Within Language, Beyond Theories (Volume III)

Within Language, Beyond Theories (Volume III)

Discourse Analysis, Pragmatics and Corpus-based Studies

Edited by

Wojciech Malec
and Marietta Rusinek

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Within Language, Beyond Theories (Volume III):
Discourse Analysis, Pragmatics and Corpus-based Studies

Edited by Wojciech Malec and Marietta Rusinek

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

The monograph *Within Language, Beyond Theories* presents a collection of insightful studies pertaining to some of the most perplexing problems in the areas of theoretical and applied linguistics. Contributors offer analyses surpassing the limits of contemporary frameworks in search of more explanatorily adequate solutions to linguistic dilemmas and accounts of new evidence drawn from a number of the world's languages. They delve into the as yet unexplored areas of linguistic reality, aiming to gain insights into the structure of the system and establish laws governing its inner organization. Importantly, linguists of different persuasions share the belief that our enhanced understanding of a language's grammar and its constituent modules will foster new advances in the novel application of the models proposed. Assisted by original and stimulating ideas, researchers will be able to make invaluable contributions to the development of their fields.

Volume Three, entitled *Discourse Analysis, Pragmatics and Corpus-Based Studies* comprises fourteen chapters organized into three parts. The papers cover a range of problems currently discussed in the domains of discourse analysis, pragmatics and corpus research. Part I, Discourse Analysis, consists of four chapters which investigate the intricacies of different discourse types, such as talk show discourse, multimodal discourse, everyday spoken discourse as well as written academic discourse. Part II, Pragmatics, addresses both theoretical and empirical issues in pragmatics, such as the status of ad-hoc concepts, linguistically encoded meaning, explicit content and the lexicographic treatment of modality. Part III, Corpus-Based Studies, comprises eight chapters which offer a corpus-based approach to the temporal meanings of selected prepositions and their semantic functions, the diffusion of gerundive complements, the institutionalization and de-institutionalization of neologisms, contextual factors in the placement of the adverb *well*, the behaviour of the verb *bake* in copular constructions, the syntactic flexibility of English idioms and their thematic composition, tendencies in the formation of nouns in tabloids and the application of cluster analysis to the categorization of linguistic data.

Part I: Discourse Analysis

Chapter One examines politicians' verbal intercourse in talk shows from a discourse analytical point of view. Due to such features as attempts at domination, aggression, simultaneous talk or cross talk, the interactional behaviour of politicians in talk shows gives the impression of destructive talk. However, it is observed that political talk shows, following ethnomethodological principles, reveal a high degree of social order and a problem-solving approach.

Chapter Two offers a comprehensive synopsis of an array of linguistic approaches to the study of multimodal texts. Having discussed a number of semiotic, pragmatic and syntactic approaches to the multimodal means of communication, the author reaches the conclusion that although multimodality can facilitate the process of communication, it may also be a source of confusion.

Chapter Three is a quantitative and qualitative corpus study of four Polish discourse markers, namely *znaczy, jakby, nie wiem* and *tak(?)*. The aim of the study is to determine their pragmatic functions, their role in the organization of discourse and their position within an utterance. A wide variety of functions has been determined, ranging from the function of clarification and approximation to those of a politeness marker, a filler, and a softener. Thus, the results obtained in this study point to the multifunctional nature of the discourse markers under investigation.

Chapter Four explores the use of reformulation and exemplification markers in the academic written discourse of non-native students of English Philology. The findings of the study reveal a relatively low number of code glosses, which calls for raising students' awareness of the use thereof in their academic discourse.

Part II: Pragmatics

Chapter Five critically discusses doubts and reservations connected with the theoretical grounding of three phenomena in relevance theory: ad-hoc concepts, linguistically encoded meaning, as well as explicit content. First, the chapter reviews the definition of an ad-hoc concept and establishes its mental and theoretical status. Next, it presents a relevance-theoretic interpretation of the stability of linguistically encoded meaning. Finally, the notion of the intersubjectivity of explicit content comes under close scrutiny.

Chapter Six examines the treatment of *surely* and *for sure* in selected monolingual and bilingual dictionaries from a pragmatic perspective with

a view to suggesting how dictionary entries of these two modal particles could be improved. Several problems with the lexicographic treatment of *surely* and *for sure* are pinpointed, for instance the fact that little attention has been given to their pragmatic function or interactive character. It is concluded that definitions of *surely* and *for sure* can be made more informative and useful if recent research findings concerning modality are taken into account in the formulation of these dictionary entries.

Part III: Corpus-Based Studies

Chapter Seven lends insights into how the temporal meanings of three Polish prepositions, *przed*, *po* and *za*, are distributed in relation to their semantic functions. The following anterior and posterior functions have been determined and investigated: distance, distance-past, distance-future, distance-retrospective and distance-prospective functions.

Chapter Eight provides the reader with a corpus analysis of gerundive complements in American English. The main objective of this study is to identify departures from the typical complementation patterns which are indicative of linguistic change. The study has been conducted within the theoretical framework of pattern grammar (Hunston and Francis 1996).

Chapter Nine is concerned with the notion of the institutionalization and de-institutionalization of late 1990s neologisms. The aim of this study is to determine the extent to which the lexical items that appeared at the turn of the 21st century have undergone the process of assimilation and lexicalisation. One of the conclusions drawn on the basis of the study is that research into institutionalization and de-institutionalization should be performed from an onomasiological perspective.

Chapter Ten focuses on an array of semantic and pragmatic factors influencing the placement of preverbal and postverbal *well*. It reports on a corpus study whose results reveal that the placement of *well* is not entirely random. What is more, its occurrence is in no way restricted to the VP-final position.

Chapter Eleven undertakes an empirical investigation of the behavior of the verb *bake* in copular constructions with an SVC pattern in the progressive aspect. The findings of the study, conducted in the light of the Langackerian (2000) process of attenuation, demonstrate that although the verb *bake* can be regarded by its very nature as belonging to the category of the verbs of creation, it primarily entails a benefactive factor.

Chapter Twelve aims at determining the syntactic flexibility of idioms by offering a corpus study of nine verbal idiomatic expressions. The results of the analysis suggest that idioms are indeed characterized by

syntactic flexibility, although to varying degrees. Moreover, idioms could best be arranged on a gradual continuum since they differ in the level of their syntactic mobility.

Chapter Thirteen presents a corpus study of nominal suffixes in English and Polish tabloids with the aim of establishing what the tendencies are in the formation of nouns in the popular press. The results of the research have confirmed the initial hypothesis about a substantial number of agentive and instrumental suffixes.

Chapter Fourteen is preoccupied with a description of the method of linguistic cluster analysis as well as with a demonstration of its effectiveness in determining important regularities and preferences in language usage. The findings from the linguistic cluster analysis concerning the usage patterns of adverbs in written Estonian conducted in this chapter have shown a tendency to avoid adverbs among Estonian language learners. It is believed that determining certain patterns in language usage through a linguistic cluster analysis may provide a useful source of evidence in language processing and foreign language instruction.

We would like to express our deepest gratitude to all the authors for their contributions, which shaped the content of this volume into its present form. We would also like to thank Elżbieta Sielanko-Byford and Nigel Byford for proofreading the volume.

Wojciech Malec and Marietta Rusinek

CONTRIBUTORS

Yvonne Belczyk-Kohl
Westfälische Wilhelms-Universitat Münster, Germany
kohly@uni-muenster.de

Daria Bębeniec
Maria-Curie Skłodowska University, Lublin, Poland
daria@hektor.umcs.lublin.pl

Oskar Gawlik
Jan Kochanowski University, Kielce, Poland
oskargawlik@vp.pl

Dominik Gryniuk
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
domigry@gmail.com

Wojciech Guz
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
wguz@o2.pl

Małgorzata Kaszak
Gdańsk University, Poland
malgoskakaszak@gmail.com

Larysa Makaruk
Lesya Ukrainka Eastern European National University, Lutsk, Ukraine
laryssa_makaruk@ukr.net

Ewa Mioduszewska
University of Warsaw, Poland
e.mioduszewska@uw.edu.pl

Joanna Pakuła-Borowiec
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
jotpebe@op.pl

Agata Rozumko
University of Białystok, Poland
a.rozumko@uwb.edu.pl

Daniela Schröder
University of Hamburg, Germany
daniela.schroeder@uni-hamburg.de

Sylwia Szewc-Koryszko
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
szewcsylwia@poczta.onet.pl

Jekaterina Trainis
Tallinn University, Estonia
pliit1@tlu.ee

Dorota Zielińska
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
yesil.dot@gmail.com

PART I

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

TALK OR SHOW?
ON 'ARGUING' AS ETHNOMETHOD IN POLISH POLITICAL TALK SHOWS: A DISCOURSE ANALYTICAL APPROACH[1]

YVONNE BELCZYK-KOHL

1. Introduction

A common argument against political talk shows in Poland is that politicians interact in a way that would be unacceptable in everyday conversation. Their manner of holding a discussion seems to be characterized by conversational disorder, mutual attempts at domination, aggression and belligerence. As a result, viewers tend to take the behaviour of politicians in talk shows to be a sign of self-aggrandizement rather than serving the aims of a theme-focused discussion. Conversation linguistics seems to confirm this interpretation, insofar as it reveals clear markers of what is commonly named destructive talk, such as interruptions, longer sequences of simultaneous speech or confrontational interaction, which can be part of face-threatening acts in the sense of Goffman (e.g. 1959; 1967).

On the other hand, to perceive these elements as markers of destructive talk would pre-suppose the existence of a discussion norm that knows only (verbal) winners or losers, that is, the existence of a competitive discussion. It would then be necessary for politicians to adapt to that norm and to put themselves in the position of the winner, while putting the other

---

[1] As terminology differs depending upon the academic field and national context, we would like to point out that we use the term 'discourse analysis' to refer to the linguistic analysis of interactional behaviour called 'Gesprächsanalyse' in Germany. This theory (and method) is influenced by conversation analysis and ethnomethodology, but also by speech act theory, discourse analysis etc. Nowadays, it is leaning towards interactional linguistics.

interactant(s) in the role of the loser(s). To manage this, they would need methods (strategies).

We will argue that, from the point of view of discourse analysis, the participants' behaviour belongs to the local management processes in intercourse and involves a problem-solving approach. This assumption leads to a modified interpretation of politicians' verbal intercourse in talk shows. Rather than understanding the features under review as elements of a disordered argument, we will conceptualize them as manifestations of a negative "high-involvement style" (Tannen 2005, see footnote 12). It should also be taken into consideration that other factors have an impact on talk show interaction – e.g., a knowledge of the ethnomethods of political talk to which politicians might feel obliged to adapt (so-called hate speech). The goal of our contribution is to analyze a sequence of what is commonly perceived as arguing in a popular TV discussion programme from the perspective of discourse analysis.

When one asks Poles why they disapprove of political TV discussion, one will probably hear one or more of the following answers: "you can't listen to politicians in a discussion – they don't talk about a theme, they fight each other", "they always interrupt each other or talk simultaneously – that's unacceptable", "they don't get specific, but beat about the bush", "they use language that's full of aggression, accusations and hatred" or "their behaviour lacks respect."

The reasons that people state for their disapproval of political talk shows reveal a lot about people's image of an ideal discussion and an ideal participant.[2] People normally provide reasons why they dislike the interactional behaviour of politicians rather than conceiving of the talk show itself as an object of disdain. If we have a closer look at the statements and restate them positively, the ideal participant in a political talk show does not interrupt, does not talk when somebody else talks, talks in a theme-focused way, does not fight, but provides arguments, is specific, does not use aggressive language full of accusations and hatred and shows respect for others.

These features are part of a concept of discussion and conversation which is normative in Polish culture.[3] In short, people mention infringements of widely-accepted discussion and conversation rules as reasons for their disapproval of politicians' interactional behaviour in talk shows. To express it in terms of ethnomethodology and conversation

---

[2] Interactional rules and the realization of written or oral texts are culture-bound. In this chapter we will only refer to Polish culture and its interactional rules.
[3] We would like to mention that it is obligatory in other European or European-influenced debate cultures as well.

analysis, by criticizing the infringements of rules, people state the existence of these rules and expect the members of their own ethnos to stick to them (cf. Garfinkel 1984; Churchill 1971).

On the other hand, one can observe that the interactional behaviour of politicians differs according to the contexts and participants in a piece of conversation. The same politicians can make use of elements of hate speech[4] in one TV discussion, but hold a discussion in a theme-focused way in another. If interactional behaviour is situatively influenced, then judgments on interactional behaviour should adapt to this assumption. Participants basically adapt to the situation and their interlocutors (recipient design). Interactional behaviour is therefore problem-solving behaviour: adaptation to the situation and interlocutors makes conversation possible. For example, in a talk show both the host and the guests have to stick to rules to make the talk show a talk show. If both sides accept shared rules on talk show behaviour in a given society, they do not need to define the situation or negotiate roles. They produce a talk show while putting a shared set of features into reality, that is, they make use of the concept 'doing',[5] in this case of a set of rules for 'doing a talk show'. If one accepts this explanation, then the interactional behaviour of Polish politicians may simply be the result of pursuing a different aim or a different set of rules than those that are accepted in everyday life. In other words, their interaction in talk shows should be considered to be as rule-based as everyday conversation, and as an (interactional) problem-solving strategy. The question then arises: in what respect are their interactions orderly and which problems do they solve?

Interestingly, the nature of politicians' interactional behaviour in TV discussions shows a striking similarity with the summary of Schopenhauer's (1896) 'dialectica[6] eristica', which is a set of 38 devices as described in the philosopher's mocking essay *The Art of Controversy*. Schopenhauer discusses "dishonest", but effective techniques of dispute

---

[4] There are different terms in use, e.g. 'mowa nienawiści' ('hate speech') or 'retoryka nienawiści' ('hate rhetoric'). For a linguistic description of hate speech in politics, see Głowiński (2007); Czyżewski (2009) discusses examples of usage in interaction from a sociological point of view.

[5] For more information on the concept of 'doing', see, e.g., Churchill (1971) and Sacks (1985); for further information on the concept, especially elaborated with respect to 'doing gender' or 'doing culture', see, e.g., Kotthoff (2002; 2004).

[6] We are aware of several definitions of 'dialectic', but as this discussion is peripheral to the present chapter, we will simply use the term in Schopenhauer's (1896) definition. The same applies to Schopenhauer's reconsideration of *The Art of Controversy*, as it is not Schopenhauer and his philosophy we are interested in.

(ibid., 8–9), under the assumption that one wants to appear right, while not necessarily being right:

> Dialectic in this sense of the word has no other aim but to reduce to a regular system and collect and exhibit the arts which most men employ when they observe, in a dispute, that truth is not on their side, and still attempt to gain the day. Hence, it would be very inexpedient to pay any regard to objective truth or its advancement in a science of Dialectic; since this is not done in that original and natural Dialectic innate in men, where they strive for nothing but victory. The science of Dialectic, in one sense of the word, is mainly concerned to tabulate and analyse dishonest stratagems, in order that in a real debate they may be at once recognized and defeated. It is for this very reason that Dialectic must admittedly take victory, and not objective truth, for its aim and purpose (Schopenhauer 1896, 13).

In most talk shows, it is not possible to decide who is right or wrong (because the discussion is not conducted with the aim of reaching a decision; see below), nor is this question of any interest to us. Our aim is rather to observe the participants' interactional behaviour. 'Dialectica eristica' is here to be understood as neutral and non-judgemental. It could therefore be claimed that politicians may use some techniques to solve a conversational problem (how to appear to be right), which could qualify these techniques as ethnomethods.[7] Basically, an ethnomethod is an interactional device shared by a group in a given society (ethnos) to produce social order (cf. Keller 2009, 104) and to give each other orientation in the line of a conversation. Deppermann (2007, 10) compares ethnomethods to collective routine ('kollektive Routine', transl. by YBK). According to him, ethnomethods are relevant for the interactants' orientation, in regard to both production and reception ("[…] produktiv wie rezeptiv orientierungsrelevant […]", ibid.). Thus, ethnomethods can be used in conversation to show each other how one wants to be understood. For example, one has different ways of answering a question;

---

[7] Further research would be needed. One could, for example, object to a transfer of 'dialectica eristica' to Polish TV discussions without explanation, as it would entail a shift in culture, space and time. But in consideration of the intellectual exchange during Schopenhauer's lifetime in Europe, it would be interesting to see *The Art of Controversy* as a piece of information of use in historical conversation/discourse analysis (see Rehbock 2001; Kilian 2005; Linke 2008) and to consider a culturally broader, transnational point of view that would reflect a former distribution of ideas and science for the analysis of the history of conversation (Belczyk-Kohl in preparation [b]).

the way we choose to answer it tells the other interactant how we want to be seen or how we want the conversation to develop.

In the present chapter, we will analyze a TV discussion sequence using discourse analysis (see footnote 1) to prove our thesis that the talk of politicians in TV discussions is not disorderly, but rule-based. The chapter is divided into three sections. Firstly, the reader is provided with some information on interaction in political talk shows. Then the interactional behaviour of participants in a talk show sequence taken from a Polish TV discussion is analyzed. By interactional behaviour we understand the verbal, paraverbal and nonverbal behaviour of the participants while creating a conversation (similar to Goffman's 2009, 144 oft-cited description of an individual turn or utterance as "all of what an individual does and says during his turn").[8] A piece of conversation is a joint production of all the parties involved. We shall therefore use the terms 'interaction' and 'participants' instead of the more static terms 'sender' and 'receptor'. As a final step, we will draw conclusions from the analysis.

2. On the political talk show – context and participants

By the term 'political talk show' we mean a theme-focused TV discussion limited in time and place (in a TV studio) that is supervised by a moderator and hosts several guests. The theme is a political one, which means it is either linked to a field of politics or, in a wider sense, it adheres to a discourse of importance to society as a political arrangement. A talk show is a public communication situation in which a group of people takes the given theme as a starting point in order to present different opinions on the theme. These points of view are presented by the guests, who are not invited as individuals, but because of their opinion or possible contribution to the talk show. Usually, the guests are politicians and therefore represent their parties and their opinions on the theme in question, but the guest list also regularly includes public persons such as experts, e.g. scientists, entrepreneurs, journalists, intellectuals and others. Depending on the subject to be discussed a member of the public may be invited to complete the discussion. As politicians and experts usually provide theoretical viewpoints, the members of the public have (in their interactional role) the function of contrasting their statements with an assumed reality. In other words, while politicians present their party's interpretation or an ideologically biased view of a given phenomenon and experts correct and complete it by providing other possible interpretations, members of the

---

[8] In this chapter, we will concentrate on the verbal interaction.

public bring in their experience as those who have to cope with the decisions politicians make – they represent the audience. The audience itself is an indispensible feature of a TV discussion, but not necessarily present in the studio. The discussion is addressed to the participants and the viewers in the studio and/or to the target group viewing the talk show at home as well.

In spite of the audience's expectations, it is not the aim of a TV discussion to come to a conclusion or to convince the others of one's rightness, but rather to show different perspectives on a theme. A political talk show is a piece of information and an element of political opinion-making (e.g. Schultz 2004, 292–3, 294, 314–15; Wagner 2008, 133–9).[9] We shall use the terms political talk show and TV discussion as synonyms.

The lack of solution-seeking for the problem discussed has consequences for the interaction itself. As the aim is rather an exchange of interesting opinions and perceptions rich in content, the contributions to a public discussion are often depersonalized. In consequence, if, for example, arguing occurs, there is no intention to settle but to stop it. 'Arguing' is a broad term and difficult to define, especially if one tries to transfer it to a situation which lacks some of the common features of arguing. One must also keep in mind that at least one of the participants might provoke and exploit a passage of arguing for their own purposes. Spiegel (2011, 17) defines the action 'Streit' ('quarrel, argument') in private interactions in the following way: "A quarrel […] is a verbal, controversial and non-cooperative form of settling a conflict, which is, amongst others, marked by disrespect of the [interaction] partner's face."[10] Interaction partners normally do not want to end contact and avoid the escalation of a quarrel (ibid., 19). Spiegel notes four features of a 'quarrel' (ibid., 18–19):

- At least two interactants differ in their point of view;
- they discuss the 'problem' factually or emotionally (emotional style has its own prosody, e.g., speaking louder, with more emphasis, but also contains "qualifying lexemes" ('bewertungshaltige […] Lexeme'; ibid., 18);
- there must be the willingness to quarrel;

---

[9] The problem of theatricality in political TV discussions cannot be discussed in this chapter, but is outlined in, for example, Holly (1994) or Meyer (2003).

[10] In the German original: "Streit […] versteht sich als eine verbale, kontroverse und unkooperative Austragungsform von Konflikt, die unter anderem durch Missachtung des Partnerimages […] gekennzeichnet ist" (translation by YBK).

- one of the interactants must show directly or indirectly that they interpret a part of the other's behaviour as face-threatening, a violation of interests or a letdown.

This set of features can be applied to political talk shows. As can be seen in the transcripted discussion sequence below, what the participants provide is a controversial, non-cooperative verbal interaction that is provocative to the others. At first glance, one aspect of a real quarrel seems to be missing: since it is a political TV discussion, there should be no reason for a 'quarrel', but rather for an 'exchange of ideas'. The interactants should not feel personally, but rather professionally involved. Interestingly, in the provided sequence the politicians act as if they are being attacked personally, and even lead the discussion at some point near a (dead) end (lines 10–14, 44–54). At this point, participants in real quarrels either stop an interaction or must change its subject. In our example the intervention of the moderator (who is busy in turn-taking organization) in a certain way saves the interactants from bringing their talk to an end.

This behaviour is typical in Polish political talk shows, when politicians from opposing parties are participating. One has to keep in mind that their participation in the TV programme is only one part of their shared conversational experience. They know each other and bring that knowledge as well as the awareness of their party's positions into the talk show. Hence, the given piece of interaction normally is not a first meeting, which has an impact on their conversational behaviour; the piece of talk is possibly rather a continuation or distribution to a wider discourse than a single interaction event,[11] which might explain the emotional engagement in the discussion. It becomes personal and bears signs of a high-involvement style, e.g., talking over, interrupting with comments during a turn and expecting others to take turns if they want to say something (cf. Tannen 2005, 30–1), but in a negative way.[12] Another explanation might

---

[11] It would be worth analyzing this assumption with regard to a bigger corpus. Talk show participants sometimes do refer to the interactional behaviour of others outside a given TV discussion, referring to pieces of information in the media, that is, to public information. They very seldom refer to nonpublic information like meetings (corpus of 25 talk shows from 2013; YBK).

[12] Tannen (2005) distinguishes a high-involvement style and a high-considerateness style, which are thought to be part of ethnicity (in later books she also classifies male/female interaction as intercultural talk, which is highly arguable and was many times falsified). The linguist describes style as conversational strategy (ibid., 11). According to her, high-involvement style is

be the use of, respectively, the defence against "hate rhetoric" ('retoryka nienawiści', Głowiński 2007), "aggressive talk" ('mowa agresji', ibid., 22) or "talk according to sharp categorizations" ('język ostrych kategoryzacji', Skarżyńska 2001) in the public political sphere.[13]

As we have already mentioned, the communication situation in a political TV discussion is not a simple one to determine. There are several levels of communication, and only one of them, i.e., the discussion itself, can be clearly observed, whereas the others are only captured indirectly. Amongst them, the studio audience's reactions to statements or the awareness of the participants that there is another audience could be observed. Everyone involved in the scene is engaged or even trapped in a double bind professional situation. The TV presenter is host, journalist and supervisor, the politician a member of a party[14] and a professional; they both talk to each other on the verbal level. They address their interaction not only to the other guests, but also or even more to the audience in the studio and at home, colleagues etc. As they are part of a public situation and are mostly media-experienced, none of them is a private individual. Everyone involved comes to the talk show with a special interest he or she wants to advocate, be it in cooperation with the other participants or against their interest in a competitive discussion.

---

hallmarked by, e.g., abrupt topic shifting, persistence, participating listenership, faster rate of speech and turn taking, marked pitch, strategic pauses etc., but is cooperative (ibid., 30–1). In the case of our example the style shows the same signs, but is uncooperative. In contrast to Tannen, we would rather see a high-involvement style as part of membership categorization (Silverman 1998, 74ff.) than of culture or ethnos. This interpretation has the advantage of accounting for the fact that either one or the other style can be activated in interaction, but does not need to be.

[13] 'Aggressive talk' and 'hate rhetoric' are two of many terms in use to describe the phenomenon hate speech. The usage of terms differs according to their date of publication, academic field and/or the classification of examples. Hate speech 'mowa nienawiści', though not acceptable in everyday conversation, is a method used for confronting the convictions of others in the public political domain. It involves journalists and other groups active in politics, not only politicians themselves (see Głowiński 2007, 23). Interestingly, it is directed at recipients of the 'we'-group and not at the ones attacked (ibid., 23–4), which underlines its status as a method (terms translated by YBK).

[14] Though mentioned often in the literature, this aspect is seldom contextualized by the interactants. The chosen TV discussion provides confirmation of the assumption, as the moderator quite often addresses the panel members by the name of their party instead of using their title and/or name (see lines 5, 8, 17, 50, 54, 61), often accompanied by a nod.

According to Goffman (1959; 1967) interactants create 'faces' and negotiate them in an interaction by their way of dressing, behaviour, way of speaking etc. They do not do this without purpose, but act to be seen as they wish to be seen by someone else. They use strategies to create their image, in order to become or remain a member of a group, to show others which group they belong to, and how they want to be understood etc. If people use conversational methods in everyday life to solve interactional problems and demonstrate to each other the social orders they stick to, then this must also be true for the group of politicians in the context of a political talk show. As politicians must verbalize and negotiate these ethnomethods, they unveil them in conversation and make them observable. What is more, as other interactants must be able to understand them and react to these strategies, the strategies must be a shared piece of knowledge and therefore must be organized, (ideally) rational and part of problem-solving behaviour in a conversation analytic sense. Therefore, the difference between everyday interaction and that in a TV discussion is, to some extent, a quantitative, not a qualitative one.

3. Order at all points – even in chaos

As sequences of arguing are supposed to be a common feature of political TV discussions, we wanted to have a closer look at an example which native speakers of Polish would classify as chaotic and aggressive, but typical. We chose a sequence from the TV discussion programme *Minęła dwudziesta* (literally: 'past eight'), aired six days a week, in which a host discusses a current political theme with several guests. In this case it is a scandal called *afera taśmowa w PO*[15] (lit. 'tape affair within PO') evoked by a covert recorded conversation between party members, in which one of them offered a job in exchange for votes in the election of the chairman of the party *Platforma Obywatelska* (PO) in Lower Silesia. The talk show participants discuss the moral aspects of the recording's content as well as the moral aspects of the covert recording itself. The sequence starts with a member of the party *Prawo i Sprawiedliwość* (PiS), who repeatedly transfers the discussion to another level, here trying to connect the recording as well as its content to the supposed moral state of PO as a party. We will present a longer sequence to show how the arguing evolves and how it leads to an entire range of interactional activities (see Table 1–1).

---

[15]   For further information see polska.newsweek.pl/platforma-obywatelska-jacek-protasiewicz-norbert-wojnarowski-slask-newsweek-pl,artykuly,273483,1.html (27.02.2014), www.tvn24.pl/raporty/afera-tasmowa-w-po,755 (27.02.2014) or www.polskieradio.pl/afera-tasmowa/Tag169072 (27.02.2014).

Table 1–1. Transcripted talk show sequence

Mineła dwudziesta (30.10.2013; channel: TVP)[16]	
Interactants:	M (Joanna Osińska, presenter)
	JS (Jacek Sasin, Prawo i Sprawiedliwość/PiS – Law and Justice)
	AS (Adam Szejnfeld, Platforma Obywatelska/PO – Civic Platform)
	AR (Andrzej Rozenek, Twój Ruch – Your Movement)
	GN (Grzegorz Napieralski, SLD – Democratic Left Alliance)
Running time:	00:30:39
Sequence:	00:20:31 to 00:22:38

1   JS   ale problem jest w tYm (.) !JAK! platforma traktuje pAństwo (.)
         but the problem is   the way Platforma treats the state

2   platforma traktuje państwo jak swój fOlwark hh (.) ostatnie zdanie jak ten
         Platforma treats the state as her farm   my last sentence as the
         <u>*laughter*</u>

3   (.) < literacki postaw czerwonego sukna < który kAżdy ciągnie w swoje
         metaphor from literature of the red cloth that everyone tries to get hold of
         <u>*speaks louder; simultaneous talk from 00:20:37 to 00:21:07 between JS, AS, AR, and M*</u>

4   AS   < protestuję protestuję protestuję protestuję
               I must protest I must protest I must protest I must protest

5   M   za chwilę platforma (.) < teraz twój ruch
         <u>*speaks louder*</u>
         Platforma in a moment now Twój Ruch

---

[16] The transcription follows the basic guidelines, but is simplified for practical reasons. It considers only those pieces of information which are necessary for our purpose. All utterances are written in small letters, capital letters mark the accent a speaker made (exclamation marks denote strong emphasis), angled brackets signal the beginning and the end of simultaneous talk, empty brackets signal an unintelligible utterance and its length, whereas the numbers in brackets denote the length of a pause in seconds; a full stop in brackets marks a short pause. The translation into English follows Rehbein's et al. (2004) demands for transcript translations (they should, for example, aim at "a reproduction of the specific action quality an utterance has" (Rehbein et al. 2004, 58; translated by YBK), but does not include a morphological transcription. The translation of an utterances tries to reflect its interactional quality, while orienting as closely as possible towards the original in word number, syntax, and position in the conversation. Thus, transcript translation does not have the status of traditional translation, but is a device to enable readers to follow foreign language conversation with regard to content. For the problems of transcript translations, see Belczyk-Kohl (in preparation [a]).

6	AS	< !NIE! ja protestuję
		no I must protest
7	M	panowie (.) < obiecałam (.) za chwilę wszYscy się odniosą (.)
		gentleman I promised it in a minute everybody may comment
8		< twój ruch teraz ma głos
		<u>*speaks louder*</u>
		now it is Twój Ruch
9	AS	< pani redaktor pani redaktor to są incydentAlne
		Mrs Osińska Mrs Osińska these are incidental
10		< incydentAlne karygodne ale incydent!TALNE! przypadki
		incidental gross but incidental cases
11	JS	< a w lubuskim a w lubuskim ( )
		and what happened in Lubuskie and what happened in Lubuskie ( )
12	AR	< ale panie pośle czy pan tak myśli naprAwdę
		but Mr Szejnfeld do you really think so
13	AS	nie !MOGĄ! być (.) podstawą do tego żeby przekreślać całą partię
		must not be the reason for writing off a whole party
14		i wszystkich jej i wszystkich jej członków
		and all its and all its members
15	JS	a w lubuskim (.) a w lubuskim ( ) a w lubuskim
		and what happened in Lubuskie and what happened in Lubuskie ( ) and
		what happened in Lubuskie
16	AS	na pewno nie na pewno nie ( )
		surely not surely not ( )
17	M	dobrze (.) teraz twój ruch (.) panowie (.) ja was nie przekrzyczę (.)
		ok now Twój Ruch gentleman I will not shout over you
	AS/JS	<u>*simultaneous talk from 00:20:55 to 00:21:07 until AR takes his turn*</u>
18	M	twój ruch < panie pośle sasin (.) twój ruch (2.0)
		<u>*tries to stop JS and AS from talking to each other without having the turn*</u>
		Twój Ruch Mr Sasin Twój Ruch
19	JS	< a co się działo (.) co się działo co ludzie mówią ( )
		<u>*continues cross talk with AS*</u>
		and what happened what happened what do people say ( )
20	M	twój ruch teraz (2.2) panowie
		now it is Twój Ruch's turn gentlemen
21	JS	co się dzieje w polityce < gOwin mówi o bagnie moralnym w platformie ( )
		what happens in politics Gowin talks about the moral morass in Platforma ()
22	AR	< bardzo bardzo
		very very

23		bardzo dobrze nasi widzowie > widzą co się dzieje tak
		simultaneous sequence ends
		the audience is getting a very good impression of what is happening yes
24	M	właśnie (.) rozmawiamy o standArdach w politYce i ja nie !MOGĘ!
		exactly we are talking about standards in politics and I cannot
25		uspokoić (.) < nikOgo żeby dojść do jakichś wniosków
		quieten anyone in order to come to some conclusions
26	?	< ale pani redaktor
		but Mrs Osinska
27	M	bardzo prOszę ee pAtrzą wasi wyborcy (.) mówimy o standArdach
		please your voters are watching we are talking about standards
28		w polityce ss próbujemy coś zmienić (.) niedobrze to wygląda
		in politics we are trying to change things it does not look good
29		< proszę bardzo twój ruch
		Twój Ruch has the turn
30	AR	< padało ee słowo bAgno
		someone mentioned the word morass
31		to jest rzeczywiście bagno i nasi widzowie chyba wIdzą gdzie to bagno
		starts speaking fast; only a little intonation
		it really is a morass and our audience might have an idea where this morass is
32		ma miejsce i po jednej i po drugiej strOnie
		it is on both sides
33		różnica jest taka że (.) taśmę renaty beger[17] nagrali dziennikArze
		the difference is that the tape with Renata Beger was recorded by journalists
34		!TER!az standardy hh jak widać w platformie poszły dalej
		and now as we have seen the standards have improved in Platforma
35		każdy każdego nagrywa już nie tylko dziennikarze hh (.)
		everyone records each other it's not only the journalists who do so
36		ee nie wiem jak daleko tak zajdziecie ee panowie z platformy myślę
		I do not know how successful you will be with this in Platforma I think
37		że nie daleko ee i to nIE są wcale ee rzeczy które powinny być ee
		not very successful and that is nothing which should be
38		pochwalane bo ee w jednak pewne zasady obowiązują
		approved because some principles do indeed bind
39		ja uważam że nagrywanie w ten sposób jest po prostu hh niegodne niecne
		I think that recording in this way is simply unworthy ignoble

---

[17] AR refers to a political affair in 2006, where a covert recording revealed a proposed deal between politicians of the parties *Samoobrona* (Self-defence) and *PiS*.

40		(.) hh oczywiście tych praktyk nie powinno być to jest zupełnie inna sprawa
		of course such practices should not happen at all this is an entirely different question
41		ale jak już jeden drugiego nagrywa i dochodzi do takiej wojny na hh (.)
		but if it starts that people record each other and it comes to such a battle over
42		przecieki na (.) pokazywanie tych nagrań i tak dalej hh za chwila
		data leakage over presenting this recordings and so on the next moment
43		pewnie druga strona też pokaże jakieś e nagrania lub coś innego hh (.)
		the others will probably show some recordings or something else as well
44		to już nie jest polityka to tak na prawdę jest !BAGNO!
		this is not politics this really is a morass
45		tak jak słusznie pan poseł powiedział (.)
		as Mr Sasin said correctly
46		tylko wy to bagno za zapoczątkowaliście hh (.) koledzy z platformy
		but it is you who started this morass the colleagues from Platforma
47		to dzielnie kontynuują hh (.) jesteście jedni warci drugich (.)
		continue it bravely you are worth each other
48		jedyna partia nie umaczana w to bagno to jest twój ruch
		the only party not taking part in this morass is Twój Ruch
49		< i bardzo dobrze że widzowie to widzą
		and it is very good that the audience sees this
50	M	< !SLD!
51	JS	< a co ( ) janusz palikot
		and what ( ) Janusz Palikot
52	AR	janusz palikot ( ) i rzucił mandat jako jedyny poseł
		Janusz Palikot ( ) and he was the only deputy
53		< ee w polskim sejmie
		in the polish parliament who gave up his deputy mandate
54	M	< teraz !SLD!
		now SLD
55	JS	< co ( ) janusz palikot ( )
		what ( ) Janusz Palikot ( )
56		ale ale był w platformie
		but but he was a member of Platforma
57	AR	!TAK! < jak zobaczył to bagno to rzucił mandatem
		yes as he saw this morass he gave up his deputy mandate
58	JS	< no
		you see
59	AR	< polecam to samo panie pośle
		I recommend you do the same Mr Sasin

60	JS	< _laughs ironically_
61	M	< !SLD!
62	AR	jak pan widzi to bagno < niech pan zrezygnUje _if you see this morass then quit_
63	GN	< a nagrywanie _and recording_
64	JS	nie widzę w pisie _I cannot see it in PiS_
65	AR	a ja widzę _but I can see it_
66	GN	a nagrywanie jest obrzydliwie _and recording is disgusting_

In line 1 JS builds up a picture; he accuses the political party PO of exploiting Poland. He begins with the signal _problem_ bringing it into direct proximity with _jak Platforma traktuje państwo_ 'the way Platforma treats the state'.[18] In line 2 he repeats this and ends the picture. He suddenly stops, takes a breath – a signal that he has something else to say or is expecting some reaction. He then strengthens the picture, bringing in a metaphor from literature about groups that are ready to act against the interest of a country in exchange for power (_ostatnie zdanie: jak ten literacki postaw czerwonego sukna, który każdy ciągnie w swoje_ 'last sentence: as the metaphor from literature of the red cloth that everyone tries to get hold of').

Simultaneously, the politician from PO – the party being attacked – recognizing the transition relevance place, reacts in line 4 (_protestuję_ 'I must protest'), so that JS cannot finish his sentence. M does not want to give them the floor and in line 5 tries to organize the turn-taking. In the following lines (6–21/22) AS and JS do not accept the several attempts of M to give the turn to the announced speaker, that is, the politician representing the party _Twój Ruch_ in 5, 8, 17, 18, 20, who also claims the turn. A sequence of simultaneous talk with a length of 90 seconds starts, which underlines the importance of the subject to the participants.

As one can see, after trying twice to give the turn to the next speaker, in 5 and 8, M lets the politicians talk, accepting the need for the cross talk. AS, in particular, claims the turn, even rejecting M's attempt to pass on the turn to the announced speaker: he answers M's turn-taking organizational device _za chwilę Platforma_ 'Platforma in a moment' (line 5) with _nie_ 'no'

---

[18] Translations of the original utterances are given in square brackets after each example.