

Discourse & Communication

<http://dcm.sagepub.com>

Address terms in the service of other actions: The case of news interview talk

Steven E. Clayman

DISCOURSE & COMMUNICATION 2010; 4; 161

DOI: 10.1177/1750481310364330

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://dcm.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/4/2/161>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Discourse & Communication* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://dcm.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://dcm.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations <http://dcm.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/4/2/161>



Address terms in the service of other actions: The case of news interview talk

Discourse & Communication
4(2) 161–183

© The Author(s) 2010

Reprints and permission: sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/1750481310364330

<http://dcm.sagepub.com>



Steven E. Clayman

UCLA, USA

Abstract

In broadcast news interviews, interviewees will occasionally address the interviewer by name. As a method of establishing the directionality of talk, address terms are redundant in this institutional context because the normative question/answer activity structure and associated participation framework make the direction of address transparent and knowable in advance. But address terms can be deployed in the service of a variety of actions beyond addressing per se. Some of these involve disaligning actions such as topic shifts, non-conforming responses, and disagreements. Others involve the presentation of views as particularly significant or sincere. Address terms are thus a resource for managing certain expressive properties of talk, as well as its disalignment from prior talk.

Keywords

address terms, disagreement, disalignment, news interviews, sincerity

1. Introduction

Broadcast news and public affairs programming has become increasingly interactive over the years, with monologic narratives and stories displaced by dialogic forms such as interviews, panel discussions, and audience participation talk shows. This development, which imports interpersonal encounters and ‘conversational’ modes of discourse into the public sphere (Fairclough, 1992; Heritage et al., 1988; Scannell and Cardiff, 1991), is one key dimension of the personalization of broadcast news that is the focus of this special issue.

This article concerns a recurrent practice in news interviews that is intertwined with this broader development in broadcast talk: namely the practice of addressing the

Corresponding author:

Steven E. Clayman, Department of Sociology, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90095–1551, USA.

Email: clayman@soc.ucla.edu

journalist or interviewer by name. To illustrate, consider this excerpt from an interview with Sarah Palin following her unsuccessful 2008 campaign as John McCain's vice presidential running mate. The interviewer, Matt Lauer, raises the issue of anonymous post-election leaks from the McCain camp that portray Palin in an unflattering light and that indicate a sharp rift between Palin and 'the McCain people' (lines 1–5). He then asks her to talk about where 'stories like that come from' (line 6).

- (1) [NBC Today 11 Nov. 2008: Sarah Palin]
- 1 IR: Have you listened to some o' the leaks that've come out since
 2 the election=where th- where they're saying that the McCain
 3 .hhh people (.) Leaked anonymously are saying we couldn't
 4 control her. .h She was a rogue. She didn't want .h our
 5 consultants around her, an it- an' it beca:me tense.
 6 Where do th:=stories like that come from.
- 7 SP: → I honestly do not know >because it's not true Ma:tt,
 8 and .hh uh: S:enator McCain and I we have a great relationship,
 9 I have nothing but honor and admiration and love for him:;
 10 and for his family,...

Palin, in response, rejects the stories as falsehoods, and as she does so she addresses the interviewer by name ('Matt').

This overtly 'personalizing' practice might seem right at home in the interactive world of the news interview. At one level, it is consistent with the interview's characteristic participation framework, wherein interviewers and interviewees address their remarks to each other while treating the media audience as ratified but unaddressed 'overhearers' (Heritage, 1985). This arrangement distinguishes news interviews from other forms of broadcast talk (e.g. celebrity chat shows) where the audience is at least intermittently addressed in a direct way.

At another level, this pattern of address is intertwined with the institutionalized activity structure of news interviews. Because interviews are organized around questions and answers, interviewees when speaking are usually engaged in the act of answering – or at least responding to – a question. And answering talk is normally addressed to the party that elicited the answer, here the interviewer. Even in panel interviews involving multiple guests, the panelists normally address their remarks to the interviewer rather than to other panelists (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, Chapter 8).

But the very 'naturalness' of address terms in this environment poses a puzzle as to their use and import. Consider that the primary function of address terms generally, explicit in their very name, is to establish the directionality of a spate of talk, that is, its delivery to a particular recipient. In some environments this may have the added effect of selecting the next speaker (Lerner, 2003; Sacks et al., 1974). But in news interviews these matters – the directionality of talk and the selection of next speaker – are already established by the activity structure and participation framework described above, both of which are normative and empirically pervasive. It is further secured, within each interview, by the interviewee's bodily orientation and gaze direction, which ordinarily remain focused squarely on the interviewer. All of this would seem to render an explicit mode of

address thoroughly redundant and unnecessary. To frame this puzzle in relation to example 1 above, why does Palin address the interviewer by name when the latter's status as recipient and next speaker is utterly transparent and knowable in advance? And why does Palin do so at just this particular point? What is the redundancy of this practice being used to accomplish?

This article demonstrates that address terms can be employed in the service of a variety of other actions beyond addressing per se, focusing on two responsive action environments in broadcast news interviews. One class of environments involves interviewee responses that are disaligning in some way, including topic shifts, non-conforming responses, and disagreements. The case of disagreement, which differs from the other cases in involving disaffiliation rather than 'pure' disalignment,¹ has been analyzed by Rendle-Short (2007) in the context of Australian news interviews. Here it will be shown that disagreement is one of a family of disaligning actions in which address terms are recurrently implicated. A second class of environments involve responses that are portrayed as particularly significant or sincere.² As we shall see, interviewers use address terms disproportionately in these environments, and they appear to be implicated in the manner in which discursive actions are inflected and aligned with – or against – prior actions.

Data are drawn from a wide range of broadcast news interviews over the past 25 years, most of which were conducted for US television. From these materials I assembled a collection of more than 140 instances of address term usage by interviewees. These form the basis for the findings reported here.

2. Address terms in disalignment

Address terms are deployed recurrently in responsive actions that are disaligning in some way, that is, actions that resist or oppose the agenda being pursued through the previous question.

2.1. Topical agenda departures

Address terms appear when the interviewee (henceforth IE) is departing from the topical agenda set by the interviewer (henceforth IR) through his or her question. Two instances of this sort appear in the following excerpt from an interview with Clinton's Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin shortly after a recent jump in gasoline prices. Asked whether he would support a reduction of the gasoline tax, Rubin refuses to 'speculate on where that's gonna go' (lines 7–9). His refusal (first arrow) is prefaced with a turn-initial 'well' which projects a non-straightforward response (Schegloff and Lerner, 2009), and then an address term. He then moves to talk about other matters (line 10).

- (2) [ABC This Week, 5 May 1996: Treasury Sec. Robert Rubin]
- | | | |
|---|------|--|
| 1 | IR1: | S:everal c:en:ts in thuh price of a g- of a <u>gallon</u> |
| 2 | | of <u>gasoline</u> : is <u>tax</u> , (0.4) which: f:alls under <u>your</u> : |
| 3 | | (.) department, (.) .hhh Have you given any thought |
| 4 | | to <u>cutting</u> thuh tax to (.) s:ave: some money for thuh |

- 5 tax (and) for thuh b:uyers of gasoline?
 6 (.)
 7 IE: → .hhh Well David that's a proposal that (.) uh:: may
 8 be made:, and may be arou:nd, that I don't wanta
 9 speculate on where tha:t- (.) where tha:t's gonna go,
 10 <but thuh president as you know,=
 11 IR1: =Well tell me where [you would like (for) it to go.
 12 IE: [too:k
 13 (.)
 14 IE: → We:ll David let me take it- a s:lightly different
 15 approach if I ma:y,=And that is tha:t (.) thuh
 16 president took sensible action this past week,
 17 and I think action that was very sensitive, (.) to
 18 thuh concer:ns of very large numbers of Americans
 19 with respect to gas prices, (0.3) He ordered an
 20 accelerated sale of: twelve million barrels of
 21 oil that C:ongress had MANdated that we sell.=
 22 as part of thuh BUDget, (0.3) As a consequence I think
 23 we'll get good prices f'r thuh ta:xpayers,...

The subsequent exchange also involves an address term prefaced topic shift. Rubin's refusal to 'speculate' prompts the interviewer (IR) to interject and pursue the question (line 11) by framing it as inviting not a speculative prediction but an expression of preference regarding the gas tax issue. Rubin, however, sidesteps the gas tax question once again (lines 14–15), again prefacing the shift with a turn-initial 'well' and an address term (second arrow). He then proceeds to talk in a more general way about Administration efforts to reduce the cost of gasoline (lines 16–23).³

The association of address terms with topic shifts is highlighted by cases where the shift occurs later in the IE's turn, after an initial spate of relatively on-topic talk. In such cases the address term is correspondingly delayed, positioned not as a preface to the *turn* but as a preface to the subsequent *shift*. To illustrate, consider Rubin's final response to the gas tax question, seen in part above and reproduced at greater length below. After his initial and comparatively modest shift from the gas tax proposal to other efforts to reduce gas prices (lines 14–29 below) comes a much more dramatic shift as he proceeds to discuss – and credit the Administration for – the generally favorable state of the US economy (lines 30–7).

- (3) [ABC This Week, 5 May 1996: Treasury Sec. Robert Rubin]
 11 IR1: =Well tell me where [you would like (for) it to go.
 12 IE: [too:k
 13 (.)
 14 IE: We:ll David let me take it- a s:lightly different
 15 approach if I ma:y,=And that is tha:t (.) thuh
 16 president took sensible action this past week,
 17 and I think action that was very sensitive, (.) to

16 → Now Jim my other two: uh problems that I think u:h (.) <should
 17 be mentioned at this> poi:nt is I hope we can get awa:y from
 18 this ide:a .h (0.2) that we can't le:ave because otherwi:se
 19 we're not a po:wer or we're not showing reso:lve . . .

However, at line 16 (arrowed) he proceeds to raise other issues, the first of which involves defending the troop withdrawal option by countering a common criticism of withdrawal. Here again, this delayed topic shift is explicitly marked as such and justified ('Now Jim my other two problems that I think should be mentioned at this point') (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: Chapter 7), and is prefaced with an address term ('Jim').

2.2. Action Agenda Departures

Questions set agendas for response not only at the level of topic but also at the level of the action that should be performed vis-à-vis that topic (Boyd and Heritage, 2006; Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Raymond, 2003). Responses that depart from the action agenda may, like topical departures, be marked with an address term. For instance, consider this excerpt from an interview with the CEO of Texaco shortly after that company agreed to settle a multi-million dollar job discrimination lawsuit. The IR asks about the motives for settling the lawsuit out of court, and he frames this as an alternative choice question that invites the interviewee (IE) to choose between two possibilities: that he settled because the company 'was in fact discriminating', or because of the prospect of 'more economic losses'. Note that both of these alternatives are unflattering to the company.

(5) [NBC Nightly News, 15 Nov. 1996: Texaco Lawsuit]
 1 IR: .h Mister Bijur what's pro:- what prompted this settlement.
 2 .hh Thuh fact that you concluded your company was in fact
 3 discrimina:ting, or thuh prospects of: (.) more economic
 4 losses.
 5 IE: → T:o:m it was that we wanted to be f:air: to ah all of
 6 the employees involved, we're a: wonderful: gr:oup of
 7 people and family in this company, en we wanta be
 8 equitable with everybody.

The IE's response ('we wanted to be fair') is on-topic in speaking to the issue of what motivated the settlement, but it is disaligned with the action agenda in declining to choose either of the proffered options. And this disaligning response – which puts the oil company in a much more favorable light – is prefaced with an address term ('Tom').

A remarkably similar case occurred in the interview with Treasury Secretary Rubin, when Rubin was asked about Administration objectives regarding the price of gasoline. After detailing what are framed as contradictory policies bearing on domestic gas prices (lines 3–5), the IR poses an alternative choice question (lines 6–7) that invites Rubin to select from among three possible objectives ('raise the price, lower the price, or keep it the same'). The enumeration of possibilities further contributes to the portrayal of official policy as confused and incoherent.

- (6) [ABC This Week: 5 May 1996: Treasury Sec. Robert Rubin]
 1 IR3: [.h h h h W:ith- w:ith [regard to oil,=
 2 IR1: [George (come in).
 3 IR3: =thuh president s:ells some out of thuh reserve to
 4 lower thuh price.=At thuh sa:me ti:me, (,) thuh
 5 government s:ays we can now ex:por:t Alaskan oil, (eh)
 6 .hh What are you trying to do.=Raise thuh price,
 7 lower thuh price, or keep it thuh sa:[me.
 8 IE: [.hhh (.)
 9 → Geor:ge, what we're tryin' to do: is to ha:ve
 10 (0.2) sensible economic policy a(b)ross a br:oad
 11 range of issues that will d'terminate where this
 12 economy ^goe;s.=And I think this's exACTly
 13 what we've done.

Here again, Rubin's response ('... sensible economic policy across a broad range of issues...') sidesteps all of the proffered options in favor of a more encompassing and ostensibly coherent policy stance. This disaligning response is prefaced with an address term ('George').

Address terms also appear in what Raymond (2003) has termed non-conforming responses to yes/no questions, that is responses that initially take the form of neither *yes* nor *no*. For instance, in a discussion of federal tax policy, a Congressional committee chairman is asked whether a supposedly simpler tax plan championed by the chairman is in reality 'just another example of different logs rolled in different ways'. In the question preface, he enumerates various particularistic deductions that remain in the new plan, thereby contradicting the claim to simplicity and favoring a *no* answer.

- (7) [ABC This Week, 8 Dec. 1985: Tax Policy]
 1 IR: .hhh Uh Mj:ster Ch:airmen (.) this (0.2) tax reform
 2 when it fir's got rolling was defended deh in large
 3 measure in terms of simplicity.=Wur='unna simplify
 4 thuh tax code. .hhhhhh You have refu:sed duh kill
 5 the: (0.9) mortgage interest deduction on second
 6 ho:mes, you have even preserved something called an'
 7 you could if you wanted to explain it to me, thuh
 8 gravestone exemption, .hhh which I gather's a
 9 depreciation fer granite quarries, .hhhhh Is this
 10 really any simpler an' isn't this just another example
 11 of different lo:gs ro:lled in different way:s,
 12 (1.5)
 13 IE: → George (0.8) uh I'm a negotiator. (1.0) Uh thuh
 14 president c'n draw a line an' say: uhthis is purity.
 15 uh- uh this is what reform is all about. (1.1) I drew
 16 a line as we:ll . . .

The IE's response ('George I'm a negotiator.'), which avoids both an unsubstantiated *yes* and a concessionary *no*, is prefaced with an address term.

2.3. Disagreements

In addition to topical and action agenda departures are responses that entail disagreement. Because disagreements in news interviews are so unlike their counterparts in ordinary conversation, some background is in order. Given the question/answer turn-taking system that organizes news interview talk in conjunction with the journalistic norm of neutrality, IRs generally confine themselves to asking questions (Clayman and Heritage, 2002). But questions, while formally neutral, can be substantively opinionated when 1) a viewpoint is asserted in the course of building the question, 2) a viewpoint is presupposed by the question, or 3) the question is built to display a preference for a particular answer (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, Chapter 6). An IE seeking to counter any of these elements is in effect 'disagreeing' with the IR, even though such disagreement takes the form of an 'answer' to a 'question'. Some of these cases also involve action agenda departures (excerpts 8 and 9 below), but the presence of disagreement alone in other cases (excerpt 10) invites its analysis as a possibly separate phenomenon of address term usage.

The following excerpt from Sam Donaldson's interview with Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin involves disagreement with an assertion embedded within the question. The object of contention is Donaldson's paraphrase of Clinton's assertion that 'he taxed rich Americans too much in 1993' (lines 3–4).

- (8) [ABC This Week, 5 May 1996: Treasury Sec. Robert Rubin]
- 1 IR2: You spoke of so glowingly thuh president's program for
 2 thuh past three years, I wonder (.) if you agree: with thuh
 3 president, (.) in his latest pronouncement, (.) that he: (.)
 4 T:A[X]ed (.) rich Americans too much.=in nineteen ninety three.
 5 ??: [hm hmm:
 6 IE: → .hhh S:am tha-that's not what he said.

Rubin bluntly disputes Donaldson's paraphrase, and his disagreement (arrowed) is prefaced with an address term ('Sam').

Address terms are also used by IEs when disputing something that is presupposed, rather than asserted outright, in a previous question. Here the IR, Margaret Warner, asks a health insurance industry representative to explain why the industry is already running ads opposing Clinton's health care reform plan at a point 'so early in the debate' (lines 1–4). In seeking an explanation for the ad campaign's early timing, this question presupposes that the timing is indeed early.

- (9) [PBS NewsHour, 21 Oct 1993: Health Care]
- 1 IR: Ah: y:ou've started all (of) this I think, thuh health industry
 2 association.>Health insurance association. .hhh Why:: so early
 3 in this debate when there's not gonna be: a vote on it ih-
 4 for maybe a year?

- 5 LJ: → Margaret health care reform is well under way. In fact, it's
6 already passed in twenty nine states...

In the course of countering this presupposition (arrowed), the IE prefaces her disagreement with an address term ('Margaret').

In both of the preceding examples, the IE begins to disagree with the very first turn constructional unit, and in both cases this initial unit of talk is prefaced with an address term. The association of address terms with disagreement per se is further highlighted by instances where the disagreement is delayed by an agreement preface (Pomerantz, 1984), in which case the address term is correspondingly delayed. Consider this excerpt from an interview with President Reagan's Director of Communications, Pat Buchanan. The IR, Ted Koppel, had previously suggested that Buchanan's ideological conservatism was affecting the content of Reagan's speeches. After Buchanan vociferously denies such influence, Koppel presses the matter (lines 1–10 below) in a way that displays a clear preference for an admission of influence. He characterizes the president as a 'terribly terribly busy' man who 'cannot possibly write every speech of his own . . .'

- (10) [ABC Nightline, 3 June 1985: Communications Dir. Pat Buchanan]

- 1 IR: ...I think what people are suggesting is that tuh
2 President of tuh United States puhaps more than any
3 other man or woman in tuh country is terribly
4 terribly busy cannot pos[sibly write every speech of=
5 PB: [Mhm
6 = 'is own,hh or for that matter go over every speech
7 line by line as you suggest. [.hhh] Uh- an when that=
8 PB: [Mhm]
9 IR: =happens, then people in positions such as your own,
10 .hh can sometimes get some of their own ideas across.
11 PB: tch .h Well sure. you could get ideas in
12 → but look every speech in tuh White House Ted .hhh
13 go:es through a process. Every- s:peech that deals
14 with foreign policy.hhh passes through tuh national
15 security council which is chaired by Bud McFarland.hh
16 buhfore it goes to tuh Prez'den' uh=th=United States.
17 .hhh There are perhaps a dozen people. (.) who'll
18 see: an' sign off (.) on a major speech .hh an' wait
19 a minute. this prez'dent DOES read (.) ev'ry speech
20 he delivers, .hh he does make edits on ev'ry speech he
21 delivers, .hh and very often he'll send it back for
22 rewrite . . .

Buchanan responds first with a brief expression of agreement (line 11), followed by a much more elaborated disagreement (lines 12–22). Here the address term (line 12) is introduced only after he completes the agreement component and enters into the disagreement component of the turn. Indeed, the address term is delayed a bit further, after

the noun phrase that launches disagreement ('but look every speech in the White House Ted') but prior to its predicate and elaboration. Notice that at the very onset of the disagreement – where the address term might otherwise have appeared – is a different discourse marker ('look') with similar attention-getting properties (which are discussed further below).

2.4. Positioning and Import for Disalignment

In the context of disaligning responses, there is a general tendency for address terms to be prefatory, positioned at or near the beginning of the turn constructional unit that launches the disalignment. And since in most cases disalignment is launched in the first unit within the response turn (e.g. excerpts 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9), address terms tend to appear at or near the beginning of the turn itself. Turn beginnings, as Schegloff (1996) has observed, are often occupied with 1) the relationship between the current turn-in-progress and that which preceded it, and 2) projection of the ensuing turn and the action it embodies. How might address terms figure in these retrospective and prospective processes?

The first and most basic point concerns the consequentiality of address terms for the timing of disalignment. As a general principle, disaligning responses tend to be delayed, with some time lag intervening between the completion of the prior action and the substance of the disalignment (Pomerantz, 1984; Sacks, 1987; Schegloff, 2007; Schegloff and Lerner, 2009). One way of understanding the use of address terms here is as another item of talk that – much like 'uh', 'well', justificatory accounts, appreciations, and so on – defers the onset of the substance of the disalignment.

Beyond delaying disalignment, address terms may contribute substantively to the act of disalignment itself. Consider that address terms solicit the attention of an intended recipient. This attention-soliciting property is evident in their recurrent use as summonses before a state of mutual engagement has been achieved (Schegloff, 1968), in the environment of overlap when attentional engagement is at risk (Rendle-Short, 2005), and most importantly as prefaces to certain sequence-initiating actions when recipient engagement is in doubt (Lerner, 2003). This same attention-soliciting property may seem incongruous in the context of a *responsive* action, when recipient engagement has already been established. However, for speakers launching into a disaligning response, the deployment of this property may be methodical. The pre-positioned address term treats the ensuing action *as if* it were an independently produced or 'first' action (see Heritage and Raymond, 2005). This may facilitate the production of a response that is less than fully responsive, built to be to some extent independent of what was projected by the previous turn. This analysis applies not only to cases where disalignment is launched in the first turn constructional unit, but also later units of talk (e.g. excerpts 3, 4, 10), insofar as the address term remains positioned prior to the disalignment. Finally, this argument regarding the import of address terms for the management of disalignment is reinforced by excerpt 10, which involves a slight departure from the usual prefatory positioning ('but look every speech at the White House Ted . . .'). Here the address term occurs a bit later in the first disaligning unit of talk (post-subject phrase, but pre-predicate), but in the prefatory position – where the address term otherwise 'should have' occurred – is another type of attention-soliciting item ('look').

The prefatory positioning of address terms in disaligning actions is a frequent but not invariant empirical regularity. Address terms may also appear at the end of the first overtly disaligning turn constructional unit (see example 1 above). It could be that the factors governing their positioning within disaligning actions are organizationally ‘weak’ and thus allow for variation in individual cases. However, evidence suggests that the later positioning is organized by reference to other functions of address terms that are unrelated to alignment/disalignment, such as those examined next.

3. Address terms and expressive actions

Address terms are also implicated in actions that are more purely ‘expressive’ in nature, attuned primarily to the speaker’s own talk rather than its alignment with sequentially prior talk.

3.1. Foregrounding talk

Address terms are recurrently associated with talk designed to stand out from the background of the turn in progress. IEs may refer to the IR by name when entering turn components that are presented as more salient or significant than what has been said to that point. The first example is from an interview in the closing days of the 1992 presidential election. The IR asks a Republican political analyst to comment on state of the race between Bush and Clinton (lines 1–2). The IE devotes the first part of his response (lines 3–8) to the news that Clinton now leads in Florida and North Carolina. He then goes on (beginning at line 9) to talk about Clinton’s growing lead in two other states, Michigan and Ohio.

(11) [CNN Inside Politics, 20 Oct 1992: Presidential Election]

- 1 IR: .hhhh Bob take a- (.) a current snap sho:t literally today as
 2 best you can:: and take us through thuh map.
 3 RN: .hhhhh Well thuh big- thuh big: ah: (0.4) difference between
 4 thuh la:st time I was with you: two weeks ago, is that we have
 5 given.hhh ah: the edge: to ah Governor Clinton in Flor:ida
 6 and Nor:th Caroli:na.=Those are- (.) are big states,
 7 particularly Fl:or:ida: .h which has been a: (.) bastion of
 8 Republican strength in pas:t presidential elections. .hhh
 9 → But even thuh- thuh worse new:s ah Katherine for uh President
 10 Bush .hhh *is that we have shifted Michigan:: .hh and*d
 11 ((* = voice fades on recording)) Ohio from leaning democratic
 12 to probable democratic.=They are: in double digit s:trength
 13 leads .hhh ((through nose)) f’r thuh democrats. .hhh An:d
 14 if ah: if thuh president cannot win both Ohio and Michigan
 15 .hh he has no chan:ce of being elected. .hThuh pro:blem.hhh
 16 f’r President Bush right now: is there is no: s-state to
 17 really z::ero in on. To concentrate on. .hhh Ah an’ there’s
 18 only two weeks to go.

Although the first item of news is presented as significant, in a variety of ways this second item is portrayed as more so. He frames the latter news item as ‘even the- the worse news’ for President Bush, and he subsequently asserts that without these states Bush ‘has no chance of being elected’ (lines 14–15). It is when he launches into this second news announcement (arrowed) that he addresses the IR by name. Here the address term is introduced immediately after the comparative evaluation (‘the worse news Katherine’) but before delivering the news to which the evaluation applies.

Foregrounding of a different sort may be observed in this excerpt from an interview with Pat Buchanan shortly after he became the Reagan Administration’s Director of Communications. Here the foregrounding involves not merely heightened significance but greater seriousness as well. Just before the live interview began, old film clips were shown of Nixon’s Vice President Spiro Agnew delivering some famous anti-media speeches that Buchanan had written for him years ago. In the very first question of the interview (line 3), the IR refers colloquially to the speechwriting skills exhibited in those old Agnew speeches (‘Kid had a flair for a phrase in the old days . . .’). Buchanan retains this informal, colloquial register in the first part of his response (lines 8–11), which is a self-deprecating and slightly tongue-in-cheek account – note the baseball metaphor (line 10) – of the declining rhetorical skills that supposedly led to his new role as director of communications.

(12) [ABC Nightline, 3 June 1985: Communications Dir. Pat Buchanan]

- 1 IR: .hhhh Joining us live now in our Washington Bureau
 2 White House communications director, Pat Buchanan..hhh
 3 Kid had a flair for a phra:se in the ol’ days. didn’t he.
 4 (1.2)
 5 PB: Y’ say ya talkin’ ‘bout Mist[er Ag]new?=
 6 IR: [()]
 7 IR: =No I’m talkin’ about young Buchanan.=
 8 PB: =Well young Buchanan was a first rate speech writer
 9 ‘n the ol’ days.=He’s lost thuh touch, he’s lost thuh
 10 hop on thuh fast ball I think, an’ uh.hhhhh now they
 11 got me in uh director o’ communications.=
 12 → =But- Ted uh (.) .hhhh those speeches
 13 of Vice President Agnew’s ‘at uh h=why they talked
 14 about no:w: I think thuh reason is thet .hhh thuh
 15 vice president touched a ner:ve there was a certain
 16 ressonance among the American people, .hhhh about what
 17 he had=tuh say an’ what we had=tuh say about then, an’
 18 I think he tabled nationally. .hhhh thee issue. (.) of
 19 media power, .h an’ media bias an’ ah think it was a
 20 legitimate question then.

At line 12, however, both the style and substance of Buchanan’s response shift dramatically. Stylistically, the colloquial and tongue-in-cheek register gives way to a straightforward and serious mode of delivery. This in turn serves as a vehicle for a substantive

defense of the viewpoint underlying those early speeches. This multifaceted shift is marked (arrowed) with a contrastive ‘But’ together with an address term (‘Ted’).

In both of the preceding cases, an address term is used as the IE is proceeding from an initial and relatively ‘peripheral’ component of the turn into a next ‘core’ component that is presented as more serious or more significant. Furthermore, while there is some variation in the exact placement of the address term, in each case it appears within the unit of talk that launches the turn’s second or ‘core’ component, at or near the beginning of that unit and hence before its primary substance is delivered.

Address terms can also be used to mark entry into entire turns that are portrayed as of heightened relevance or importance. Following a question about third-party candidate Ross Perot’s impact on the 1992 presidential campaign, the IE – a Democratic strategist – begins his response by characterizing this as ‘the big question mark in this race’.

(13) [CNN Inside Politics, 20 Oct 1992: Presidential Election]

- 1 IR: Any big Perot influence?
 2 MS: .hhh Yeah I- I think that uh:: (.) the: (.) that is thuh-
 3 → thuh big question mark in this race, Katherine.=Ah: .hhh he
 4 has:: had a:: in one tracking poll:, internal tracking
 5 private poll, he hadda seven point gain: .h as a result
 6 of last night’s debate. .hhh Thuh question i:s does he
 7 keep gaining, .hh and that is a hope r::eally of thuh
 8 Bush people.=That’s their only hope for winning, that he
 9 will keep gain:ing .hh and take away thuh pro chan:ge vote
 10 .hh from Clinton, .hhh ah the: that- that is their only
 11 hope. .hhh Or:: instead d-do you have the u::sual .h ah
 12 reaction near the end of a three way race: .hh while people
 13 say Ah this guy can’t win. .hh And they go back to the
 14 ah frontrunning candidate.

Immediately after this superlative characterization, and before proceeding to elaborate, he addresses the IE by name (‘Katherine’, arrowed).

3.2. Speaking ‘sincerely’

Finally, address terms are associated with a variety of actions – expressions of beliefs, opinions, feelings, intentions, and so on – that are offered as genuine, sincere, or ‘from the heart’. It’s not easy to distinguish this usage from others discussed above, since designedly ‘sincere’ expressions may also be foregrounded and in tension with views embodied in the prior question. Nevertheless, these are not perfectly overlapping sets, and address terms are distinctively positioned within cases involving the display of sincerity. Unlike the tendency toward prefatory positioning within disalignment, address terms here range more freely across the turn constructional unit launching the expression, with most appearing at *the end* of that initial unit. All of this invites analysis as a possibly distinct phenomenon of address term usage.

As an initial entry into this phenomenon, consider that address terms recurrently crop up in environments that are pre-established as calling for the disclosure of sincere views. The first example comes from an interview with Hillary Clinton shortly after the infamous Monica Lewinsky scandal surfaced. As the interview is winding down, Matt Lauer asks Mrs Clinton to reflect on the life choice that she and her family made in pursuing the presidency and coming to Washington five years ago. More specifically he asks, given five years of personal and political attacks, whether the whole experience ‘has been worth it’. That he is asking her to speak *from the heart* and disclose her true inner feelings is apparent in the lead-up to the question (at lines 7–8), which invites her to share the thoughts that she has when she ‘sit[s] home at night’.

(14) [NBC Today, 27 Jan 1998: Hillary Clinton]

- 1 IR: (I have) just a few seconds left. Uh:m based on: whatcha
 2 know now.
 3 IE: Mm hm,
 4 IR: Five years after coming to Washington. Thuh personal
 5 attacks,
 6 IE: [Mm_
 7 IR: [thuh political attacks, .hh Do you sit home at night an’ think
 8 it’s worth it, it has been worth it,
 9 IE: → .hh I do Matt. An’ I’l- An’ I’ll tell ya why:. (.)
 10 #Uh:m# Obviously I’ve thought uh lot about that. Because
 11 .hh this has been: ay grueling ordeal. An’ it has:=uh
 12 required (.) every bit of: .hh religious faith, an’
 13 spiritual resources Bill an’ I have:, It has=uh: (.) been
 14 uh- an incredible personal challenge. .hh But I think about
 15 it in two ways. I believe thuh country is better off because . . .
 16 ((answer continues))

In response, Mrs Clinton affirms that it has indeed been worth it. She does so by matching some of the terms of the question in her initial response (‘Do you . . .’, → ‘I do’), thereby confirming the viewpoint offered in the question while also asserting her epistemic authority on something she has primary rights to know about (Heritage and Raymond, 2005; Stivers, 2005), namely her own feelings about the course her life has taken. Moreover, in the course of expressing such feelings, she addresses the IR by name (‘Matt’).

It bears emphasis that Hillary Clinton does not answer all questions in this way. Earlier in the interview, when asked a series of relatively ‘factual’ questions concerning the Monica Lewinsky allegations (lines 3 and 5 below), her responses remain on this dispassionately factual level and do not contain address terms.

(15) [NBC Today, 27 Jan 1998: Hillary Clinton]

- 1 IR: .hh I- I wanta talk about Kenneth Starr in uh second.
 2 Be- Before I get tuh him let me just ask you
 3 Do you know Monica Lewinsky?
 4 IE: → No. Mm mm. .h[h

- 5 IR: [You've never met her.
 6 IE: → I may have?, Ya know there are hundreds: an' hundreds of
 7 .hh uh young people who serve as interns. An' .hhh ya
 8 know we have (.) big events for them, we take pictures
 9 with them but.hh unless they work directly in my office
 10 I'm: I'm not likely to meet them.

It is only when the questioning shifts from matters of fact to personal feelings, and when she is explicitly asked to express them sincerely, that she chooses to address the IR by name.

Another instance of a question specifically inviting an IE to *speak from the heart* comes from an interview with President Bush concerning conditions in Iraq. Prior to this excerpt, Bush suggested that a recent surge in violence could be a strategic move by some Iraqis seeking to turn US public opinion decisively against the war in advance of Congressional elections. When asked if the Iraqis are indeed trying to influence US elections (line 1), Bush first offers a markedly tentative confirmation ('Could be' at line 2), although he immediately backpedals from this position, noting the lack of intelligence on this point. The IR subsequently pursues the point (line 4) by inviting Bush to address it not as a factual matter but in terms of his 'gut' feelings, thus lowering the epistemic bar as a way of encouraging Bush to say more forthrightly what he has been reluctant to say thus far.

(16) [ABC This Week, 22 October 2006: President Bush]

- 1 IR: So they're trying to influence the elections?
 2 GB: Could be, (.) I d- I don't know I haven't (.) I- I- I-
 3 don't have any intelligence 'at says that, I=
 4 IR: =But what's your gut tell you.
 5 (.)
 6 GB: → tch Uh George (.) I(d)- my gut tells me that they have
 7 (.) all along been tryin' to inflict enough damage that
 8 we leave. .hh And the:: leaders of al Qaeda have (.)
 9 made that very clear.

It is at this juncture that Bush employs an address term (line 6), after which he goes on to express what he himself frames as a 'gut' feeling that the violence is indeed politically motivated. Here again, when the interviewee has been invited to speak from the heart – or from the gut, as it were – we find an address term being deployed in his response.

The clustering of address terms in such environments suggests that they are somehow associated with the action of speaking 'sincerely', but what function do they actually serve? It could be that the address term itself is incidental or extraneous to the action in question. After all, the preceding cases have been pre-constructed by the antecedent question as involving the disclosure of true inner feelings. Address terms could thus be merely accomplice to an action that is brought off by other means. On the other hand, address terms may be more centrally implicated in this action. That is, they may themselves be a

way of ‘doing’ *speaking from the heart*, and if so they could be mobilized in the service of that action even in environments not pre-constructed as such.

Some evidence for the latter perspective arises from instances where address terms are used by IEs when defending against skepticism. A straightforward example can be seen in this excerpt from an interview with a former New York City police detective who had been accused of collaborating with the Mafia and of committing murder. At the beginning of the excerpt, the accused officer avows his innocence (lines 1–3), citing his 23-year tenure as a New York City detective and noting that ‘we’ (presumably, members of the NYPD) ‘don’t go around killing people’. The IR responds with clear skepticism (lines 4–14), pointedly challenging the officer’s claim to innocence and in particular the notion that being on the NYPD is *prima facie* grounds for believing that one is a ‘good guy’.

(17) [CBS 60 Minutes, 28 May 2006: Mafia Cops]

- 1 IE: I was a New York City detective for twenty three years.
 2 (0.4) We don’t go around killin’ people. (.) I did not
 3 kill Eddie Lino. (.)h I’m not a cowboy.
 4 IR: Yeah. But I mean .h being on the police force doesn’t
 5 mean .hh automatically I’m a good guy:.,
 6 IE: No[:
 7 IR: [There’ve been guys on the police force who have killed.
 8 IE: .h Yes:.,
 9 (.)
 10 IR: So that doesn’t- (.) you know that’s not a good (0.7)
 11 answer for me.
 12 (.)
 13 IE: Well=-
 14 IR: =To s[ay I didn’t do it because I’m on the j[o:b
 15 IE: [ih- it’s- it’s- [No.=
 16 IE: =it’s my answer. (.) It’s my answer because .hh
 17 → I have pride in myself Mister Bradley, .hh I wouldn’t
 18 do that. .hh (.) Put my life in jeopardy, my family,
 19 disgrace the badge,.hh disgrace the city,.hh take
 20 everything that I’ve worked for (0.6) my whole life,
 21 (0.5) and throw it away, (0.6) and kill somebody in
 22 the street like a cowboy, (1.0) It’s not my style.=
 23 It’s not me.

The IE counters this challenge, first by re-invoking his previous argument (line 16), and then by reference to self-pride and a desire to avoid personal and professional disgrace (lines 17–23). Immediately, after the avowal of self-pride, and just before the subsequent accounts, he addresses the IR (line 17). Here the use of the more formal last name and title (instead of the less formal first name used in previous examples) may be related to the fact that this particular IE is not a politician or public figure, so that greater social distance separates him from the IR (Brown and Ford, 1961; Brown and Gilman, 1960).

A remarkably similar sequence of events – IR skepticism → IE defense with address term – can be seen in this excerpt involving a newly elected Los Angeles City Councilman. The Councilman initially claims to be a ‘bridge builder’ who is aligned with neither of the two factions that currently divide the council (lines 3–8), and this claim is itself address-term marked (line 4). The IR’s skepticism is apparent in her subsequent question – instead of accepting the ‘bridge builder’ claim, she disregards that claim by pressing him to align with one of the factions (lines 9–11).

(18) [KPCC Air Talk, 5 Nov 2001: Councilman Tom LaBonge]

((IR has been discussing the split within the City Council between the “old guard” and the “young turks.”))

- 1 IR: . . . Where do you come dow:n in here.=are you the swing vote,
 2 (.)
 3 IE: You know that great bridge that crosses the L A River,=
 4 I’m a bridge builder.=Patt, I work with people. I work
 5 both .hh uh: those who’ve been arund and those
 6 who’re- new . . . ((several lines omitted))
 7 . . . So .hh I’m just lookin’ to get us all to work together
 8 for the best interest of all o’Los Angeles.
 9 IR: tch Where do you think your interests lie in terms of one
 10 group or the other.=Are you more aligned with one: are
 11 you more sympathetic with one or the oth[er].
 12 IE: [I’m uh:
 13 sympathetic to everybody who wants to help Los An’les.=>
 14 → I really a:m.=Pa:tt, I’m not intuh: you know I’ve never
 15 been .hh I been w- I- I’ve gotten my great joy outta
 16 public service- (0.2) of doing public service. of helping
 17 people. .hh of bein’ successful.=Not necessarily the
 18 politics of the politics.

Having pursued a factional alignment directly in the face of a claim to non-alignment, the IR conveys skepticism regarding its sincerity. The IE, however, continues to hold to a more unifying political stance (‘I’m sympathetic to everybody who wants to help Los Angeles’, in lines 12–13) and then proceeds without pause to avow his sincerity on this point: ‘I really am Patt,’ (arrowed). It is at this juncture, when explicitly claiming sincerity in the face of previously expressed doubts, that the IE addresses the IR by name.

The Sarah Palin case at the beginning of this article (excerpt 1) provides yet another instance of this pattern (IR skepticism → IE defense with address term). Palin’s denial of a rift between the McCain and Palin factions of the presidential campaign follows a previous exchange (not shown in excerpt 1) in which she had claimed that the campaign was unified and mutually respectful. In this context, the IR’s pursuit of this issue in excerpt 1 challenges that previous claim, and Palin’s response (‘I honestly do not know because it’s not true Matt’) is geared to sincerity both explicitly in its initial framing (‘honestly’) and implicitly via the address term. So here again as in excerpts 17 and 18, an effort to shore up a previous claim in the face of an overt challenge is address-term marked.

In a wider range of cases, address terms are associated with claims being offered in broadly inhospitable environments. IEs are not always responding to overt skepticism, but in other instances they are making claims that they themselves have previously admitted are without a confirmed factual basis (e.g. example 16), or claims that run contrary to their own previous remarks. For an example of the latter, consider this excerpt from the President Bush/Iraq War interview (seen earlier in excerpt 16). The Administration had for many months argued that the US should ‘stay the course’ in Iraq, while accusing anti-war advocates of wanting to ‘cut and run’. But when the IR makes reference to James Baker’s efforts (as co-chair of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group) to formulate an approach ‘between cut ‘n run and stay the course’ (lines 4–9), Bush denies that his Administration’s policy had ever been ‘stay the course’ (lines 10–11). That initial denial (‘Hey listen we’ve never been stay the course George’) is capped off with an address term, which is thereby positioned at some distance from the turn-initial and attention-getting ‘Hey listen’.

- (19) [ABC This Week, 22 October 2006: President Bush]
- 1 GB: . . . and therefore.hh w- w- w’l say to the American
 2 people (0.4) .h we won’t cut ‘n run. (0.7) On the other
 3 hand we’ll constantly adjust our strategy [to ()
 4 IR: [That’s
 5 exactly what I wanted to ask you about ‘cuz James Baker
 6 says that he’s looking for something betwee::n
 7 (0.4)
 8 GB: c[ut ‘n run
 9 IR: [cut ‘n run and stay the course.
 10 GB: → Well- we- hey listen we’ve never been stay the course
 11 → George, .h We have bee:n (.) we will complete the
 12 mission. (1.0) .h We will do our job and help- (.)
 13 achieve the goal but we’re constantly adjusting
 14 the tactics. Constantly.

Here the claim runs contrary not only to assumptions encoded in the previous question, but to what the Administration itself had long publicly advocated and was by then common knowledge.⁴ If address terms are indeed implicated in, rather than merely associated with, the activity of speaking ‘sincerely’, this would account for their recurrent use in inauspicious environments of this sort. Such examples, in turn, provide evidence that at least some address terms may, in some environments, be ‘doing’ *speaking from the heart*.

This practice is plainly useful in a range of action environments where genuineness or sincerity becomes salient. Beyond enabling speakers to express belief in the absence of evidence (as in example 16), or in the face of contrary evidence and outright challenges (as in examples 1, 17, 18, 19), it also facilitates vows and promises that might otherwise come across as hollow and disingenuous. The final example is from the interview with the CEO of Texaco just after the oil company settled a major racial discrimination lawsuit. As the interview is winding down, the CEO is asked if he will take steps to combat

racism not just within his own company but in the wider society (lines 1–4). While most of the previous questions focused on workplace discrimination and cast the CEO himself as uninvolved in the discriminatory acts of which his company was accused, here the CEO's own actions are at issue.

(20) [NBC Nightly News, 15 Nov. 1996: Texaco Lawsuit]

- 1 IR: Ou:tsi:de of thuh company, ou:tsi:de of Texaco and your
 2 duties there, will you take any more pro: a:ctive ro:le
 3 f'r example.hhh in try::ing ta l:ower thuh temperature
 4 on >racism in America?<
 5 IE: → I'll do everything I can To:m.=I: I believe in equal
 6 o:pportunity f'r all:, f'r all men and women of every
 7 color race creed and religion.

The CEO promises to 'do everything I can' (line 5), and he goes on to support this promise by expressing a belief in equal opportunity for all (lines 5–7). But the promise is bolstered not only by the explicit avowal of egalitarian attitudes; it is also bolstered by the appending of an address term, which casts the promise itself as heartfelt.

This particular phenomenon converges with other research on the pragmatics of sincerity in interaction (e.g. Clift, 2001; Edwards and Fasulo, 2006). Given the Gricean insight that interactants are assumed, by default, to be telling the truth, sincerity is *not* ordinarily something that is actively 'done'; it is rather a common taken-for-granted premise of interaction and a basis for conversational implicature. Correspondingly, overt avowals of sincerity embodied in formulations like 'actually', 'in fact', 'to be honest', etc., tend to be restricted to certain specialized contexts that broadly parallel the inhospitable environments seen here. Thus, speakers actively 'do' genuineness or sincerity at moments when they can no longer assume that they will be viewed as such. Address terms, it would seem, can serve as a much less overt resource for similar ends.

4. Discussion

This article began with a puzzle regarding the seemingly redundant use of address terms in broadcast news interviews. Given the overwhelming transparency of address in this environment – a transparency secured by the institutionalized activity structure and participation framework, and reinforced by the participants' non-vocal behavior – why would interviewees ever need to indicate who they are talking to in such an explicit way?

The solution is that address terms here are doing something else altogether, their apparent redundancy mobilized in the service of a variety of other interactional objectives. These include managing certain expressive properties of action – namely its prominence and sincerity – as well as its disalignment from prior talk. For most of these functions, address terms tend to be prefatory to the action in which they are implicated, although when geared to sincerity they range more freely across the action and occur frequently at the end of the turn constructional unit through which it is launched.

The disaligning and foregrounding uses of address terms appear to exploit their attention-soliciting property as a resource. This in turn partly explains why they tend to

be prefatory for such uses, since the resource of recipient attention is best secured in advance of the action for which it is being sought. By means of this practice in this sequential position, address terms can work to highlight the ensuing talk, or cast it as being produced to some extent independently of the prior action.

On the other hand, the later positioning of address terms for speaking ‘sincerely’ suggests that this particular use exploits some other property that address terms possess. Indeed, their later positioning may itself invite the understanding that they are being used *not* to solicit attention in the service of foregrounding or disalignment, but for some other purpose. But what is it that links this particular practice to this category of action? The data examined thus far do not permit a definitive answer to this question. For now it may be noted that address terms, which cast the talk in progress as directed to a singular co-present recipient, have a distinctly personal and intimate quality in the context of broadcasting to a mass audience. They *explicitly* disattend the media audience for whom the interaction is ostensibly being conducted. Perhaps ‘speaking personally’ is a way of indicating that one is not ‘playing to the audience’, which may in turn further the interviewee’s self-presentation as genuine and sincere.

Additional light may be shed on this practice by tracking its use beyond the confines of the news interview to other forms of broadcast talk, as well as its use in the domain of ordinary conversation. It remains for future research to explore the scope of the uses documented here, and to identify others for which address terms may be deployed.

Acknowledgements

Earlier versions of this article were presented at the National Communication Association annual meetings (November 1998), the Western States Speech Communication Association (2002), the Ross Priory Seminar on Broadcast Talk (April 2007), the American Sociological Association annual meetings (August 2007), and a seminar at Saitama University in Japan (September 2007). I am indebted to those in the audience who provided comments. I am particularly grateful to John Heritage, Geoff Raymond, Manny Schegloff, Tanya Stivers, Joanna Thornborrow, and an anonymous reviewer for their helpful feedback on previous drafts.

Appendix: Transcript Notational Conventions

Speech excerpts were transcribed with notational conventions adapted from the standard conventions used in conversation analysis. The transcripts capture the details of speech and audience behavior, although the excerpts in this article have been slightly simplified to enhance readability. Below is a guide to the transcription symbols used here; for a more detailed exposition, see Atkinson and Heritage (1984: ix–xvi).

A: That’s my view.

A: That’s my:: view.

A: THAT’S my view.

A: That’s my- my view.

Underlined items were hearably stressed.

Colon(s) indicate the prior sound was prolonged.

Capital letters indicate increased volume.

A hyphen denotes a glottal stop or “cut-off” of sound.

A: .hhh That's my view.
 hhhh At least for now.

Strings of "h" mark audible breathing. The longer the string, the longer the breath. A period preceding denotes inbreath; no period denotes outbreath.

A: That's (.) my view.
 (1.3)

Numb+note elapsed silence in tenths of seconds; a period denotes a micropause of less than 0.2 seconds.

B: But should it be?

Equal signs indicate that one event followed the other with no intervening silence.

A: That's my view.=
 B: =But should it be?

Brackets mark the onset and termination of simultaneous activities.

A: That's [my view.]
 B: [But shou]ld it

Punctuation marks capture intonation at unit boundaries: period=falling; question mark=rising; comma=slightly rising.

A: That's my view?
 B: But should it be.

Open parentheses indicate transcriber's uncertainty as to what was said.

A: That's my ()
 At (least for now).

Words in parentheses represent a best guess as to what was said.

Notes

1. In this article, the term 'disalignment' will be used broadly to encompass responses that are disaffiliative as well as those that depart from the topic or action agenda set by the previous question.
2. For broader discussions of sincerity in broadcast talk, see Montgomery (1999), Myers (2000), and Scannell (1996, Chapter 3).
3. In both instances in excerpt 2, the address term occurs in conjunction with the discourse marker 'well', and in the same sequential order ('Well David'). The ordering of these items is likely to be systematic. The same holds for the ordering of address terms in relation to 'now' ('Now Jim' in excerpt 4) and 'but' ('but Ted' in excerpt 12).
4. Following this interview, numerous journalists and commentators noted the contradiction, and one opposition website (www.dubyaspeak.com/repeatoffender/stay) documented 40 prior instances of Bush using 'stay the course' to characterize his Iraq policy.

References

- Boyd, E. and Heritage, J. (2006) 'Taking the History: Questioning During Comprehensive History-Taking', in J. Heritage and D.W. Maynard (eds) *Communication in Medical Care*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, R. and Ford, M. (1961) 'Address in American English', *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 62: 375–85.
- Brown, R. and Gilman, A. (1960) 'The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity', in T. Sebeok (ed.) *Style in Language*. New York: Wiley.
- Clayman, S.E. and Heritage, J. (2002) *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures On the Air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clift, R. (2001) 'Meaning in Interaction: The Case of Actually', *Language* 77: 245–91.

- Edwards, D. and Fasulo, A. (2006) "'To Be Honest'": Sequential Uses of Honesty Phrases in Talk-in-Interaction', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 39: 343–76.
- Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Heritage, J. (1985) 'Analyzing News Interviews: Aspects of the Production of Talk for an "Overhearing" Audience', in T. van Dijk (ed.) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol. 3*, pp. 95–119. New York: Academic Press.
- Heritage, J. and Raymond, G. (2005) 'The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Assessment Sequences', *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68: 15–38.
- Heritage, J., Clayman, S.E. and Zimmerman, D.H. (1988) 'Discourse and Message Analysis: The Micro-Structure of Mass Media Messages', in R.P. Hawkins, S. Pingree and J.M. Wiemann (eds) *Advancing Communication Science: Merging Mass and Interpersonal Processes. SAGE Annual Reviews of Communication Research*, Vol. 16, pp. 77–109. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.
- Lerner, G. (2003) 'Selecting Next Speaker: The Context-Sensitive Operation of a Context-Free Organization', *Language in Society* 32: 177–201.
- Montgomery, M. (1999) 'Speaking Sincerely: Public Reactions to the Death of Diana', *Language and Literature* 8: 5–33.
- Myers, G. (2000) 'Entitlement and Sincerity in Broadcast Interviews about Princess Diana', *Media, Culture, and Society* 22: 167–85.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984) 'Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes', in J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action*, pp. 57–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raymond, G. (2003) 'Grammar and Social Organization: Yes/No Interrogatives and the Structure of Responding', *American Sociological Review* 68: 939–67.
- Rendle-Short, J. (2005) "'Catherine, You're Wasting Your Time'": Address Terms Within the Australian Political Interview', *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 1503–25.
- Sacks, H. (1987) 'On the Preferences for Agreement and Contiguity in Conversation', in G. Button and J.R.E. Lee (eds) *Talk and Social Organization*, pp. 54–69. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. and Jefferson, G. (1974) 'A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation', *Language* 50: 696–735.
- Scannell, P. (1996) *Radio, Television, and Modern Life*. London: Blackwell.
- Scannell, P. and Cardiff, D. (1991) *A Social History of British Broadcasting, Volume 1: 1922–1939*. London: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1968) 'Sequencing in Conversational Openings', *American Anthropologist* 70: 1075–95.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1996) 'Turn Organization: One Intersection of Grammar and Interaction', in E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff and S.A. Thompson (eds) *Interaction and Grammar*, pp. 52–133. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2007) *Sequence Organization in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. and Lerner, G. (2009) 'Beginning to Respond: Well-Prefaced Responses to Wh-Questions', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 42(2): 91–115.
- Stivers, T. (2005) 'Modified Repeats: One Method for Asserting Primary Rights from Second Position', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38(2): 131–58.

Steven E. Clayman received his PhD in Sociology from the University of California, Santa Barbara, and is Professor of Sociology at UCLA. His research concerns the interface between language, interaction, and social institutions, with an emphasis on journalism and the mass media. His articles have appeared in leading journals in sociology, communication, and linguistics, and he is the co-author (with John Heritage) of *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air* (Cambridge University Press), and *Talk in Action: Interactions, Identities, and Institutions* (Wiley-Blackwell).