

JOANNA SZCZEPAŃSKA-WŁOCH
Jagiellonian University in Kraków
joanna.szczepanska-wloch@uj.edu.pl
ORCID: 0000-0003-4794-6154

QUESTION(ING) STRATEGIES IN BRITISH POLITICAL NEWS INTERVIEWS: GRILLING THE INTERLOCUTORS AS A STRATEGIC WEAPON

Keywords: political interview, dialogue game, questions as strategies

Abstract

Every dialogue is constrained by a rigid framework, which manifests itself in its linear character (an initial-continuation-counter move structure or a question-answer relationship and dismissal-argumentation order of dialogue), and which illustrates the functional dependencies between sentences or sequences of sentences. The following study focuses on the discourse-pragmatic notion of the interviewer's text-forming strategies, and, in particular, the question-answer relationship of political news interviews in Great Britain. Attention is focused on the questioning strategies employed by Andrew Marr in *The Andrew Marr Show*. Various types of questions within epistemic logic, which act as the strategic repertoire of the participants in dialogue games (Carlson 1983), are examined. The list of question types includes indirect and direct questions, where the former refer to sentential (*yes-no*), search (*wh*-questions), conditional, alternative, tag, ellipted, disjunctive or conjunctive questions (as instances of multiple questions), and the latter to questions presupposing the accomplishment of the specific epistemic state. Andrew Marr, as a dominant participant in this dialogue game, at least with reference to his role that presupposes topic control (selection and change of topics), will use this strategic weapon to influence the politicians' performance and make them account for their political actions.

1. Introduction

Since “to play a game is for each player to choose a strategy” (Hintikka and Kulas 1983: 51), the strategy conceptualizes the course of the game and its outcome (Hintikka

and Carlson 1979: 183). A strategy is a signpost that directs players, signalling what moves to make in every conceivable situation (Hintikka 1979: 23, Hintikka 1996: 294; Hintikka and Kulas 1983: 163), it is a function “whose arguments and values are members of our domain of individuals” (Hintikka and Kulas 1983: 155), and, most importantly, it is an explanatory tool in the reading of natural-language semantics within Game-Theoretical Semantics (GTS). Finally, in the context of this study, it is a linguistic tool enabling the interactants (in this case the interviewer) to engage in a dialogue game.

A strategy of *Myself* (also referred to as *I*, *Verifier*, *Proponent*, *Defender* – the first player) that wins against the strategy of my opponent is termed a “winning” strategy,¹ is expressed by a second-order proposition (Peacocke 1979: 119; Hintikka and Kulas 1983: 27, 36; Hintikka and Kulas 1985: 5), and depicts the truth of the proposition and determinateness of the semantical games. Additionally, *Myself* joins the basic *question-answer game* as the party initiating the first move (question). *Myself* is able to “play the role of the devil’s (nature’s) advocate,” which is equivalent to changing one’s role, in order to verify/check the strategic repertoire of the opponent (Hintikka 1973: 65). *Nature* (also referred to as *Falsifier*, *Opponent* – the second player), in turn, is the party offering the answer. The process of verification of sentence *S* materializes itself with *yes–no* questions phrased by *Myself* and addressed to *Nature*. Strategies must be made known so that the game can reach its end point. Those strategies defined as higher-order functions² (performing the role of arguments) affect the moves in a subgame (Hintikka and Carlson 1979: 183). By the same token, the strategy or strategies employed by the players will remain in a similar reliance as the one/s depicted earlier; they are dependent on or contingent upon moves made in earlier subgames. Interestingly enough, the number of strategies is closely related to the existence of a winning strategy: it is not the abundance of strategies that determines the outcome of the game, but the desired payoff. Additionally, strategies need to be recursive to be operable and computable. The fact that they are non-recursive may prevent the determinateness of the game process (Hintikka and Kulas 1983: 49–50). In addition, a strategy may be perceived as good on the condition that the goals (e.g. the attainment of certain epistemic state) of the first player (the interviewer) are reached.

The above strategic inclination forms a simplified model of a dialogue, in which strategies make up its core and move its components. This, in turn, imposes the systematic and coherent structure of the game situation (Carlson 1984: 5). In consequence, the linearity (i.e. initial-continuation-counter move structure or question-answer relationship) of every dialogue bears upon the “functional dependencies” between the sentences or sequences of sentences (i.e. various functions that sentences

¹ The concepts of “strategy” and “winning strategy” draw heavily on the mathematical theory of games by Luce and Raiffa (1957/1958, *Games and Decisions*) (Hintikka and Kulas 1983: 163).

² A strategy comprised of individual moves from earlier subgames, as well as the opponent’s strategy, the earlier strategy, fulfils a first-order function; the later strategy, which encompasses strategies already revealed or sets of atomic entities, is called a higher-order functional (Hintikka and Carlson 1979: 183; Hintikka and Kulas 1983: 51).

or sequences of sentences serve in a dialogue, Carlson 1983: 58). In summary, the prime purpose of such rules rests on the functional structure established between the related moves.

The above moves (or micro-strategies) establish the linear relationship in a dialogue. These, in turn, can be explicit or implicit depending on the specific goal the player is attempting to accomplish. Both can function as responses or replies, or initiators of a communicative act. Neither has to resemble the preceding move nor does it have to refer to the antecedent component of the previous move, but may correspond to multiple antecedences. Not infrequently, a move (micro-strategy) by one player pertains to the moves (micro-strategies) that have not been explicitly articulated. And it is implicit assumptions that exercise considerable influence on a real life dialogue. However, the implicitness and explicitness of strategic actions should not be reviewed in isolation, since both build a dialogue game.

2. Data presentation

The analysis conducted for this study is based on “naturally occurring” text samples, free from manipulation or reconstruction of the acquired data (cf. Atkinson and Heritage 1984). The data collected in order to investigate the text-forming strategies deployed by the interviewer comprises ten political interviews on the British national broadcaster. They were hosted by Andrew Marr as part of his programme *The Andrew Marr Show*, broadcast by BBC1 on Sunday mornings, with the material originating from between 22 July 2012 and 15 February 2015. The strategic repertoire of the interviewer is composed of different question types (direct and indirect), which can further be systematized by referring to their structure: elementary, conditional, alternative, disjunctive *yes-no*, tag or ellipted questions, as well as declarative sentences performing the role of questions. As a result of the constraints the publication of the results of this study may impose, the presented examples were selected from seventy-seven excerpts that served to depict the discussed research problem. The analysis embarks on as yet unexplored territory and constitutes a necessary complement to comparative research into the strategic repertoire of the interviewees/political actors in Poland and Great Britain, which has so far not been given due attention. Obviously non-exhaustive, since it does not include an analysis of text-forming strategies employed by a Polish interviewer, this study constitutes the starting point for systematic and comprehensive research into the discourse-pragmatic phenomenon of the interviewer’s text-forming strategies. And only when this has been effectuated will the results be comprehensive and definitive. Yet, before the findings are discussed, we shall lay out a methodological foundation for this study. In order to accomplish this task, instances of different question types construed as strategies as delineated by the theory of dialogue games by Lauri Carlson (1983), within Game-Theoretical Semantics, will be considered in order to briefly outline the phenomenon in question. It also needs to be added that the above methodological slant marries formal semantics and the discourse-pragmatic approach to the interviewer’s text-forming strategies.

3. Questions as the Interviewer's strategies

Natural-language semantics within Game-Theoretical Semantics examines various types of questions within epistemic logic that act as the strategic repertoire in dialogue games (Carlson 1983). The list comprises indirect and direct questions, where the former is composed of sentential (*yes-no*), search (*wh*-questions), disjunctive or conjunctive questions, and the latter questions positing the accomplishment of a specific epistemic state (Carlson 1983: 26).

Let us then illustrate the discussed approach with a few examples, moves or strategies in a dialogue game. Example 1 presents an indirect question, which, as Carlson (1983: 24) explicates, is “a double question combining a search question (who?) with a choice question (coffee or tea?)”. He further mentions that “the choice connected with the disjunction *or* in questions is left to the answerer/s” and so is the opponent's move.

Example 1

Who wants coffee or tea?

Example 2 is an instance of eliciting questions that may suit several purposes. Not only can the parties involved in a dialogue game agree on a topic, but the party issuing the question can also engage their interlocutor in a conversation through the skilful formulation of the question (“Do you know what I have here?”, Carlson 1983: 113). A quintessential example of this strategy that reflects its sarcastic nature is as follows:

Example 2

A: Is Reagan republican?

B: Is the Pope catholic? (Carlson 1983: 114).

The answer to the question posed is self-evident, therefore the interlocutor employs a stratagem that will presuppose the obviousness of the answer. Speaker A has to infer the correct response to the question addressed, which, needless to say, is positive.

An implied question, handsomely illustrated with questions and the process of deduction by Sherlock Holmes (Carlson 1983: 100–101), is framed as a direct question:

Example 3

A: Who is the murderer?

The murderer wears square-toed boots.

Who wears square-toed boots? (Conan Doyle 1905 *online*).

To explicate the above example, we need to touch upon the principles underpinning the process of question formation and the dialogue game. A question understood as a request shall be handled with a desideratum meeting the condition of truth-value (Carlson 1983: 100–101): a desideratum in the form of a declarative sentence that results in a further sentence or question. The rationality of the player's actions is reflected in the selection of consistent (*viz.* satisfiable and logical) alternatives, and is indicative of the rationality of the interlocutors' actions.

A “three-person dialogue” (Carlson 1983: 115) is composed of three players (cheerleader applicants, see Example 4), of whom only one knows the answer to a question topic (i.e. whether they have been accepted as members of a cheerleader group), the remaining two do not. The one that possesses the strategic advantage over the other two outmanoeuvres her interlocutors by asking a question, in lieu of disclosing her state of knowledge:

Example 4

A: Did you make it?

B and C: I don't know.

A: So we all made it!

The author of the above type of question attempts to embellish the exchange with a witty retort, rather than supplement the epistemic field of her interlocutors with additional information.

A *rhetorical question* is “the erotetic counterpart of sarcastic (or ironic) assertions” (Carlson 1983: 126), as it demonstrates the player's willingness to conclude a conversation or the topic covered, i.e. to show disinterest or even ignorance:

Example 5

A: What will Jack say?

B: Who knows? (Carlson 1983: 118).

This rendition of sarcasm or irony is pragmatized via the *irony convention* (*Put forward a sentence only if you accept its contrary*) that collates speakers' beliefs and the words spoken. In addition, the dismissal or denial of the presupposition of the question may as well be indicative of a rhetorical question. The question is phrased, yet the utterer does not expect a response:

Example 6

Isn't this delicious?

Yet another type of question, i.e. an *elementary question*, relies on only one answer in the declarative form. The veracity of the assertion is likewise yielded via an interrogative sentence (i.e. the opposite of the presumed answer). A list of semantically elementary questions not substituted by a disjunctive (*yes* or *no*) form was proposed by Bolinger (1978a, in Carlson 1983: 124–125). He provides us with *loaded* questions and *guesses*. Declarative answers are to be received when loaded questions are framed (e.g. invitations: “Do you want some?”, self-evident facts: “Are you still around?”, one-way questions: “John, are you awake?”, self-answering questions: “Do you realize that today is the tenth?”, ritual questions: “OK, is everybody ready?”, or requests: “Will you help me?”), whereas superordinate search questions serve as a foundation for guesses (e.g. suggested answers to search questions: “What's the matter? Are you tired?”, specification questions: “Is today the seventeenth?”, or queried inferences: “Does he always snore?”).

The typology of questions would be incomplete without *tag* and *echo questions*. The first type is contained in anaphoric, elliptic and question formation means, and

is thematically related to the assumptions made. The second type, in turn, manifests itself in sentential (polarity) echo questions:

Example 7

A: I am hungry.

B: You are hungry?

A: Yes, I am hungry. (Carlson 1983: 133).

that copy the assertion made, yet follow a different intonation pattern; and search (*wh-*) echo questions:

Example 8

A: I am hungry.

B: You are what?

A: I am hungry. (Carlson 1983: 133).

which replace the words uttered that would otherwise hinder the construction of the presupposition of the assertion. The above type of question relies on the usage of the interrogative pronoun or a question word (Carlson 1983: 130–136). Further, echo questions can fulfil the role of quiz questions: they do not echo the claims made, or court questions, and hence take the end position in the sentence (Bolinger 1978b: 131).

Now, let us move on to the application of this strategic perspective within GTS to the political news interviews and particularly to a dogged style of questioning employed by Andrew Marr.

4. A dogged style of questioning

The indisputable originator of the dogged style of questioning is Jeremy Paxman, former host of *Newsnight* on BBC Two. Known for “grilling” his interlocutors, Paxman “mercilessly” held “politicians to account until they crumbled under the limelight” (Wyatt 2014). His flagship interview was conducted in 1997 with the then Home Secretary, Michael Howard. Paxman’s “victim” was asked twelve times: “Did you threaten to overrule him?”. According to the BBC’s homepage, this interview was to stall Howard’s political career.

4.1 Indirect disjunctive (*yes or no*) questions

An equally dogged and relentless style of questioning has been adopted by Andrew Marr. And, similarly to Paxman, he repeatedly asks the interviewee (Ed Miliband) – five times – about the same area of interest, yet, in contradistinction to Paxman, not using the same question:

- (1) A.M.: (*over*) **Will you bring it down from the £26,000 per...**
 E.M.: (*over*) Well, look, on the housing benefit issue...

- A.M.: (*over*) Yeah it's the total per household I'm talking about.
 E.M.: Well, on the overall welfare cap what we've said is [...]
 A.M.: **Okay. So will you bring it down from £26,000 – yes or no?**
 E.M.: Well, what we've said very clearly is that we want a cap overall on the welfare...
 A.M.: **Yes or no?**
 E.M.: ... on the welfare budget, and we're going to look at how we do it exactly in the right way because unless you...
 A.M.: (*over*) **But down from £26,000 – yes or no? It's a very straightforward question.**
 E.M.: (*over*) Well, look, we're open to... we're open to that. But let me just...
 A.M.: (*over*) **So it will come down?**
 E.M.: No, but let me explain, Andrew [...]
 (Excerpt 1, 11 January 2015)

The interviewer begins his questioning with the disjunctive *yes* or *no* form. He elaborates by further specifying the issue and making use of one of the three types of relations between clauses presented by Halliday (1985; Fairclough 2008), i.e. elaboration. Again, he repeats the question allowing the interviewee to choose between “yes and no”. The message is further reinforced and cut short to “yes or no?”. The question “But down from £26,000 – yes or no? It's a very straightforward question” does not take a standard form, since no auxiliary verb has been used, just the coordinating conjunction “but”, the adverbial particle “down”, £26,000, which is the substance of the question, and the “yes or no” phrase supplemented with a clause explaining the purpose of the question. The final question in this exchange illustrates a final effort expended to receive an answer and is an instance of a declarative question with a final rising intonation, which acts as an inference consequential upon the opponent's previous moves. Additionally, the end position of yes-no can even be more emphatic and can attribute presuppositions to a greater extent (Bolinger 1978a). It is conducive, hence it indicates that the speaker is predisposed to the type of answer he is expecting and is simply inviting the hearer's verification. It has a positive orientation, thus it only accepts assertive items (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 233–236).

Andrew Marr's persistent and evaluative questioning style manifests itself in testing the interlocutor with loaded questions. It is relatively easy to see their two-fold nature, yet it is particularly difficult to yield satisfactory responses or the given context. The *yes/no* question presented below verifies the diplomatic skills of Nigel Farage, or, more probably, has been framed to demonstrate or remind the audience of the somewhat hard-lined and unconventional views of the interviewee. We can infer that the interviewer is fully aware of the interviewee's answer, as can be evidenced by the use of the adverb “still”.

- (2) A.M.: And are you **still** in favour of people with long-term conditions like HIV not being allowed into this country because of the health consequences?
 (Excerpt 2, 25 January 2015)

4.2 Indirect conditional question

Another common method of interrogation is performed by means of a hypothetical condition, which may imply that the interviewer doubts whether the condition will be fulfilled or indeed whether it will take place at all:

- (3) A.M.: **But if you were prime minister, you would be open to the possibility of more surveillance powers and open to the possibility of more funds for the security services?**
- (4) A.M.: **So you would take part in a debate if there was no prime minister on the other side of the studio?**

(Excerpt 3–4, 11 January 2015)

Both excerpts are from the interview with Ed Miliband, the Labour Party leader at the time, who was campaigning in his attempt to win the 2015 general election. The use of the 2nd Conditional by the interviewer may suggest that the interviewer seriously doubts the Labour leader will govern the country or win a majority in Parliament, which is confirmed by the interviewer himself, who, however, mitigates his prognosis with a modal verb (“might”):

- (5) A.M.: It’s to win an overall majority, I’m sure.
E.M.: (*over*) I want to put for... put forward... Good answer. I’m putting forward...
A.M.: (*laughs*) But I’m suggesting that you **might** not make it.

(Excerpt 5, 11 January 2015)

4.3 Indirect alternative question

Dissatisfied with the result of the questioning, the interviewer decides to elaborate on the topic and make the desideratum of the question complete, i.e. attain the epistemic state. He achieves his aim by employing an alternative question resembling a *yes–no* question:

- (6) A.M.: **Is that ludicrously too high, ludicrously too low?**

(Excerpt 6, 5 January 2014)

which may be a reduced version of:

- (7) Is the number I have just provided ludicrously too high or is it ludicrously too low?

Still another example of an ellipted form of an alternative question:

- (8) A.M.: Broadly speaking, do you think immigration at the levels we’ve seen over the last ten years has been **good for Britain or bad for Britain?**

(Excerpt 8, 5 January 2014)

which might be taken as a reduced version of:

- (9) Broadly speaking, do you think immigration at the levels we've seen over the last ten years has been good for Britain or do you think immigration at the levels we've seen over the last ten years has been bad for Britain?

4.4 Matching-polarity tag question

The matching-polarity tag (a tag question where the statement and question are either positive or negative; i.e. either double positive or double negative) can be used to merely confirm the assumption/s of the speaker. The speaker (here the interviewer) is unbiased in eliciting the information from the interviewee, thereby the analyzed tag question can be understood as presupposition free (cf. Carlson 1983: 133). Although this type of tag question is not preceded by the inferential "so" or exclamatory "oh", which are said to characterize such a tag question (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990), the premise or assumption inferred from the information available is rather a conjecture than a firm statement. What the interviewer expects is to hear confirmation of this conjecture (cf. Carlson 1983). We cannot, however, ignore the sarcastic overtones of this type of tag question.

- (10) A.M.: What about taxation, you'd like to bring the rate down from 45p to 40p, **would you?**

(Excerpt 10, 5 January 2014)

4.5 Indirect *wh*-questions and positive *yes-no* questions

What is conspicuous in the following excerpt from the interview with Nigel Farage is the barrage of questions that the interviewee faces, which include the use of two *wh*-questions at the beginning and close of the turn, and three positive *yes-no* questions acting as alternatives to one another. Interestingly, these express the heterogeneity or polyphony of discourse, which may prove to be an effective strategy that either the interviewer or the interviewee can deploy. A discursive subject can explicitly or implicitly address both his/her own and the interlocutor's opinions. It can operate at the level of text structure, modality, linguistic styles or genres. The presence of numerous speakers in every discourse becomes an inherent part of heterogeneity, and it is often somebody else's parlance that is a constitutive element of one's speech.

In this example the polyphony of discourse is expressed via a parenthetical remark. The interviewer echoes his interlocutor's words, yet is intrigued by their meaning. He turns to the audience to express his doubt not only concerning "a good number" (a parenthetical comment), but also about Nigel Farage performing a leading role in British politics (*if*-clause).

- (11) A.M.: And with a good number of MPs, **however that is, if** you find yourself in the happy position of holding the balance of power and exercising influence, **how will you use that influence? Would you join the Conservatives as allies? Would you join a coalition? Would you be outside as a kind of flying buttress to the Conservatives? How would you act?**

(Excerpt 11, 25 January 2015)

4.6 Declarative quasi-casual remark as a question type

In the exchange below a laconic comment in the form of a response token suffices to provoke the interlocutor. Andrew Marr does not attempt to overtly disagree with Nigel Farage, yet his standpoint can be easily inferred. Despite the interviewee's endeavours to take the floor and articulate his own argument, the interviewer manages to voice his claim. This example demonstrates that a turn in the dialogue game does not need to abound in linguistic complexity in order to be winning. And, as Brandenburger and Nalebuff (1998: 121) maintain, a shortage may be more profitable than a surplus.

- (12) N.F.: Well, I'm afraid there's some quite strong documentary evidence and we've been investigating this. There are some big open questions in Brussels about money. And the final straw on Friday, a Hastings meeting that took place in West Yorkshire where gerrymandering appears to have taken place. Now that added to his ...

A.M.: (over) **Well...**

N.F.: (over) **Hang on.** His... That added...

A.M.: (over) **I have to keep saying that he denies all this.**

N.F.: **Well, he can deny that, but I tell you what he can't deny** and that's his continuing associations with political extremists from Pakistan despite us saying please, please keep away.

(Excerpt 12, 25 January 2015)

4.7 Direct elementary question

A question that has only one answer in declarative form and the answer to which is its presupposition (since a negative answer would equal denial of a presupposition), and which is often framed in news interviews, is an elementary loaded question. By way of illustration, let us consider a one-way question: a question that does not call on the negative answer (Bolinger 1978a; cf. Carlson 1983: 124) from the interview with Ed Milliband:

- (13) A.M.: Now in the mood of cross-party harmony that we're discussing here, you are going to be voting as the Labour Party for the government's legislation on the deficit reduction programme. **I'm right about that – in the House of Commons – yes?**

(Excerpt 13, 11 January 2015)

In the excerpt provided the interviewer expresses disbelief concerning the Labour Party's plan of action, for it would appear to be extremely improbable that the government and the opposition are in agreement. To receive an explicit answer from the leader of the opposition, the interviewer does not follow the canonical rule for the formation of interrogatives, i.e. an auxiliary verb (both modal and non-modal) + a subject or an interrogative *wh*-element, an auxiliary + subject, but forms an affirmative sentence in the function of a question with "yes" having a rising intonation.

“Yes” at the end of the sentence presupposes only one answer, in all likelihood – an affirmative answer. This form of questioning resembles a declarative question with the final rising intonation (e.g. “You realize what the risks are?”, Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 235) and is used to ask the interlocutor to verify the information presented earlier. It has a positive orientation, hence entails an assertive item.

5. Conclusion

The strategic paradigm propounded by Hintikka (1979, 1996, 2000) and Hintikka and Kulas (1983), according to which language should be perceived as a goal-oriented process, builds the foundation for the study into the strategic repertoire of political actors. This strategic perspective consists of the analysis of text-forming strategies, which consequently enclose the study of individual moves. In turn, the question-answer pattern within the theory of dialogue games (Carlson 1983), with questions and answers construed as moves, furthers the objectives of this study. As Heritage and Greatbatch (1991) specify, and with whom it appears to be necessary to agree, news interviews include turn-taking schema following an explicitly structured process, in which the roles of the interviewer and interviewee are precisely defined. Hence, the interviewer’s role appertains to the process of addressing questions following a code postulating objectivity, impartiality and neutrality. However, it cannot limit itself to simply being “mouthpieces or ciphers” (cf. Heritage 2003: 57), but watchdogs or “devil’s advocates” (cf. Clayman and Heritage 2002), who carefully scrutinize the information presented and test the politicians’ accountability, which can be observed in the interviews analyzed. The design of the questions may facilitate the challenge with which a politician is confronted. Neither choice is satisfying and neither brings advantage. What they bring is the continuous alertness and readiness that a politician needs to display, since the traps are baited. From a discourse-pragmatic perspective, the interviewer’s role rests on the supplementation of the much-needed information to the audience/potential voters about the political agenda of the politicians interviewed. The interviewer endeavours to wield a considerable influence not only in the political, but also social arena. And it is precisely the language or its linguistic realization that facilitates this task. It may be inferred that the more probing and dogged questions with which politicians are addressed, the greater the chance that politicians will finally have to address them. The implications that follow may pertain to the attainment of a certain epistemic state that may be a decisive factor in winning or losing elections.

The interviewee’s role, in turn, is to receive the responses to the questions posed with no “initiating actions” (such as unsolicited comments on prior talk) or sequences (for example, asking questions to which the interviewer or other interviewees would be obliged to respond) (cf. Heritage and Greatbatch 1991: 97–98; Montgomery 2011: 36). Both the interviewer and interviewee assume pre-arranged roles resulting in recurrent forms of interrogation/initiation and response. It can be inferred that the evasive character of the politicians’ turns, so prevalent in their responses,

may be resultant upon the adversarial nature of questioning, which necessitates them, as it were, to assume such a role, and act as a critical determinant of the politicians' public accountability.

In summary, the interviewer in the question-answer game is no longer a passive recipient or initiator of an exchange, but may actively participate in said interaction (cf. Potter and Wetherell 1987: 165; Kvale 2010: 130). And there appears to be nothing out of the ordinary in attempting to engage in the dialogue game, since the knowledge that the interviewer might obtain during this process via text-forming strategies (questions phrased) may assist both the addressees (politicians) and the audience (potential voters) to accomplish their own purposes, even if these are somewhat divergent.

References

- Atkinson J.M., Heritage J. 1984. *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bolinger D. 1978a. Yes-no questions are not alternative questions. – Hiz H. (ed.). *Questions*. Dordrecht, Boston, London: D. Reidel: 87–105.
- Bolinger D. 1978b. Asking more than one thing at a time. – Hiz H. (ed.). *Questions*. Dordrecht, Boston, London: D. Reidel: 107–150.
- Brandenburger A.M., Nalebuff B.J. 1998. *Co-opetition*. New York: Currency Doubleday.
- Carlson L. 1983. *Dialogue games*. Dordrecht, Boston, London: D. Reidel.
- Carlson L. 1984. *Well in dialogue games. A discourse analysis of the interjection "well" in idealized conversation*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Clayman S.E., Heritage J. 2002. *The news interview: Journalists and public figures on the air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Conan Doyle A. 1905. *The return of Sherlock Holmes*. London: Georges Newnes. [available at: [retn.pdf \(sherlock-holm.es\)](http://retn.pdf(sherlock-holm.es)), accessed: 10 March 2020].
- Fairclough N. 2008. *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Greenbaum S., Quirk R. 1990. *A student's grammar of the English language*. Harlow: Longman.
- Halliday M.A.K. 1985. *Introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Heritage J. 2003. Designing questions and setting agenda in the news interview. – Glenn P., LeBaron C., Mandelbaum J. (eds.). *Studies in language and social interaction: In honor of Robert Hopper*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum: 57–90.
- Heritage J., Greatbatch D. 1991. On the institutional character of institutional talk: The case of news interviews. – Boden D., Zimmerman D.H. (eds.). *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press: 93–137.
- Hintikka J. 1973. *Logic, language-games and information. Kantian themes in the philosophy of logic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hintikka J. 1979. Language-games. – Saarinen E. (ed.). *Game-theoretical semantics*. [= *Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy* 5]. Dordrecht, Boston, London: D. Reidel: 1–26.
- Hintikka J. 1996. *Ludwig Wittgenstein: Half-truths and one-and-a-half-truths*. Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hintikka J. 2000. Game-theoretical semantics as a challenge to proof theory. – *Nordic Journal of Philosophical Logic*. vol. 4: 127–141. [available at: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1a1e/1d6da68a32c9071ecf02679bed637f2cb8d3.pdf>. accessed: 21 June 2022].

- Hintikka J., Carlson L. 1979. Conditionals, generic quantifiers, and other applications of subgames. – Saarinen E. (ed.). *Game-theoretical semantics*. [= *Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy* 5]. Dordrecht, Boston, London: D. Reidel: 179–214.
- Hintikka J., Kulas J. 1983. *The game of language*. *Studies in game-theoretical semantics and its applications*. Dordrecht, Boston, London: D. Reidel.
- Hintikka J., Kulas J. 1985. *Anaphora and definite descriptions*. Dordrecht, Boston, London: D. Reidel.
- Kvale S. 2010. *Prowadzenie wywiadów*. [transl. by A. Dziuban]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Luce D.R., Raiffa H. 1957/1958. *Games and decisions*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Montgomery M. 2011. The accountability interview, politics and change in UK public service broadcasting. – Ekström M., Patrona M. (eds.). *Talking politics in broadcast media: Cross-cultural perspectives on political interviewing, journalism and accountability*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 33–55.
- Peacocke C. 1979. Game-theoretic semantics, quantifiers and truth: comments on Professor Hintikka's paper. – Saarinen E. (ed.). *Game-theoretical semantics* [= *Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy* 5]. Dordrecht, Boston, London: D. Reidel: 119–134.
- Potter J., Wetherell M. 1987. *Discourse and social psychology*. London: Sage.
- Wyatt D. 2014. *The Independent* (Wednesday, 18 June 2014). [available at: <https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/tv/features/jeremy-paxman-s-best-newsnight-interviews-9310918.html>, accessed: 16 March 2022].

