with a 'beginning'" (Schegloff, in press). Instead, such utterances are built to be grammatically dependent on the prior TCU. Typically, IR increments to their own turns are treated by IEs as additions to, rather than replacements of, prior TCUs. Nonetheless increments can substantially alter the sense or relevance of the question being asked. Because participants treat them as relevant in their interactions, we include them as a coding category. The following instances exemplify IR increments to their own turns that are demonstrably oriented to by IEs.¹⁰ In each case, the IR's possibly completed TCU is arrowed "a" and its appended increment is arrowed "b."

(30) (Nightline 7/22/85:5)

- | | | |
|----|-----|--|
| 1 | IR: | =Arrright you're willing tuh renounce tuh violence, |
| 2 | | you say: tuh violence is a failure of tuh White |
| 3 | | leadership in South Africa if it is going on therefore |
| 4 | a- | is it not also a failure .hhh of tuh leadership of |
| 5 | a- | tuh Blacks. |
| 6 | | (0.5) |
| 7 | IE: | [h h h h h] |
| 8 | b- | IR: [such as your]self |
| 9 | | (0.6) |
| 10 | IE: | I:: hhhh I suppose one:- well one could say that but |
| 11 | | I do not think () that I:: or any other leader h.hh |
| 12 | | should be made to take tuh responsibility for what |
| 13 | | is happening |

(31) (Newsnight/Heseltine:3)

- | | | |
|----|-----|---|
| 1 | IR: | Just finally: Mister Heseltine, do you think that this |
| 2 | | European stand you are taking (0.1) .h will be of |
| 3 | a- | assistance to you: if and when you should stand .hh for |
| 4 | a- | election a:s successor to Missus Thatcher. |
| 5 | IE: | Nuh- this is- |
| 6 | IE: | This is the new: sort of rvariant |
| 7 | b- | IR: Given the fact that Mister Heath |
| 8 | b- | has been booed at the conference. |
| 9 | IE: | this is the ne:w |
| 10 | IE: | This is the ne:w variant of: . . . |

In both cases, the IR's prior TCU has come to possible completion in an interrogative and speaker transition is relevant. Equally, each of the increments in hearable as a continuation of the prior TCU. In case (30), the increment sharpens the force of a prior question by including the IE as one of the "leadership" that has failed. In case (31), the appended clause offers a spin on the previous question while also providing a new focus for the IE's response—a focus that could supplant the previous question's proposition that Mr. Heseltine will in fact stand against Mrs. Thatcher for political leadership. Noticeably, the increment in case (31) is launched after the IE has begun what is projected as a protest against the IR's line of questioning and may be designed to constrain the shape of that response-in-progress (similar to what Jefferson, 1981, identified as "post-response pursuit of response").

Although IR increments to their own turns are neither TCUs nor questions in their own right, in our data they are invariably grammatical continuations to TCUs that do questioning. A valid appraisal of their import, therefore, should be based on the observation that they are evidently intended by IRs and treated by IEs as elements of questioning.

Third-Person Versus Nonattributed Statements

Statements would seem on their face to be clear evidence against the claim that IRs are restricted to questioning in the news interview. Nonetheless, one kind of statement may bear further scrutiny: statements attributed to third parties as a source. The attribution of IR statements to third parties involves a shift in "footing" (Goffman, 1981), which makes it a useful resource for IRs who are institutionally charged with maintaining a "neutralistic" position (Heritage, 1985; Clayman, 1988, 1992; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991). For example, the format can be used to topicalize, but not align with, another IE's stated position, as in case (32). Notably, IE2 preserves the IR's third-party attribution to IE1 in his response (Clayman, 1988).

(32) (MacNeil/Lehrer 7/22/85:7—simplified)

- 1 IE1: . . . they 'ave been totally unsuccessful. (0.4) An' one
 2 has: to take this into acco:unt. (0.3) when on:e (0.2)
 3 speaks about (0.2) thuh present spate of violence in

- 4 South Africa.
 5 (0.4)
 6 — IR: Peace 'as not worked he says Mister Ambassador,
 7 IE2: .hhhh Well he's referring to: uh a- a thuh (
 8 period of time in: uh f:ar distant h pa:st. . . .

Similarly, the IR in case (33) mitigates an interruptively initiated challenge to the IE by formulating his talk as reporting the position of a third-party (the President).

(33) (MacNeil/Lehrer 7/19/93:2) ((On the firing of FBI director William Sessions))

- 1 IE: Well certainly the F.B.I.: has: done some tremendously
 2 wonderful things in thuh last few years. . . .
 3 They sol:ved thuh problem (
 4 ah in New Yor:k. Arrested a whole group of them,
 5 .h an:d the uh another in Los Angeles just a few:
 6 weeks ago. Of skinheads [who were heavily arm ed
 7 HHHh But on the other-
 8 Excuse me but on the other hand thuh President di::d
 9 say that there was a leadership vacuum there::, and
 10 that the agency was (
 11 a deep (
 12 I: I::m: perfectly satisfied with what thuh
 13 President said. I'm- I'm- .hh I hu- I think the worl:d
 14 o' both (
 15 It- it's their decision and I: support them.

This IR turn is clearly fashioned as a counter to the IE's remark: The IR begins the assertion (line 1) with a challenge-projecting "But on the other-". That challenge, however, is referred to as the position of none other than the U.S. President. Thus, the IR's turn gives the IE, in effect, a position to rebut. It is notable that the IE does not treat the IR's mitigated challenge as representing the IR's own personal position (see lines 12ff).

In case (34), by contrast, the IR's statement is not third-party attributed and becomes the object of direct and repeated attack (lines 4 and 7):

(34) (Afternoon Plus:7.3.79)

- 1 IR: .hhhh Lord Longford erm (0.5) we-we we do take a lot
 2 of trouble (0.8) rehabilitating (0.5) criminals. .hhh
 3 er: [and long]
 4 - IE: [Well I d] on't- I don't ()
 5 IR: [long term] scheme for the
 6 criminals.
 7 - IE: No I don't agree with that at all (sir).
 8 IR: [But we don't seem] to- Sorry.

The IR subsequently abandons this line of argument (line 8; cf. Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991, pp. 126-127).

The distinction between statements that are third-party attributed and those that are not is an important one for the news interview context. Responses to nonattributed statements formulate them—as in case (34)—as instances of IR assertion, agreement, criticism, or argument, all of which are inappropriate given the IR's institutional (and, in the U.K., legal) position. Third-party attributed statements, by contrast, are regularly treated by IEs as adhering to the expectation of IR neutrality as well as accomplishing questioning and are treated as ancillary, but legitimately so, to IRs' core questioning practices (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991, pp. 120-121).

Time and Speaker Management

A final major component of the "Other" category in Table 1 consists of IR turns that are concerned with the transfer and allocation of speakership by: (1) informing IEs about program time constraints, (2) selecting next speakers, and (3) enforcing the institutional preallocation of turn order and type. With the exception of (1), these tasks are, for the most part, accomplished in the course of questioning and are managed through details of question design. Under some circumstances, however, IR TCUs and/or turns are dedicated to accomplishing these tasks in their own right. In these circumstances, the management of turn transfer and allocation can be convergent with questioning in its interactional and institutional relevance.

Time Management

Greatbatch (1988) and Clayman (1989) have detailed the ways in which the management of time and, ultimately, of interview closings is the formal responsibility of IRs. In the following two cases, from a U.S. and a U.K. interview, the IRs' turns are exclusively occupied with alerting IEs to time constraints:

(35) (Nightline 6/5/85:7)

- 1 IE: Well it-uh obviously competition is both domestic
 2 (.) and international. But look et thuh record of
 3 General Motors to come back to thuh G M uh-eh-
 4 Hughes uh-merger .hh
 5 - IR: Lemme ca-lemme cau-tion you we're down
 6 - to our last minute so give it quickly please.
 7 IE: [O k a y wha- what]
 8 'as General Motors done. .hh It's abandoned thuh- thuh
 9 small car field. . . .

In case (35), the IE appears to project a long turn and the IR interposes his warning, anticipating both the place where the IE's TCU-in-progress will come to completion (Jefferson, 1983) and where the IE has identified a topic (the GM-Hughes merger) that could be talked about at greater or lesser length. In case (36), by contrast, the IE appears already oriented to time constraints, which the IR's intervention simply upgrades.

(36) (Newsnight/Evans:3)

- 1 IE: . . . and ah (.) I'll go out on a limb and say: I think it's
 2 likely to be increased further .hh by future events
 3 but I would like to make two very quick points. =
 4 - IR: = Very quickly if you would.
 5 IE: There's a generational thing he:re. . . .

We note here, in passing, that this IR orientation to, and responsibility for, time management is a further facet of the institutionality of news interview conduct in general, and of the preallocation of turn types according to the roles of IR and IE in particular.

Speaker Selection

In interviews with more than one IE, IRs dedicate some turns exclusively to allocating speakership.

(37) (DLP: Hattersley 1:4) ((The "Neil" referred to in line 16 is IE1))

- 1 IR: Let me ask you this, ah your decision to abstain in
 2 thuh second ballot .hh has been: described by one of
 3 your parliamentary colleagues who is for Mister Benn
 4 .hh as political cowardice: What's your answer to
 5 that? =
 6 IE1: ((8 lines of response omitted))
- 14 . . . I don't think there's uh any cowardice in it.
 15 Roy Hattersley.
 16 IR: .hhhh Ah I think u- Neil's behaved- I don't want to
 17 damn him by ah saying this but I think he's behaved
 18 with great courage over thuh last week.

Here, the selected IE (IE2) responds with talk to the issue raised by the IR's prior question.

A more elaborate case is (38). The IR formulates a question, having proposed that each IE answer in succession (with the phrase "going around the horn once with you all" [lines 1-2]). The IR's subsequent turns are, with one exception (lines 59-60), limited exclusively to nominating each next speaker.

(38) (Nightline 6/6/85:20 ((abridged))

- 1 IR: Arright folks lemme just go:: around thuh horn once
 2 with you all an I'd like tuh start with you Mister
 3 Hancock () uh-hhh I wanna focus just for a moment
 4 on thuh problem () of radioactive waste. () a soluble
 5 problem, d'you buhlieve?
 6 (0.3)
 7 IE1: .hh It should be soluble. Unfortunately . . .

- 33 - IR: Senator McClure?
 34 (.)
 35 IE2: .hh The program is working, it is on track . . .
- 59 - IR: =Mister Pollard, d'you see any problems with what
 60 you've heard?
 61 (0.2)
 62 IE3: .hhhhh I think thuh biggest problem I've seen is . . .
- 73 - IR: Doctor Yallow?
 74 (0.6)
 75 IE4: I think () that there's two things that concern me . . .
- 92 - IR: Doctor Fabricant.
 93 (0.4)
 94 IE5: tch .hhhhh I think Mister Koppel that () w're
 95 embodying a:ll thuh problems we heard of our
 96 colleagues this evening . . .

Three of the four IR turns subsequent to the initial framing question both nominate a next speaker and invoke the question initially raised in lines 3-5. In the second of these subsequent turns (lines 59-60), the IR both selects a next speaker and adjusts his previous question. Although the data are not fully shown here, in each of the five cases the IE responds with talk that is fitted to the topic in progress. The IR's proposal of a particular course of action - soliciting each IE's response (formulated as going "around the horn once with you all") - overarches the set of sequences that constitute this spate of talk.¹¹ In effect, this activity will not be understood as complete until each IE registers a response.

IEs' contributions to news interview talk. Although these sets of IR turns are obviously not interrogatives, some of them in fact accomplish questioning directly, and those that do not nevertheless accomplish tasks of turn allocation and management that are institutionally assigned to IRs and routinely handled in and through questioning.

IR increments to their own turns (cases [30] and [31]) and use of address terms—whether query intoned (case [38], lines 33 and 73) or not (case [37]; case [38], line 92)—clearly accomplish what questioning accomplishes: They occasion answering. IEs respond to them as occasions on which they have been exclusively and legitimately selected to respond to the topic at hand. The IRs' use of address terms for speaker management assumes an agenda of questioning that is already in play and, in this sense, is parasitic on questioning as the more fundamental institutional order underlying the news interview.

Related issues concerning the embodiment of interview talk arise when IRs dedicate turns at talk to time management. These turns address IE answers-in-progress and aim to expedite or, in the case of interview closings, to terminate that progress (Greatbatch, 1988; Clayman, 1989).

Finally, third-party attributed statements are a noninterrogative IR turn type that is highly akin to questioning. Although they are obviously not syntactically formed questions, they nonetheless are designed and understood as "calling for an answer." Moreover, they do so while respecting a core constraint that questioning otherwise handles: IRs should maintain a neutralistic posture and should, in particular, avoid taking positions that could be directly attributed to themselves or the broadcasting organization. IEs typically treat third-party attributed statements as "calling for an answer" in a completely legitimate fashion (Clayman, 1988, 1992; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991).

Distributional Analysis II

What we have described in this section amounts to institutional extensions to the grammatical/pragmatic core of questioning practices that we coded and represented in Table 1. These institutional extensions augment the features of questioning captured in Table 1 by acknowledging the distinct normative and institutional setting of the broadcast news interview. Coding over these institutional extensions yields Table

Turn-Taking Enforcement

Finally, IRs address some turns to enforce the institutionalized preallocations of turn order and type. In case (39), the IR acknowledges and permits an IE's proposed departure from the constraint that an IR question precede any IE contribution (Greatbatch, 1988; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991).

(39) (Nightline 12/4/89:5)

- 1 IE1: Of- of course, but it doesn't mean that it's their
2 job to go out and uh make thuh newspaper fodder.
3 IR: .hhh Mister MacName-
4 IE2: (May I can) say a word?
5 - IR: Yess;:r,
6 IE2: May I can say a word to this?
7 - IR: Yes sir.
8 IE2: Dear friends. Let me tell you. in all frankness
9 .hh the United Sta:::tes have no control at a:ll
10 .h about thuh developments in eastern part of
11 Germany . . .

And in case (40), the IR sanctions the IEs for multiple departures from that constraint.

(40) (Nightline 6/5/85:7)

- 1 IE1: . . . thank [goodness (.) temporarily =
2 IE2: [Now if you let-]
3 IE2: if you let me say just wa-
4 IE3: [Mister Forbes] [Gentlemen yer-] yer- yer-
5 - IR: yer an absor:bing trio but yer not harmonious. And if-
6 - if- if- if ya don't talk o:ne at a time I'm afraid
7 - we're not gonna hear what any (.) one of you says.]
8 - [Okay Mistuh Kop] pel
9 IE2: if I may: uh- uh- say my uh- piece. . . .
10

Reviewing these last three classes of nonquestioning forms we observe that their institutional relevance is to address, select, and manage

TABLE 2
Percentage of IR Practices Associated With IR-IE Turn Transitions in the News Interview

	U.K. ^a	U.S. ^b
Syntactic questions	62.9	49.7
Tag questions	3.7	3.4
Declarative questions	3.7	1.2
Q-Substitute	0.0	2.5
B-Event	11.6	8.3
Q-Increments	0.6	2.2
3rd-Party attributed	3.4	5.5
Time/Speaker management	3.4	14.5
Nonattributed statements	8.3	6.2
Other ^c	2.4	6.5
	100.0	100.0

^a*n* = 330. ^b*n* = 324. The "Other" category in this table differs from Table 1 in that it now consists solely of actions that occur in almost every kind of talk-in-interaction: collaborative completions (Sacks, 1992, pp. 320ff; Lerner, 1991) and next turn repair initiators and responses to those of IEs (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). The U.S. figure also includes receipt tokens, which were largely confined to a single interview. No receipt tokens occurred in the U.K. data. This discrepancy may be due to a more informal broadcast stance in the U.S. (Heritage, Clayman, & Zimmerman, 1988). Though it could be argued that next turn repair initiators in fact accomplish questioning, we have not so treated them.

2, which details the distribution of IR practices associated with IR-IE turn transition in our news interview data base.

Aggregating the first six categories of Table 2, we find that 82.5% of IR-IE turn transitions in the U.K. and 67.3% in the U.S. occur after a TCU that accomplishes questioning. This increases the support shown in Table 1 for the claim that news interview interaction is organized in and through questioning. Unlike the evidence presented in Table 1, however, Table 2 presents for evaluation other IR practices (third-party attributed and time management) that we have claimed are closely affiliated with questioning. These additional IR practices, which embody an orientation to the normative constraint of IR neutralism, account for a further 6.8% of turn transfer in the U.K. data and a notable 20% of turn transfer in the U.S. data.

Two aspects of the categories in Table 2—the function of third-party attributed statements, and the gross U.K./U.S. discrepancy in time/speaker management—warrant further brief discussion.

IR recourse to third-party attributed statements is relatively rare. However, their occurrence is regularly associated with IR-IE turn transfer. This is so in spite of the equivocal status of third-party

attributed statements in relation to the normative organization of the news interview. As noted earlier, this equivocality is captured in referring to them as "ancillary procedures," (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991) implemented to maintain IR neutralism especially when challenging IEs (Clayman, 1988, 1992). Although they do not pose questions interrogatively, they do call for a response to a neutralistically posed position. Their close similarity to questions in this regard militates against dismissing them as nonquestioning turn types in the institutional context of the news interview.

With regard to the discrepancy between the incidence of time and speaker management turns in the U.K. and U.S. data, we simply note that time management issues arise more frequently in news programs that are interrupted by commercial breaks and/or are interrupted more often by them. A higher proportion of the U.S. data compared with U.K. data comes from broadcasting sources funded through advertising revenue. Similarly, commercial television in the U.S. is more frequently interrupted by advertisements than in the U.K. Consequently, the American IRs in our data base involve themselves more frequently in time management than their U.K. counterparts. Whereas American IRs devote more than 1 in 7 turns to time and speaker management, their British counterparts, by contrast, devote a scant 1 in 30 turns to the same end.

The results of Table 2 might be summarized as an answer to the following question: To what extent do IRs and IEs orient their conduct to the normative constraint that IR-IE turn transfer should properly take place after IRs have addressed a question (or its functional equivalent) to an IE? Table 2 shows that some 85.9% of IR turns in the U.K. and 81.8% of American IR turns are consistent with this constraint. More strongly stated, the *prima facie* distributional evidence *against* the observance of this constraint reduces to the "Nonattributed Statements" and "Other" categories, which account for only 10.7% of the U.K. corpus and 12.7% of the U.S. corpus. The distributional evidence robustly supports the interactional relevance of this institutionally grounded constraint on news interview conduct to an extent that is perhaps only rarely encountered in distributional studies of normative phenomena.¹²

There is an important sense in which the figures presented in Table 2 capture only half of the relevance of the normative constraints on turn transfer in the news interview. That table focuses only on IR TCUs that are associated with turn transfer. However, it does not address nonfinal TCUs in IRs' multi-TCU turns. Nonetheless, these constitute further

affirmative evidence of the parties' orientations to the normative constraints sketched earlier. For example, every time that we have coded a multi-TCU IR turn as having come to transfer in a question (or B-event or statement, etc.) we have captured a course of action that was not the product of the IR's agency alone but rather the contingent, co-constructed product of the IR's and IE's interaction. This can be seen clearly in case (41), where British conservative cabinet minister Patrick Jenkin responds to a question about whether government controls will weaken the autonomy of conservative-held local government agencies. At each of the arrowed points (a-e) in the IR's turn, the IE passes on an opportunity to respond to the IR's turn-so-far. Five of these points are passed: it is at the sixth point (f) that the IR comes to the completion of a recognizable question and it is this that occasions the onset of the IE's response.

(41) (Weekend World:84)

- 1 IR: I tell you what I would like to press you o:n, = and it's
 2 this, = and I think you know that at least the preamble to
 3 this question is tru:e. .hh We'll see what you think of
 4 the question in general.
 5 .hhh Your admission you see (0.8) that there is a trade
 6 off here between the need to reduce this expenditure
 7 (0.2) and formally use democratic rights .hh will upset
 8 a -- some Tories.
 9 .hhh Not all Tories agree: with the government's policy
 10 in trying to reduce expenditure like that.
 11 .hh There might even be some Torie:s .hh who unlike even
 12 me: don't think that public expenditure is an important
 13 issue anyway.
 14 .hh But what they do think is hellish important (0.2)
 15 is local democracy.
 16 (0.2)
 17 and running their own shi:res in their own way.
 18 .hh Aren't you afraid that by what you have said to
 19 me: .h you may have made a rod for your own back and
 20 simply strengthened the arguments of those people
 21 .h especially in the Lo:rd:s .hh who think that local
 22 democracy is much more important than cutting
 23 expenditure. =
 24 IE: =tch Well .hhh e:r anybody who . . .

At each of the arrowed points, the IR reaches a place where turn transition might ordinarily be relevant (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Ford & Thompson, in press). At each of these points, the IE could reasonably produce a "continuer" that overtly passes on an opportunity to talk (Schegloff, 1981) or initiate a fully fledged turn of his own. The IE's withholding of any response across these opportunities constitutes his contribution to the final outcome, which is IR-IE turn transfer at a question. Thus what is ordinarily thought of as an action under the direction of a single agent (in this case, the IR) is in fact the co-construction of *both* participants (in this case, the IR and the IE). IE withholdings such as these, just as much as IR conduct, provide evidence for the normativity of questioning TCUs as an occasion for turn transfer.¹³

FROM TCUs TO TURNS: THE QUESTION DELIVERY STRUCTURE

So far, our analysis of IR questioning has been dominated by a focus on grammatical form and on variations around and from grammatical form. A major consequence of this focus, however, is that we have concentrated more or less exclusively on a single TCU in the IR's turn—the turn-transitional one—as the site at which questioning takes place. Consequently, we have ignored many aspects of the construction of nonfinal TCUs and we have implicitly assumed that "questioning" occurs only at the level of the TCU. In this section, we observe that IRs accomplish the activity of questioning across multiple TCUs in what we call "question delivery structures" (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991, p. 117).

Consider case (42). Here, we note how: (1) the IR transforms a statement (lines 1-5) into questioning through the use of a grammatical question (line 6), and (2) the IE (Margaret Thatcher) displays an orientation to the IR's first TCU and incorporates elements of it into a response that is nevertheless occasioned by and addressed to the IR's second TCU.

(42) (WAO:Thatcher:3)

- 1 IR: As you (.) argue the ca:se (.) passionately: perhaps
 2 even aggressively .hhh there are those ah-n-including
 3 Michael Heseltine perhaps who say that .hhh eh-the

- 4 da:nger given the to:ne .hh is that (.) Britain (.) at
 5 some poi:nt becomes i:solated in Europe.
 6 .hh Is that not a real da:nger?
 7 IE: .hhh Well I've just given you a whole list of thi:ngs
 8 .hhh that under this government we've managed to
 9 achieve in Europe and Michael Heseltine was a member
 10 of my government for a very long time. .hhh I don't eh-
 11 have much regard-and this has been always a
 12 characteristic of me .hh I don't have much regard to
 13 rhetoric.

Central to the IR's questioning here is the indexical "that" of the interrogative TCU (line 6), which refers to the first TCU. Thatcher's subsequent response incorporates at least two elements of the IR's first TCU. First, the IR's reference to Britain becoming "isolated in Europe" (line 5) is countered by a reference to what Thatcher's government has "managed to achieve in Europe" (lines 8-9). Second, the reference to "Heseltine" as a possible critic of Thatcher's stance (line 3) is countered by reference to the claim that Heseltine "was a member of my government for a very long time" (lines 9-10). Clearly then, both parties are alive to the fact that questioning can be accomplished across the entire course of an IR's utterance, even though this is not made manifest until the IR's interrogative TCU at line 6.

Multi-TCU turns consisting of [statement] + [operator + proterm + (negation) + [intensifier] + assessment], such as case (42), constitute a structure for delivering a question.¹⁴ This structure is notable for its simplicity and portability, both of which hinge on the role of proterms in interrogatives of this and related forms. Almost any IR statement-formatted TCU can become reflexively transformed into the core of a questioning action by calling on the IE to respond to the statement-formatted utterance with a reflexive [operator + proterm + assessment] format and its variants, such as tag questions. IEs thus face an omnirelevant contingency that almost any IR statement-formatted TCU can become reflexively transformed into the core of a questioning action through such an IR turn format. In what follows, we briefly sketch four further IR turn formats.

In developing this analysis, we focus on turn organization and in particular on the ordering of TCUs in multiunit turns (Schegloff, in press). We collect the four IR turn formats considered here under the

rubric "question delivery structures." Each of these is somewhat more complex in its deployment of questioning than the [statement] + [operator + proterm + assessment] format considered earlier. Whereas the latter format is specified grammatically, those that follow are specified in activity terms.

[Background + Question]

(43) (WAO:25.1.79)

- 1 IR: .hhh The: price being asked for these letters is three
 2 thousand pounds.
 3 Are you going to be able to raise it,
 4 IE: .hh At the moment it seems not. We've been u- very much
 5 left to our own resources in this (.) instance, .hh we
 6 might manage perhaps a half of it . . .

The IR's first TCU (lines 1-2) establishes important background information (which is likely to be unknown to the news audience) as a context for his second TCU, which presumptively draws on this information as the basis for inquiring about the institution's ability to raise that amount of money. Notice the IE's indexical reference ("half of it," line 6) to the IR's own indexical reference (at line 3) to the sum specified in the IR's initial TCU.

[Relevance + Question]

(44) (Nightline 7/22/85:5)

- 1 IR: .hh Two- two members of your organization (.)
 2 supposedly arrested today:
 3 d'you feel in some danger when you go back
 4 (0.4)
 5 IE: .hh There is always danger: I mean there is n-
 6 absolutely no guarantee: .hh that anyone is safe and
 7 especially now that the South African government has
 8 declared a state of emergency . . .

The IR's first TCU (lines 1-2) establishes the relevance of the subsequent interrogative TCU (line 3) by providing information about a significant, recent event that might occasion fear in the IE. The IE, in acknowledging the danger, orients to the timeliness of the questioning by reference to the recency ("especially now," line 7) of the "state of emergency" (line 8).

[Counter + Question]

(24) (WAO:13.3.79)

- 1 IR: .hhh er What's the difference between your Marxism and
 2 Mister McGarhey's Communism.
 3 IE: er The difference is that it's the press that constantly
 4 call me a Marxist when I do not, (.) and never have
 5 (.) er given that description of myself. [hh I']
 6 IR: [But I've heard you-
 7 - I've heard you'd be very happy to: to: er
 8 .hhh er describe yourself as a Marxist.
 9 - Could it be that with an election in the offing you're
 10 anxious to play down that you're a Marxist. [er /Not at all
 11 IE: Mister Da:y. = And I:'m (.) sorry to say I must disagree
 12 with you, = you have never heard me describe myself
 13 .hhh er as a Marxist. = I have o:nly . . .

Here, the IR's TCU at lines 6-8 counters the IE's self-description. The IR's subsequent interrogative TCU problematizes that self-description by reference to its possibly instrumental motivation. The IE responds to the [counter + question] format with a denial and then explicitly counters the counter on which the IR's question was built.

[Contrast Structure + Question]

(45) (Bush-Rather:1) ((IE = Vice President George Bush))

- 1 a → IR:hh Donald Gregg still erves as your trusted
 2 advisor, he was deeply involved in running arms to

- 3 the contras, 'n 'e didn't inform you.
 4 .hhh Now when President Reagan's (0.3) trusted
 5 advisor: Admiral Poindexter: (0.5) failed to inform
 6 HIM:; (0.7) thuh President (0.4) fired 'im.
 7 (0.5)
 8 Why is Mister Gregg still:; (0.2) inside thuh White
 9 House 'n still a trusted advisor.
 10 IE: Because I have confidence in him, .hh 'n because this
 11 matter Dan:; as you well know:; 'n your editors know:;
 12 has been looked at by .hh the ten million dollar
 13 study by the: (.) Senate 'n thuh House; .hh it's
 14 been looked at by thuh Tower Commission . . .

Here, the IR's first two TCUs (arrowed a and b) establish a contrast between the conduct of President Reagan and the IE's own conduct in two claimedly similar situations.¹⁵ The IR's third TCU (arrowed c) then exploits the contrast as a resource with which to hold Bush to account for his relative inaction. The IE begins with a direct response to the question and then moves to deny the continued relevance of the contrast, which, by his account, has been settled by Senate and House inquiries and the Tower Commission.

Although these examples are very far from exhaustive, they clearly point to the range of forms through which IRs accomplish, and IEs orient to, the construction of questioning across TCUs. In each of these five cases, the IRs' prefatory, noninterrogative TCUs are integral to the questioning that each turn finally achieves. It is clear, then, that questioning in the news interview cannot be confined within the boundaries of single TCUs taken in isolation from the turns and sequences in which they occur.

In each of the five cases, the question delivery structure is not intersected by any IE talk. We have already commented on the extent to which IEs routinely withhold response to IRs' noninterrogative TCUs. We can now observe that the IR multiunit turns considered here as question delivery structures depend on such IE withholdings. The very organization of these turns is grounded in the expectation that IEs will withhold response pending the IR's production of an interrogative TCU.

This is not always the case, however. Indeed, when IEs can project a likely hostile question that some IR prequestion sets up, then the resources and the motivation for IE intervention are mobilized. Case (1)

clearly exemplifies this. Interventions of this kind further underscore the reflexive relationship between the prefatory and interrogative components of IR turns that constitutes them as acts of questioning. Indeed, were the two components not constitutively related, IEs would lack the resources to preempt a question by intersecting its antecedents.

With this discussion of question delivery structures we hope to have underscored further the importance of recognizing that news interview questioning is a complex, multifaceted activity. In particular, in this section we have shown how that activity cannot be understood as confined to single TCUs in isolation from either the turns or the sequences in which they occur. These observations raise anew the initial concern with whether grammar—even in an augmented interactional form—can be adequate to describe a practice that has often been described in just those terms. They also limit the relevance of the coding procedures described because, clearly, IRs deploy questioning in ways the coding scheme has not been designed to capture and that it simply cannot capture. In the discussion that follows, we address these and related points.

DISCUSSION

This article embodies a fairly successful attempt to develop and apply a framework for determining the extent to which IRs engage in questioning in the news interview. In the following discussion, we situate the results of this analysis by addressing three issues: (1) We reflect on the achievements and limitations of the coding task that we have attempted here. Some of our successes and our difficulties arise from the use of grammatical form (the interrogative) as a proxy for an activity (questioning). (2) As a follow-up to these observations, we consider and exemplify the possibility that an interrogative may not do questioning at all. (3) Finally, we point to ways in which the interrogative aspects of IR utterances form a focus for intricate competition between IR and IE. These forms of competition, although they speak to the centrality of grammar in the management of news interview questioning, reach far beyond anything that could be captured in the coding framework we have developed and point to the continuing and massive relevance of single-case analyses in treatments of news interview interaction.

The Coding Project: Strengths and Weaknesses

What has the coding accomplished? As noted earlier, previous treatments of the news interview relied on informal quantification as one type of evidence for the operation of a distinctive set of constraints on news interview turn-taking. The coding exercises reported in this article develop those previous observations by replacing informal descriptions of the distribution of IR and IE conduct with formal, systematic quantification of the extent to which IR questioning organizes turn transfer in the news interview. We are confident that the results reported in this article could readily be replicated using other news interview data.¹⁶

This article also addresses an important distinction in conversation analysis more generally: that between order at the local and aggregate levels (Schegloff, 1993). As Schegloff observed, order at the level of the single case is the primordial basis for concerted talk-in-interaction. Further, it is a prerequisite for any investigation of interactional data, including those that attend at in this article is, of course, based on an framework finally arrived at in this article is, of course, based on an extensive analysis of news interview talk conducted on just such a single, case-by-case basis.

Order at the aggregate level, by contrast, normally concerns a relationship between an interactional practice and some aspect of social structure, such as a social or discourse identity. At this level, we have established a relationship between the institutional identities of IR and IE, and turn transfer between them organized in terms of questioning. Further, we have established a distribution for a set of IR single-TCU questioning practices that has some *prima facie* cross-national validity—at least in anglophone data. The distributional differences that do exist between the U.K. and the U.S. in our data can, as we have noted, be mainly accounted for by differences in the organization of news programming in the two societies. We have also laid the groundwork for more fine-grained comparisons of IR practices. For instance, using this framework, significant differences in particular IR styles might be described. Similarly, the impact of variation in the number of IEs on IR conduct (e.g., IR recourse to statements and continuers) could readily be determined.

Finally, and perhaps most obviously, this article's treatment of IR questioning should be seen as one specification of "the deep ways in

which syntax matters to turn-taking, albeit a syntax conceived in terms of its relevance to turn-taking" (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 721; see also Schegloff, 1979; Lerner, 1991; Ford, 1993; Schegloff, in press). Specifically, we have explored grammatical facets of IR turn design that are strongly associated with turn transfer in the news interview context.

How easy was the coding task? News interviews are institutional in a way that is formal (Drew & Heritage, 1992) and, in a sense, formalistic. Both of these characteristics simplified the coding task to some degree. Whereas many forms of institutional talk are not associated with a formal turn-taking system, IRs and IEs manage their conduct through one that is: The news interview involves a preallocation of turn types according to the institutional roles of IR and IE. This formal institutionality provided a framework with which we coded IR turns at talk. Put simply, it enabled us to determine whether the final TCU of each IR turn recognizably engaged in questioning and/or certain institutionally specific, affiliated activities.

Likewise, the formal character of news interview turn-taking greatly simplified our interpretation of the coding by resolving Schegloff's (1993) "denominator" problem. Because the news interview turn-taking system is formal and normative—IRs *should* engage in questioning in each of their turns—the "environment of possible occurrence" (Schegloff, 1993, p. 104) for IR questions is each IR turn at talk. Thus, in coding, we generally did not have to consider whether some IR utterance constituted a point at which a question should relevantly occur. This solution to the denominator problem also makes the quantitative analysis of the data relatively straightforward: Interactional relevance can be directly converted to statistical relevance. One need only contemplate the difficulties in constructing a parallel set of types for IE answers to grasp the extent to which these issues simplified the coding undertaken here.¹⁷

Finally the formalistic nature of news interview interaction eased the coding task. By "formalistic" we mean that IRs and IEs orient to the grammatical form per se of IR utterances as an accountable matter. Although IRs can perform a wide variety of actions—for example, "instigating," "challenging," "affiliating," and so on—they must do so within the constraint that these actions take the form of questioning. Accordingly, we were able to focus our coding primarily on grammatical aspects of questioning, rather than on the much wider range of actions potentially embedded within IR turns.¹⁸ These simplifications of the

coding tasks stem directly from the normative relationship between grammar and institution that lies at the heart of news interview conduct.

This same relationship raised some immediate problems and paradoxes in the coding task. Preeminent among these was that we were obliged to code "deviant" cases—classically the strongest type of evidence for normative constraint (Schegloff, 1968; Heritage, 1984)—as evidence *against* the working of the turn-taking system. For example, in case (1), the IR's response to the IE—"That wasn't a question it was a statement" (line 9)—would be coded as a first-person statement. Thus coded, it represents a statistical contribution to the evidence against the notion that questioning is central to the organization of the news interview, even though, of course, the IR's utterance invokes the very normative organization that the coding was designed to capture.

Sustained departures from the preallocation of question-answer sequences also raised serious problems for the coding task. For example, passages of IE-IE interaction (often done as "disagreements"; Greatbatch, 1992) do not show in the tables, which therefore do not register what might constitute another, perhaps alternative, locus of news interview organization. Similar problems arise when IRs "argue" with IEs. Recurrent IR-IE overlap can make reliable determination of the beginnings and ends of *turns* at talk impossible. Without the ability to determine where IR turns begin and end, the coding schemes become vulnerable to a version of Schegloff's denominator problem. For these reasons, the coding schemes described here cannot easily handle these more antagonistic spaces of overlapping talk in news interviews.

Questions That Do Not Do Questioning

As we noted at the beginning of this article, many analysts start from the presumption that grammatical form is a primary resource from which questioning can be directly mapping. Indeed, in the analysis leading up to Table 1, we adopted this presumption as our own. However, Schegloff (1984) has offered cogent reasons for skepticism about such a position. He observed that there are sequential contexts in which a syntactically formed question does not do questioning, whereas in others, a statement-formatted utterance can do just that. This raises profound issues about the relationship between syntactic form and social action, because:

Even where an utterance is in the linguistic form of a question, and seems to be doing questioning, the latter will not be adequately accounted for by the former. For if the question form can be used for actions other than questioning and questioning can be accomplished by linguistic forms other than questions, then a relevant problem can be posed not only about how a question does something other than questioning, but about how it does questioning: not only about how questioning is done by non-question forms, but about how it gets accomplished by question forms. (Schegloff, 1984, pp. 34-35)

These observations were made about data from ordinary conversation, but they also apply to talk in more specialized institutional settings such as the news interview. In our own data, we have shown a number of classes of IR utterances that, although not grammatically formed questions, nonetheless accomplish questioning.

There are also cases in our data in which clearly question-formatted TCUs are evidently not accomplishing questioning. The following is a single, but dramatic, case in point. This notorious British interview was conducted by David Frost with a businessman, Emil Savundra, who had sold his auto insurance company — effectively liquidating it — leaving many claims outstanding. Savundra was subsequently tried and convicted for fraud.

The interview took place before his trial and was conducted in front of a studio audience composed of individuals who had claims outstanding against the company. Savundra sat facing the audience, which was highly animated, while Frost addressed him from a standing position, frequently standing over him.

This extract follows a passage in which Savundra has denied “legal responsibility” and “moral responsibility” for his dealings. In what follows, each of the three “questions” that Frost puts to Savundra push the limits of news interview questioning. Indeed, these questions in this sequential context can be heard — and indeed are treated by the IE and the audience — as direct challenges to the IE.

(46) (O:21.4.81) ((Aud = Studio audience))

- 1 — IR: How can you be responsible and head of company when
- 2 all these things happen. .hh And you think by some
- 3 fake deal with Quincey Walker (.) four thousand
- 4 pounds (.) on June twenty-third
- 5 IE: |You have already assume::d| You have already

- 6 IE: assumed |a fake deal:|
- 7 — IR: |How d'you get rid| of moral responsibility.
- 8 Aud: Yeah.
- 9 Aud: You can't
- 10 Aud: You can't
- 11 IE: How- you have already assumed (0.6) you've- one
- 12 thing: the fake deal:
- 13 — IR: Well forget the fake deal. |How| do you sign a bit
- 14 IE: |Right|
- 15 IR: of paper |.hh| that gets rid of past moral
- 16 IE: |Yes|
- 17 — IR: responsibility. = Tell me that.
- 18 IE: By i- =
- 19 IR: = 'Cause we'd all love to know.

Frost's questions concerning “moral responsibility” are hearable as rhetorical and not as in search of an answer. This is particularly apparent in the second formulation of Frost's question (line 7), which overlaps and interdicts the IE's attempt to correct an earlier assertion. Notably the audience affiliates with this question, thereby treating it as an assertion to be agreed with. At the third attempt, beginning at line 13, Frost reformulates his previous question by reference to signing “a bit of paper,” thereby further undermining the credibility of the business transaction that Savundra argues has relieved him of his responsibilities. Frost subsequently pursues a response with a question substitute (line 17, “Tell me that”) and, after the IE's initiation of a response, further pursues with a TCU that aligns himself directly with the audience (line 19, “Cause we'd all love to know.”). This remark, which is articulated in a deeply ironic fashion, directly intimates that the question it refers to is unanswerable.

This interview was widely regarded as a form of trial by television and indeed was cited by Savundra, in his appeal against his subsequent conviction for fraud, as having prejudiced a fair trial. In a summing up that strongly influenced the subsequent outlooks of U.K. news and current affairs producers (Tracey, 1977), the appeals judge — commenting on this interview — concluded that:

The court has no doubt that the television authorities and all those producing and appearing in televised programmes are conscious of their public responsibility and know also of the peril in which they would all stand if any such

interview were ever to be televised in future. Trial by television is not to be tolerated in a civilised society. (Tracey, 1977, p. 108)

Though IR questions can, in fact, not do questioning, they should do so.

Coding, Grammar, and Questioning

In this discussion, we have been concerned with describing some of the achievements and difficulties of trying to capture questioning in the news interview by focusing on (1) the grammatical form of (2) TCUs involving IR-IE turn transition.

First, with regard to grammar, we have argued that a narrowly circumscribed grammatical conception of questioning is insufficient for the task of coding interactional data. Such a focus misses what we have identified as important pragmatic and turn-constructive features of questioning in this institutional environment, and therefore threatens to impoverish any evaluation of news interview interaction, whether quantitative or qualitative.

Second, with regard to the coding schemes' exclusive focus on IRs' final TCUs as the site of questioning, we have argued that questioning can, by contrast, be accomplished as the reflexive product of multiple TCUs. Although the results of the coding, which focus on IR-IE turn transfer, capture the *recognizability* of questioning in the news interview, they fail to capture the complex *dynamics* of questioning as an institutionally specific course of action.

Finally, we have pointed to cases where grammatical questions accomplish activities that are clearly other than questioning. All of these points have led us to construe questioning as an activity that cannot be reduced to grammatical form.

It might appear that we have come, if only incrementally, to a denial of this article's initial focus on the relevance of grammatical form for news interview interaction. Such a conclusion, however, would be premature. Lerner (1991, p. 455) observed that: "because participants to a conversation must analyze every syntactic structure both within its course and within its context, the components of a participants' syntax must be described within these constraints and with the situated interests of the participants in mind." This observation mandates drawing together analyses of sequence organization and turn design. To achieve

this requires that both utterances and sequences be treated for their real-time properties at the level of the turn and of the TCU.

1. Turns must be treated sequentially, recognizing that participants treat each turn as responsive to a prior utterance and conditional for a next utterance. Participants rely on this normative organization of responsiveness and conditionality as grounds for both inference and action.
2. TCUs must be treated for their "in-progress" character, recognizing that participants analyze them over the course of their production. Participants rely on analyzing TCUs-so-far in order to anticipate the actions that they embody and the points at which these actions will be complete, and to design and position their own responses appropriately. Grammar evidently matters for the latter consideration. Moreover, because TCUs and their multiples comprise the turns at talk that accomplish actions, grammar also matters in the construction of sequences.

In the following illustrative example, each party analyzes the other's turn-so-far (1) for the grammatical form of each successive component, (2) for its turn-constructive units, and (3) for the actions that these units house. All of this analytic work is done under the assumption, particular to the news interview, that the IR's turn should properly come to a "question" that the IE should respond to. In what follows, the grammatical and sequential aspects of talk intertwine as resources for the construction of the moment as part of a news interview.

In case (47), an IR invokes ex-Conservative Prime Minister Edward Heath's views to elicit an IE's response. In this interview, the IR has repeatedly attempted to align the IE, British Conservative politician Michael Heseltine, with Heath and in opposition to the party's current leadership. Heseltine has resisted the IR's efforts by repeatedly objecting to the introduction of "personalities" into political analysis.

(47) (Newsnight Heseltine:2)

- | | | |
|---|-----|---|
| 1 | IR: | Do you- do you agree with Mister Heath I'm |
| 2 | | not trying to introduce personalities but |
| 3 | IE: | eh heh heh .hhh But = |
| 4 | | =you're you're exactly what you're doing. |
| 5 | IR: | but I'm asking No. |
| 6 | | I'm asking you about a h an ar-gument he |

- 7 put forward which was that .hhh on the (.) by
 8 th- on the preparation of the manifesto, =
 9 IE: I have-
 10 IE: =The point of producing a book.
 11 IR: (no one's been consulted properly =.
 12 IE: =W' th't- (.) that's I mean that's ridiculous . . .

In the course of his repeatedly intersected turn, the IR can be seen to design and re-design his TCU-so-far (started at line 1) a number of times.

1. To anticipate a potential objection to the reference to Mr. Heath, the IR sets aside his initial course of action (asking the question that begins "Do you- do you agree" [line 1]) to take up a second, aimed at preempting an objection that the question-so-far "introduces personalities" (line 2).
2. The IR's preemption, potentially accomplished with "I'm *not* trying to introduce personalities" is extended when the IE anticipates (line 3) and directly counters (line 4) the IR's efforts.
3. That the IR orients to the IE's counter (lines 3-4) in recasting the TCU-so-far can be seen in the IR's abandoning "I'm asking" to respond directly to the IE with "No." at line 5, prior to re-starting the abandoned "I'm asking."
4. The re-started counter at line 6 has a double potential: The utterance "I'm asking you" can be treated as both a defensive statement and as on-the-way-to a question in its own right. Subsequently, the double potential of the TCU is realized. Not only does it defend against the IE's charge by offering an alternative characterization of the IR's own action, it also serves to retrieve the gist if not the form of the question initiated at line 1. Crucially, in specifying the statement of Mr. Heath's as referring to a matter that the IR had intended to ask about, the *which* clause (begun in line 7) reintroduces it as an issue for the IE to address. Notably the IE abandons his previous resistance (lines 3-4, 9, and 10) to the production of the IR's turn by responding directly to it, at line 12.

A number of conclusions can be drawn from these observations. Grammar is evidently pivotal to these transformations. First, grammar provides for their very recognizability. That the IR has abandoned one

course of action temporarily in favor of another is available in part because of the grammatical discontinuity between "do you- do you agree with Mister Heath" and "I'm *not* trying . . ." Likewise, grammatical aspects of talk-in-interaction also motivate these transformations. For instance, in the TCU starting at line 6 the IR must realize the beginnings of a "question" before coming to a transition relevance place, or else the IE (and the overhearing audience) will hear the turn as simply defensive. That realization is accomplished through the deployment of the final *which* clause (lines 7-8, 11).

Participants analyze the grammatical aspects of utterances as they occur in real time. For example, Heseltine's intersection and oppositional completion of the IR's turn (line 3-4) is made possible by the "not X, but Y" format projected by the IR's turn-so-far (Atkinson, 1984a, 1984b; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986; Lerner, 1991). Heseltine's ability to provide a possible, but subversive, completion evidences the import of grammar for participants' real-time analyses of turns in progress. Likewise, the IR's "No" (line 5) displays an exact monitoring of the IE's TCU-so-far for what it will take to be complete. Specifically, the IR starts his turn at the first sound of the IE's "doing," which is unambiguously projectable as a possible completion point.

In this case, by attacking the early part of the IR's turn, the IE has significantly disrupted both the sequential organization of the news interview — as a sequence of IR questions and IE answers — and the very legitimacy of the IR's conduct. Thus the IR designs his turn at talk (1) to defend himself against that challenge and, at the same time, (2) to re-establish the interview's orderliness by returning to a question-answer sequence. In this sequential and institutional context the transformations described acquire their particular significance as interactional features of the IR's and IE's courses of action. The analyses of case (47) and cases like it (e.g., case [23]) capture, we believe, much of what is interactional, and institutional, in news interview questioning.

CONCLUSION

This article has addressed an issue that remains controversial within the field of CA: the utility and relevance of coding and quantification as

an approach to analyzing interactional data. From its inception, CA has been an approach centered on the detailed explication of single cases of interaction and on collections of these. The fundamental organization of human interaction in which CA is primarily interested has not, so far, warranted the use of quantitative methods and, in fact, has posed significant problems in their implementation (Schegloff, 1993). Moreover, few if any contemporary research questions that originate within CA require specifically quantitative solutions. Conversation analysis can and will continue to advance without recourse to quantitative analysis.¹⁹

However, if investigators apply CA to issues in sociology, psychology, or communication or to problems in medicine, education, law, and so forth, then some kind of quantitative assessment of interactional phenomena will become central. Put simply, any effort to associate an interactional practice with some social category or outcome will require quantitative evidence. In this article, we have considered such a problem: to assess the nature and extent of questioning in news interviews in two anglophone societies. This exercise mandated quantitative analyses, based on coding turns at talk.

Starting with grammar as a *prima facie* basis for coding, we attempted to capture the range of IR practices that accomplish questioning. A strictly grammatical coding framework proved inadequate given (1) the interactional nature of our data and (2) the institutional context of news interview interactions. Thus we augmented the grammatical core of our coding framework with classes of IR actions that accomplished questioning through additional pragmatic, turn-constructural, and institutional features. The result of coding news interview interaction using this procedure is the demonstration of a significant convergence between a normative organization for action and the array of conduct in the empirical world prescribed by that organization. As reported, IRs massively restrict themselves to turns that take a questioning form and these issue in IR-IE turn transfer to a degree that is, as Heritage and Greatbatch (1991) argued, "overwhelming."

For these purposes, the development and application of a framework for coding IR turns at talk was an important analytic tool. As we have seen, however, it is far from perfect. Indeed, it is quite a blunt instrument. Not only are there cases where questioning is being done

that are not captured by the framework, but there are also cases—like the Savundra example (case 46)—where interrogatives do not accomplish questioning in the first place. Although these kinds of cases might lead one to conclude that coding interactional data is a fruitless enterprise, we do not believe this conclusion is warranted. The products of coding offer a macroscopic snapshot of "order in the aggregate." They are not designed to, and cannot, compete with the sensitivity and specificity of single-case analyses of which they are properly aggregates (Schegloff, 1993). Rather, they are approximate, but informative, complements to such analyses.

Having begun with the problem of questioning in relation to turn-taking considerations, our interest was drawn to the phenomena of questioning in a more expanded sense. Our initial codings focused, for principled reasons, on the final TCU of each IR utterance. However, we subsequently began to examine some simple ways that IRs can deliver questioning across several TCUs in their multi-TCU turns. These question delivery structures, as we have called them, embody a variety of broadly projectable courses of conduct. In them, the final interrogative unit of such multi-TCU IR turns mobilizes the various resources established in the prior units to realize a particular questioning effect.

Throughout, grammar has played a central role in our analyses. However, its significance has not been as a template from which the activity of questioning can be read off. Rather, we have sought to treat it as, in the first place, a resource through which interactants construct, recognize, and respond to courses of conduct as not only intelligible, but also more or less legitimate in the broadcast interview setting.

NOTES

- 1 Schudson (1994) gave a nuanced account of the emergence of the news interview as a medium of journalistic practice.
- 2 The interview from which (1) is an extract was extensively discussed in contributions to *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, Volume 22, 1988/89.
- 3 The obvious exceptions include lexical turn constructional units, such as response cries, and acknowledgment tokens, and so forth.

4 The data base for the quantitative aspects of this article consists of some 12 U.S. news interviews and 36 U.K. interviews collected over a decade or so. The U.K. data derive from both radio and TV broadcasts, including: from radio, the *Today* program, *The World at One* and others; and, from television, *Newsnight*, *Weekend World*, and *Channel Four News*. The U.S. data are exclusively from TV sources, predominantly: ABC television's *Nightline* and PBS' *MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour*. These interviews embody a little over 600 IR turns at talk, equally divided between the U.S. and U.K. The U.K. interviews are generally shorter than those from the U.S.; they are drawn from a wider range of programs, and they are less interrupted by commercial breaks than their U.S. counterparts. Particular examples in the text of this article are drawn from a substantially larger corpus of data from both countries.

5 A warning: Our usage of the term "interrogative" here may be at variance with the usage current among a significant number of linguists. In that usage, the term is reserved for a more restricted set of sentence types including: yes/no, alternative, and WH-questions, and may not include, for example, declarative questions (see, e.g., Levinson, 1983).

6 As a practical coding decision, we have subordinated declarative questions to B-event statements: IR turns that take the form of query-intoned B-event statements are coded as B-event statements, not declarative questions, though they could fall into the latter category also.

7 Note that, in the determination of B-events, investigators must decide whether the topic of the IR's question is fundamentally or properly known to the IE in the latter's capacity as an experiencing subject, expert, or spokesperson. For example, in the following case, the IR's turn is addressed to the IE's expertise.

(MacNeil/Lehrer 7/22/85:1) ((IE is the South African ambassador))

IE: tch .hhhhh It is perhaps too soon:: to make make a judgment on that. .hh It is uh: uh- an extrordn'y measure, () thet 'as been taken () but it uh: has been taken to deal with an extrordn'y: s- circumstance and condition .hh so: I feel: that one has to allow some time:e for it
 -- IR: tch .hhhhh Thuh judgment being that there was no other course of action,
 (0.2)
 IE: tch .hhhhh Well () it's a question of how you: uh deal with uh- () a situation of vi:lence eh that uh- is not respecting:: ordn'y:: uh citizens lives.

By contrast, the following instance *cannot* be treated as a B-event, because the rules for victory on a cloture vote are a matter of public record, rather than private expertise.

(MacNeil/Lehrer 7/23/85:5)

IE: Yes 'ere gonna be one more trial duhmorrow: and uh .hh ya know it may be: () uh::: that the: high water mark for: () for this: uh vote for thuh cloture .hh will possibly be fifty-eight er fifty-nine votes. .hh
 But uh::=
 -- IR: =That means you lose ()
 IE: Well () no. Rea lly: what 'as happened is the: uh thuh people of our country 'ave lost.

In this case, the IR formulates something well-known to both himself and the IE partly to inform the television audience who may not know the rules for a cloture vote. In analyzing utterances of this type, we need to take into account: (1) the knowledge states and relative rights to knowledge of IRs and IEs, (2) IRs' and IEs' orientation to the knowledge state of the overbearing audience, and (3) the orientations toward these knowledge states that IRs and IEs display to one another in the design of their turns at talk. This last dimension — which emphasizes the interactional aspects of constituting a statement as a B-event statement — will repay extensive further analysis.

8 Atkinson and Drew (1979) observed that an accusation makes a denial a relevant and preferred next. With regard to case (23), we similarly note that, following the IR's third-party attributed criticism, the IR's subsequent question will normally be designed to anticipate a rejecting or denying response. Such an anticipation is realized in this case through the preference organization of the IR's question "Do you reject all that?"

9 Although in an overwhelming majority of cases where a distinction among component TCUs can be made, IEs direct their responses to the IR's last TCU, in cases such as this — where an IR follows a question with a statement — it may be impossible to parse specifically which of the prior TCUs the IE addresses in the construction of the response. Further, in these cases, this equivocality is not treated as a difficulty by IRs or IEs.

10 IRs can also construct TCUs as increments to IE turns, see case (22). A substantial number of the IR B-event formulations take the form of IR increments to IE turns. Roth (1994) has recently investigated IR increments to IE turns.

- 11 Heritage and Sorjonen (1994) distinguished between the concepts of "sequence" and "activity," arguing that a single sequence — such as an adjacency pair — can embrace a variety of activities and that, conversely, a number of sequences can be encompassed in a single activity.
- 12 Parsons (1937, pp. 91–92) asserted the distinction between, and potential convergence of, the normative and factual orders: "the normative elements [of order] are essential to the maintenance of the *particular* factual order which exists when processes are to a degree in conformity with them" (p. 92, emphasis in the original). Nearly 60 years later, studies of the nature and extent of that convergence remain rare. Although the lack of comparison studies require that we make this particular claim about the news interview with some caution, our findings regarding the fit between the normative organization of news interviews and the actual conduct of IRs and IEs coincide to a degree that might have surprised even Parsons himself.
- 13 In a context where a majority of IR turns consist of multiple TCUs and an overwhelming majority of those include statement-formatted TCUs, the low incidence of turn transfer associated with statement-formatted TCUs is significant. At a rough quantitative estimate, considerably less than 10% of statement-formatted IR TCUs engender any kind of response from IEs. We reserve analysis of these withholdings for another occasion.
- 14 Elements within the curly brackets are optional to the format, though case (42) contains all of them. This format is closely related to [statement] + [tag].
- 15 Contrast structures of this type are discussed by, *inter alia*, Smith (1978), Watson (1978), Atkinson (1984a, 1984b), Heritage and Greatbatch (1986), and Clayman (1988).
- 16 It is important to note that intercoder reliability for our data base varied substantially among different coding categories. For example, our coding of B-events was less reliable than our coding of syntactic questions, in which we were nearly unanimous.
- 17 Work by Harris (1991) and Bull (1994) points to serious and abiding difficulties in operationalizing such apparently simple matters as whether an IE's response 'answers' an IR's question or not. These difficulties have led others, such as Greatbatch (1986a, 1986b) and Clayman (1993), to focus on 'non-answers' as actions whose status is negotiated by the participants rather than determined by coders' fiat.
- 18 These characteristics of IR questions mitigated other problems associated with coding interactional data. A persistent risk associated with coding turns at talk is that conduct becomes "decontextualized" (Zimmerman, 1993), social action is rendered as atomistic behavior, and collaborative achievements become construed as the monolithic products of individual intentions. For these reasons, Linell and Markova characterized the coding of interactional data as inherently "monological" (Linell & Markova, 1993; Markova & Linell, 1993).

The fact that we have coded "first" actions that are properly produced as questions in the formalistic sense described somewhat mitigates these problems in this case, especially when the IE contribution to the interactional realization of IR questions is explicitly recognized.

- 19 There are some issues within CA where some kind of quantification may be desirable. See Heritage (in press) for a discussion of some areas where quantitative analysis can be valuable.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, J. M. (1984a). *Our masters' voices: The language and body language of politics*. London: Methuen.
- Atkinson, J. M. (1984b). Public speaking and audience responses: Some techniques for inviting applause. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 370–409), Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Atkinson, J. M., & Drew, P. (1979). *Order in court: The organisation of verbal interaction in judicial settings*. London: Macmillan.
- Bull, P. (1994). On identifying questions, replies and non-replies in political interviews. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 13, 115–131.
- Clayman, S. (1988). Displaying neutrality in television news interviews. *Social Problems*, 35, 474–492.
- Clayman, S. (1989). The production of punctuality: Social interaction, temporal organization and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95, 659–691.
- Clayman, S. (1991). News interview openings: Aspects of sequential organization. In P. Scannell (Ed.), *Broadcast talk: A reader* (pp. 48–75). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Clayman, S. (1992). Footing in the achievement of neutrality: The case of news interview discourse. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work* (pp. 163–198). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Clayman, S. (1993). Reformulating the question: A device for answering/not answering questions in news interviews and press conferences. *Text*, 13, 159–188.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work* (pp. 3–65). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, C. E. (1993). *Grammar in interaction: Adverbial clauses in American English conversations*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, C. E., & Thompson, S. A. (in press). Interactional units in conversation:

- Syntactic, intonational and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1981). Footing. In E. Goffman (Ed.), *Forms of talk* (pp. 124-159). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Greatbatch, D. L. (1986a). Aspects of topical organisation in news interviews: the use of agenda shifting procedures by interviewees. *Media, Culture and Society*, 8, 441-455.
- Greatbatch, D. L. (1986b). Some standard uses of supplementary questions in news interviews. In J. Wilson & B. Crow (Eds.), *Belfast working papers in language and linguistics* (Vol. 8, pp. 86-123). Jordanstown, Northern Ireland: University of Ulster.
- Greatbatch, D. L. (1988). A turn-taking system for British news interviews. *Language in Society*, 17, 401-430.
- Greatbatch, D. L. (1992). The management of disagreement between news interviewees. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work* (pp. 268-301). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, S. (1991). Evasive action: How politicians respond to questions in political interviews. In P. Scannell (Ed.), *Broadcast talk* (pp. 76-99). London: Sage.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, England: Polity.
- Heritage, J. (1985). Analyzing news interviews: Aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience. In T. A. Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (Vol. 3, pp. 95-119). New York: Academic.
- Heritage, J. (in press). Conversation analysis: Methodological aspects. In U. M. Quasthoff (Ed.), *Aspects of oral communication*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Heritage, J., Clayman, S., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1988). Discourse and message analysis: The micro-structure of mass media messages. In R. P. Hawkins, J. M. Wiemann, & S. Pingree (Eds.), *Advancing communication science: Merging mass and interpersonal processes* (pp. 77-109). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Heritage, J., & Greatbatch, D. L. (1986). Generating applause: A study of rhetoric and response at party political conferences. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92, 110-157.
- Heritage, J., & Greatbatch, D. L. (1991). On the institutional character of institutional talk: The case of news interviews. In D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure* (pp. 93-137). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Heritage, J., & Sorjonen, M.-L. (1994). Constituting and maintaining activities across sequences: And-prefacing as a feature of question design. *Language in Society*, 23, 1-29.
- Jefferson, G. (1981). *The abominable "ne"?: A working paper exploring the phenomenon of post-response pursuit of response* (Occasional Paper No. 6). Manchester, England: University of Manchester, Department of Sociology.
- Jefferson, G. (1983). Notes on some orderliness of overlap onset. In V. D'Urso & P. Leonardi (Eds.), *Discourse analysis and natural rhetoric* (pp. 11-38). Padua, Italy: Cleup Editore.
- Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation*. New York: Academic.
- Lerner, G. (1989). Notes on overlap management in conversation: The case of delayed completion. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 53, 167-177.
- Lerner, G. H. (1991). On the syntax of sentences in progress. *Language in Society*, 20, 441-458.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Linell, P., & Markova, I. (1993). Acts in discourse: From monological speech acts to dialogical inter-acts. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 23, 173-195.
- Markova, I., & Linell, P. (1993). *Coding dialogue: Individual behaviours versus social interactions*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Parsons, T. (1937). *The structure of social action*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pomerantz, A. M. (1980). Telling my side: "Limited access" as a "fishing" device. *Sociological Inquiry*, 50, 186-198.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. New York: Longman.
- Roth, A. L. (1994, February). *Questions as increments to answers in the news interview*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, San Jose, CA.
- Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 54-69). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters. (Original work published 1973)
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation: Vol. 1. Fall 1964-Spring 1968*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*, 70, 1075-1095.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair for syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givón (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics 12: Discourse and syntax* (pp. 261-288). New York: Academic.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1981). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse* (Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics 1981, pp. 71-93). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1984). On some questions and ambiguities in conversation. In J.

- M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 28-52). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1988/89). From interview to confrontation: Observations on the Bush/Rather encounter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 22, 215-240.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1993). Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26, 99-128.
- Schegloff, E. A. (in press). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361-382.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8, 289-327.
- Schudson, M. (1994). Question authority: A history of the news interview in American journalism, 1860s-1930s. *Media, Culture and Society*, 16, 555-587.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5, 1-23.
- Smith, D. (1978). K is mentally ill: The anatomy of a factual account. *Sociology*, 12, 23-53.
- Tracey, M. (1977). *The production of political television*. London: Routledge.
- Watson, D. R. (1978). Categorization, authorization and blame negotiation in conversation. *Sociology*, 12, 105-113.
- Zimmerman, D. H. (1993). Acknowledgment tokens and speakership incipency revisited. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26, 179-194.

The Distribution of Person-Referring Expressions in Natural Conversation

Andrew J. Wilson and David Zeitlyn
Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology
University of Oxford

This article outlines a methodology that integrates past approaches to the subject of address and reference, which will allow for the systematic and quantitative analysis of which person-referring expressions are preferred by whom, and when they are used. Our purpose is to make a case for examining personal reference as it occurs in natural conversation and to outline a way to make this possible. We present our methodology and highlight certain practical problems that arise, along with suggested responses. This includes a discussion of the coding scheme that has been developed and applied to a corpus of natural conversation. The desired result of this article is to give a clear account of the aims and constraints of our project. We discuss the differences

This article has been prepared as part of an Economic and Social Research Council (U.K.)-funded project "Kinship and Language: A Computer-Aided Study of Social Deixis in Conversation" (Grant No. R000233311). David Zeitlyn is a British Academy Research Fellow at the Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology, Oxford, and a Research Fellow at Wolfson College, Oxford. We are very grateful for all the help received from these different sources.

Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to David Zeitlyn, Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Oxford, 51 Banbury Road, Oxford, OX2 6PE, U.K.