

THE USE OF CO-CONSTRUCTIONS IN RUSSIAN TV AND RADIO POLITICAL
INTERVIEWS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF VLADIMIR POZNER AND ALEXEY VENEDIKTOV)

by

Anna Fomchenko

Copyright © Anna Fomchenko 2021

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF RUSSIAN AND SLAVIC STUDIES

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2021

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Master's Committee, we certify that we have read the thesis prepared by Anna Fomchenko, titled *The Use Of Co-Constructions In Russian TV And Radio Political Interviews (On The Example Of Vladimir Pozner And Alexey Venediktov)* and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Master's Degree.



Dr. Liudmila Klimanova

Date: Aug 20, 2021



Dr. John Leafgren

Date: Aug 20, 2021



Dr. Peter Ecke

Date: Aug 20, 2021

Final approval and acceptance of this thesis is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copies of the thesis to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this thesis prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the Master's requirement.



Dr. Liudmila Klimanova
Master's Thesis Committee Chair
Russian and Slavic Studies

Date: Aug 20, 2021 

ARIZONA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor, Dr. Liudmila Klimanova, for her continued support and incredible patience with me. Thank you, Dr. Klimanova, for your encouragement, advice, and suggestions regarding this work. I cannot thank you enough for all that you have done for me.

I would like to thank the head of the Russian and Slavic Studies Department, Dr. Leafgren, for the invaluable support and help provided to me during my studies at the department, for patience and understanding.

I would like to thank my beloved family – my mom, sister, grandmother, and stepfather, for their continued support and prayers, for their faith in me and unconditional love.

A very special thank you to my dad who taught me how to think and write; who is in heaven now and who, I am certain, helped me to overcome my fears and anxiety, and I was able to finish this work.

And, of course, thank you God and the Universe for making all things possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	5
ABSTRACT.....	6
CHAPTER I.....	8
CHAPTER II.....	13
CHAPTER III.....	22
CHAPTER IV.....	30
CHAPTER V.....	54
CHAPTER VI.....	60
APPENDIX A.....	63
REFERENCES.....	64

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. The frequency of occurrence of co-constructions.....	31
Table 2. The time of occurrence of co-constructions in each interview (min:sec).....	59

ABSTRACT

The present study investigates the use of co-constructions (or sentences-in-progress) in Russian TV and radio political interviews. The author analyzed ten political interviews conducted by Russian journalists Vladimir Pozner (TV interviews) and Alexey Venediktov (radio interviews). The analysis demonstrated the following results. Co-constructions in political interviews serve several distinct purposes. They are used (1) to obtain necessary information, (2) to correct facts provided by interviewees, (3) to ask questions, (4) to establish contact with interviewees and maintain it during the interview, (5) to express agreement and affiliation, (6) to express disagreement and negative assessment, (7) to supply a forgotten word or string of words. The use of co-constructions is influenced by personalities of conversational participants. The results of the analysis showed that the frequency of occurrence of co-constructions on TV and radio interviews is the same. The study follows the analytical framework based on conversation analysis.

Keywords: conversation analysis, co-construction, joint construction, sentence-in-progress, compound turn-constructive unit, radio interview, TV interview.

The best way to communicate is Morse code. What you click is what you get. Unambiguous signal. That is why our language is unique because it all depends on who speaks, to whom, and when, what they both read, how they relate to each other, whether it is Wednesday or Friday, whether they speak jokingly or seriously.

– Tatyana Chernigovskaya, a Soviet and Russian scientist in the field of neuroscience, psycholinguistics, and theory of mind.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Media discourse and media itself have received increased attention of researchers over the past few years. The power of the media forces researchers to explore various techniques that are used by the media to influence the audience. As Marina Zheltukhina (2016) states, “Mass media is based on the use of manipulative influence” (p. 295). Not only do mass media provide society with news, but they also influence society. In addition, different media represent different political parties, and confrontation between them often leads to information wars, in which each party tries to stand up for their truth. The audience witnesses such media confrontations, and it becomes difficult to understand who is right and who is wrong in the conflict. Journalists, being the main force of the media, often become those who can resolve the conflict. Journalists collect and process information, inform the audience, and communicate with the authorities.

With the rapid development of technologies, the relationship between political sphere and media is becoming ever closer. Politicians are less likely to communicate with the public directly and more often do it indirectly – through interviews on television, radio, print media, and social networks.

Political interview which is the focus of this study differs from other interview types. The purpose of a political interview is to explain and promote a certain political idea, address and solve an important issue. In such an interview, the interviewer is a journalist whose task is to monitor and control the changes in communicative roles, because politicians often try to take the floor and expect that they will be given the opportunity to substantiate their position (Tintin & Sinu, 2016). In addition to controlling communicative roles, journalists strive to ensure that the discourse of the interviewed politician is perceived by the audience. The final goal of

political interviews is to reach an understanding with the audience on key issues related to domestic and foreign policy issues.

Often, journalists use great courage to reveal information that politicians do not want to show to the public. To achieve this goal, journalists use a number of strategies, including linguistic techniques, psychological pressure, and even manipulation. Journalists' manipulations are determined by their goal to obtain necessary information from interviewees – something that politicians do not want to disclose (facts, statistics, different types of data, etc.). Journalists who work with such a genre as interview directly communicate with interlocutors and have many opportunities to influence them.

One of the linguistic techniques used to influence interlocutors in interviews is co-construction (other names are sentence-in-progress, unit-in-progress, joint construction, collaborative unit). The term “co-construction” came from conversation analysis that was chosen as the methodology for this study as it will allow to see in great detail how language is used by journalists to achieve specific goals of an interview.

Although journalistic interviews are planned, there is a significant degree of spontaneity, especially in semi-structured interviews. At first, it may seem that any spontaneous conversation is a chaotic, disorganized instance. Sacks', Schegloff's, and Jefferson's theory of conversation analysis (1974) proves the opposite and allows researchers to look at conversations as a set of organized units. Whether it is an official interview, a political debate, or a casual conversation with friends, these interactions are all treated by conversation analysis as organized collaborative structures. In the theory of conversation analysis, conversations are governed by and produced inside the turn-taking system: each speaker is entitled to talk until he or she reaches a point of possible turn completion, and another speaker takes a turn to talk.

Co-construction was defined by Harvey Sacks, founder of conversation analysis. Later, the concept of co-construction was greatly developed by Gene Lerner who defined co-constructions as “single sentences that are produced across the talk of two (or more) speakers” (Lerner, 1991, p. 441). With co-constructions, conversations become interactional, and participants are able to maneuver in a single talk changing and redirecting the topic.

Lenore Grenoble (2013) was the first linguist to examine the manipulative purpose of co-constructions in Russian political interviews. In her 2013 study, she looked at the use of co-constructions in radio political interview and casual conversations between relatives. Grenoble highlighted different purposes that co-constructions serve in conversations. In a casual interaction between friends and relatives, co-constructions are used by participants to express solidarity, agreement, and involvement. In radio political interviews, participants use co-constructions to manipulate each other, influence and redirect the topic, and fill in a pause (Grenoble, 2013). Manipulative strategies are used by journalists to obtain information, collect more details, and reveal hidden facts.

Lenore Grenoble looked at the use of co-constructions only in radio interviews. This led me to explore the use of co-constructions in TV interviews and then compare them with those found in radio interviews.

The current study investigates the use and distribution of co-constructions in Russian public political interviews recorded on TV and radio. Comparative analysis will be conducted in order to explore purposes co-constructions serve in TV and radio political interviews. It can be assumed that co-constructions occur more often in TV interviews. The first reason for this is that long pauses, or “dead air,” are unacceptable on the radio (Stephenson, Reese, and Beadle, 2013), therefore, conversational participants may avoid long pauses by using co-constructions. The second reason lays in the specifics of radio and TV. On TV, unlike on radio, journalists

can see non-verbal signs such as gestures, facial expression, body language, etc. Such non-verbal elements often speak for themselves, and if non-verbal communication signals interviewee's discomfort, a journalist should move to the next question following the rules of ethics (Avraamov, 2003). Finally, long pauses on TV are acceptable and can frequently occur, therefore, journalists may not need to use co-constructions in order to fill in a pause.

To test the hypothesis, ten interviews conducted by two of the most influential and famous Russian journalists Vladimir Pozner and Alexei Venediktov were selected. The significance of this study lays in the specifics of the material analyzed. Political interviews are socially important as they create a space, in which the most important social problems are being addressed, discussed, and resolved. A journalist in such a space interacts with the guest and takes part in addressing and solving the problem. Success of the interview highly depends on journalists and their ability to establish and manage a contact with interviewees, navigate conversations, and obtain information. The study is significant as it will allow to see how, by using joint constructions, journalists use their ability to address important social problems and take part in solving them.

This study is intended to answer the following questions:

1. What purposes do co-constructions serve in Russian TV and radio public political interviews?
2. What are the differences and similarities of using co-constructions in TV and radio political interviews?
3. What influences the use of co-constructions in Russian TV and radio political interviews?

The study will follow the framework based on conversation analysis (Sacks et al., 1974). The methods of conversation analysis will be used to analyze co-constructions grammatically and semantically.

The study has the following structure: Chapter II provides a general overview of what co-constructions are as well as the specifics of the Russian political interview; Chapter III illustrates methodology used in this study as well as the description of data; Chapter IV provides detailed analysis of co-constructions found in the selected interviews; Chapter V is the discussion of the findings and reflection on them; Chapter VI provides concluding remarks and limitations of this study.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the theory of conversation analysis, conversations are organized instances governed by the turn-taking system. The fundamental component of this system is a turn-constructive unit (TCU), the basic unit of a conversation. To be considered a TCU, a unit must be grammatically, pragmatically, and intonationally complete. If one of these criteria is not met (for example, a unit is not complete intonationally), a unit cannot be considered a TCU. Turn-constructive units may be lexical ('yes,' 'here'), phrasal ('in a classroom,' 'not here'), clausal ('when I graduate,' 'if it doesn't rain'), sentential ('I am going to the store,' 'I like my dog') (Sacks et al., 1974).

According to the turn-taking system, each speaker is entitled to talk until he or she reaches a point of possible turn completion called a transition relevance place (TRP). Conversation analysis highlights several signs of TRP: pauses, falling intonation, syntactic and semantic completion. Speakers easily recognize these signs and take their turns to talk. A smaller unit created within one turn-constructive unit is called a co-construction, which is the focus of this study.

The structure of co-construction was first described by Sacks et al. (1974) and later elaborated by Lerner (1991). Other names for co-constructions include sentence-in-progress, utterance-in-progress, joint construction, unit-in-progress. The example below illustrates a typical co-construction:

Speaker 1 Excuse me can you give me that umm

Speaker 2 → book?

Speaker 1 reaches a potential transition relevance when saying “umm,” and it gives Speaker 2 a signal that they may take a turn and complete the utterance started by Speaker 1. Therefore, the utterance (hence a TCU) “Excuse me, can you give me that, umm, book?” was built by two speakers. The utterance was started by Speaker 1 and completed by Speaker 2.

Co-constructions are formed by multiple (two or more) speakers and have the following mechanism: one speaker starts talking, reaches a TRP, another speaker picks up on the prior utterance and completes it. What makes it possible for co-constructions to occur? Gene Lerner (1991) identifies several instances when it happens.

First, and the most common is an *if/then* sequence when the first part of a sentence consists of an *if* part, and the second part is completed by another speaker with a *then* part. In Russian, this sequence is equivalent to the *если (бы)/то(бы)* sequence. The example below illustrates this sequence.

Speaker 1 If there is rain tomorrow

Speaker 2 → then we’ll stay home.

In talk-in-interaction, co-constructions are often used to construct lists. This type of joint construction is possible when the second part of an utterance logically fits the first one. List structure is a projectable feature of talk. In the list structure, semantic completion is prioritized over syntactic completion. The example below illustrates the principle of the list structure.

Speaker 1 First they take the intermediate level

Speaker 2 → and then they take the advanced level.

Lerner also distinguishes a type of co-construction built with the interjection *well* (the Russian *ну*), which signals disagreement. Here, it is important to mention that co-constructions

do not only demonstrate agreement or affiliation: “The co- prefix in co-construction is intended to cover a range of interactional processes, including collaboration, cooperation, and coordination. However, co-construction does not necessarily entail affiliative or supportive interactions” (Jacoby & Ochs, p. 171, 1995). The following example illustrates a co-construction built with the interjection *well*.

Speaker 1 They say it takes a lot of time

Speaker 2 → well not necessarily.

The *well* projects an upcoming component that will demonstrate disagreement with the prior turn. Other markers that signal upcoming disagreement include *but*, *yes but*.

Sometimes in conversations participants may quote someone. Then they will use quotation markers such as “she/he says/said,” “they say/said.” In this instance, the first utterance will consist of a quotation marker, and the second utterance will continue the previous one by adding onto it a quote itself.

Speaker 1 I wish they told me

Speaker 2 → why don’t you come over

Speaker 1 yeah.

Lenore Grenoble (2013) distinguishes two types of co-construction: *extensions* and *completions*. Extensions are simply tacked on the prior utterance: one speaker talks, reaches a transition relevance place, and another speaker extends that utterance by adding a new component onto it. Extensions do not require a syntactic host and can be added as long as they are semantically and pragmatically appropriate and fit the overall context.

Speaker 1 And she took us with her ↓

Speaker 2 → on her car

Speaker 1 yes.

In completions, the first component typically projects the second one, so even if the first speaker does not reach a transition relevance place, co-construction may still occur. Common formation of a completion is to pick up on the relative pronoun *kotoryi* (equivalent to English which/that/who) and add a new component onto it (Grenoble, 2013). The example below illustrates this principle.

Speaker 1 He wrote many books that

Speaker 2 → became world famous.

Russian, as a morphologically rich language, gives many opportunities for joint constructions to occur. In Russian, the first part projects the second, but it also restricts it in some ways (Grenoble, 2013). For example, if there is the word *kotorye* in the first part of a co-construction (which is who/that/which in nominative or accusative plural), then the second part must syntactically match.

It is a common situation when one speaker does not reach a transition relevance place, and another speaker will still be able to complete the turn. This becomes possible because (1) speakers share the linguistic system that involves a shared syntax, and (2) there is a projection, based on shared syntax and common knowledge shared by all conversational participants. Shared syntax and projection are the two main features of co-constructions. Here, it is important to note that co-constructions differ from interruptions (which are the violation of the turn-taking system (Sacks et al., 1974)) in that all components of co-constructions are always built one upon another.

The focus of this study is on joint constructions in journalistic interviews. Joint constructions serve different purposes in casual conversations and political interviews. In

casual conversations, they are used to express solidarity or agreement, or to make a joke. The purposes that joint constructions serve in interviews are different and include obtaining information, disclosing and correcting facts, expressing disagreement (Grenoble, 2013).

The interview is deservedly one of the most popular journalistic genres. Journalists across the world favor the interview because of the unique characteristics of this genre. These characteristics include direct communication with a speaker, an interactive mode of transmitting information, readability, ease of perception. The interview can be an instrument for obtaining information or an independent journalistic genre. In this work, the focus will be on the interview as an independent journalistic genre.

As defined by Maria Lukina (2003), “an interview between a journalist and an interlocutor is a conversation between two people who do not just exchange information, but create a new information product – relevant, socially significant, and intended for publication” (Lukina, 2003). One of the main features of a political interview is social significance. Journalists conduct political interviews not only to satisfy the audience’s curiosity, but to solve an issue, or bring it up for discussion. Talking through the problem together, journalists and their interviewees can reveal hidden problems and issues in society.

An interviewee may be seen as a person who is of great interest to the public (usually, figures of popular culture, so-called “pop-stars”). In this case, the interview will look more like a talk between friends, where one shares details of a personal life. Another situation is when an interviewee is seen as a specialist in a specific field – medicine, politics, culture, art, science, etc. In this case, the interview will take an entirely different course. A journalist will treat an interviewee as a source of information and, in some cases, may pressure him or her in order to obtain important information.

Not only is the interview one of the most popular and common genres in the media space, but it is also one of the most difficult genres. Success of the interview directly depends on a journalist. A journalist has to do some important work prior the interview: read other interviews with a future guest to avoid asking the same questions, read about the guest to know him/her better, etc. A journalist should be aware of non-verbal signals and recognize them when talking to an interviewee. A journalist should carefully work through the question list. Composing questions is an important stage of preparation for the interview. Depending on a purpose of the interview, the questions and the manner of questioning will vary. Finally, a journalist should establish and manage contact with interviewees and be able to maneuver in a conversation when needed.

The ability to maneuver a conversation is an essential skill for a journalist. One may never know what response to a question will be. An interlocutor may take a pause to think or use transition words to delay an answer. These and other signs inform journalists that they may (or should) take a turn and start speaking. Lukina (2003) highlights a number of verbal and non-verbal expressions which signal a journalist to take a turn. These expressions include falling intonation, difficulties completing a phrase, interlocutor's gestures showing his or her wish to change the topic or move to the next question, interlocutor's use of transition words.

One of the ways to navigate the interview is to use special questions. Mikhail Shostak (1998) discusses two types of questions: an interruption question (*vopros-perebivka*) and a prompt question (*vopros-podskazka*). A journalist uses an interruption question to clarify an interlocutor's response or expand the topic ("Ah, speaking of that!"). Shostak states: "The interruption question often clings to the word or some expression, repeats it, "ponders it" and – cleverly turns the conversation" (Shostak, 1998). With a prompt question, a journalist completes an interviewee's reply, attempting to get interviewee's acceptance or rejection of a

guess. With a prompt question, a journalist can provoke an interlocutor by completing a reply or asking follow up questions such as “Did you mean that..?”, or “So, are you saying that..?” and other similar constructions.

As a former journalist, I used these types of question very rarely. I did not want my interviewees to be interrupted and lose their trains of thought. I wanted them to be as open and sincere with me as possible, so I would give them as much time to think and as needed. However, it is different in political interviews. Specific feature of such interviews is that they do not reflect just an individual opinion, but the point of view of an official government, political party, or movement. The politician may try to completely ignore the rules established by the journalist and follow their own logic and the course of the interview (Tintin & Xinu, 2016). Therefore, the journalist’s ability to control communicative roles and navigate the conversation course is essential in political interviews.

Another reason why TV and radio journalists should be able to navigate the course of the interview is the editing opportunity. In print media journalists can always edit interviews, cleaning it from everything unnecessary, just like if they were polishing a marble statue. On TV and radio, this practice is nearly possible because everything happens in “real” time. Whatever is said by interview participants on the radio will go to the audience right away. On TV, interviews will be published without much editing. Therefore, the journalist’s ability to maneuver on radio or TV conversation using special questions and other linguistic constructions is important for the success of the interview.

By using various linguistic techniques, journalists have the opportunity to criticize, apply pressure and construct situations that are difficult for the interviewee to cope with. In political interviews journalists can place politicians in situations, in which they have a significant risk of failing at their public persona. However, the interviewee is not powerless:

successful politicians develop strategies for handling difficult interview situations (Tintin & Xinu, 2016).

In their study, Maria Kuzmina and Svetlana Jufkina (2017) discuss the manipulative techniques journalists use on TV to pressure interviewees and keep the attention of the audience. One of these techniques is similar to what was discussed earlier – an interviewer completes a response for their interviewees. Kuzmina and Jufkina write that this strategy has a negative impact because it leads to misunderstanding, loss of conversation flow, and interlocutor's negative reaction (Kuzmina & Jufkina, 2017). However, when we talk about political interviews, in which each “party” (e.g., participant) has its own agenda and opinion, such a technique is beneficial.

Due to its specific characteristics, political interview is a difficult genre, and only an experienced journalist can handle this type of an interview. In a political interview, like in no other interview type, it is especially important for a journalist to control changes in communicative roles and be able to maneuver a conversation. Why? Politicians who represent government policies or interests of their political faction, will try to defend their interests and policies. Politicians often have their own view on events, which they will want to convey to the audience, and which may not coincide with the wishes of the audience. It is always common that politicians hide some important information or do not want to discuss certain events and news which are of the importance to the audience. This is when a talented journalist will try to obtain important information and disclose hidden facts. There are multiple techniques that are used by journalists in political interviews, one of which is joint constructions.

It is important to note that compound turn-constructive units give conversational participants an opportunity to build joint constructions by asking a question, correcting facts, asking for clarification, establishing contact, etc. However, it may not necessarily mean that

these opportunities will be used. As Lerner states, “Though a compound turn-constructive unit provides an opportunity for anticipatory completion, it does not require it; that is, the opportunity is sometimes taken and sometimes not taken [...]. Completion of a compound turn-constructive unit-in-progress by another participant is sequentially possible but not necessarily sequentially required or implicated” (Lerner, 1991, p. 454). That is why the question of a journalists’ ability to use these opportunities is relevant for this study.

This chapter gave a general overview of what co-constructions are, what type of co-constructions exist, what makes it possible for them to occur in conversations, and specific characteristics of the political interview. The next chapter provides description of methodology and data. I will start the chapter by introducing conversation analysis as a methodology; I will then proceed with the justification of the choice of conversation analysis as an analytical method in this study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND DESCRIPTION OF DATA

The current study follows the framework based on conversation analysis, which was developed in the 70s of the last century. There is a number of linguists who were involved in the development of conversation analysis, but the main person is Harvey Sacks. Sacks was able to draw people's attention to the fact that conversations are central to the social world (Isupova, 2002). Language is the oldest and most influential social institution. Through everyday conversations people explore the world, and large part of the processes takes place precisely through conversations and interactions. Speech is a powerful tool, and through conversations we can expect motives and goals of the participants in the conversation. In addition, what we say and how we respond often depend on what we are told. Conversation analysis does not only look at verbal components of interactions, but it also pays close attention to non-verbal components (gestures, eye movements, pauses, sighs, etc.), which play a significant role in analyzing conversations (Ulanovskij, 2016).

One of the premises of conversation analysis is that even the smallest detail (even if it is non-verbal) in people's utterances can be significant to the interaction (Ekström, 2007). For psychology and related fields, conversation analysis as a method is interesting in that it makes it possible to look at the processes of conversation interaction (both individual and group) in a detailed and systematic way.

Conversation analysis is directly related to ethnomethodology, the main concern of which is ordinary, everyday activities and behavior (Garfinkel, 1996). One of the main ideas of conversation analysis is that what people do in relation to each other is best understood through detailed studies of naturally flowing conversations (Ekström, 2007). Today, ethnomethodology and conversation analysis are considered a single theoretical tradition, in

which the former sets a general methodology, and the latter provides specific research tools (Ulanovskij, 2016). It is important to note a significant difference between conversation analysis and classic sociolinguistics: conversation analysis considers simple everyday conversations to be important as they provide a great basis for the analysis. Interestingly enough, initially speech events such as interviews, individual diaries and people's stories about various events were not accepted as a basis for analysis due to lack of spontaneity. However, later even these types of speech events became acceptable because they have a certain degree of spontaneity. For example, a response in an interview can drastically change its course.

For conversation analysis, conversation data plays an important role: on the basis of these data, an analysis of interactional moves is conducted, and only then conclusions are drawn. The hypotheses are not formulated before the analysis (Isupova, 2002). In this regard, conversation analysis is closely related to phenomenology, "the study of essences...the philosophy for which the world is always 'already there' before reflection begins" (Merleau-Ponty, 1996, p. 7). Conversation analysis can be considered as the phenomenology of conversation. CA fully responds to the key principles of phenomenology in that it studies everyday, ordinary activities, avoids prepared hypotheses, pays attention to details and contexts (Ulanovskij, 2016).

From this point of view, conversation analysis is the opposite of interaction process analysis developed in psychology by Robert F. Bales, who identified the system of categories that describes the main types of participants' behavior in group interactions (Bales et al., 2009). Even though this scheme is convenient for the analysis of group discussion and is still used in practice, it contains a number of disadvantages. The system of categories contains only twelve types of participants' actions. The system turns out to be predetermined and simplifies the

complexity of interaction. Finally, Bales' system ignores the situational context for the sake of quantitative indicators (the frequency of occurrence of behavior types).

In conversation analysis, interactions are not selected on the basis of pre-formulated theories that determine the greater or lesser significance of a particular feature. When researchers begin their analysis with concrete details of the actual actions, they do not initially know what exactly is interesting in the materials they examine. In other words, conversation analysts can make anything the subject of the analysis and find something interesting in it. Moreover, since we do not know in advance what exactly will be interesting, there is no reason to consider some data more suitable for analysis, and some less (Korbut, 2015).

Conversation analysis is an empirical, observation-based approach. It is not just the study of language, but the study of the social interaction between people, which occurs precisely with the help of language. Therefore, the main focus of conversation analysis is not language itself, but how it is used in interactions and activities performed when people talk. Conversation analysis studies language in its relation to society and societal processes.

In the theory of conversation analysis, conversations are organized instances governed by the turn-taking system. The turn-taking system was developed by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974). After listening to recordings of various conversations, they concluded that there should be a system that governs conversations of all types. Because every talk is situational and has a certain context, there should be a universal model that could be used to analyze any conversation. The turn-taking system allows one to look at all types of conversations as organized structures.

Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) highlight the main features of the turn-taking system: (1) change of speakers recur, (2) one speaker talks at a time, (3) numbers of speakers vary, (4) occurrence of more than one speaker at a time is common, but brief, (5) transitions

from one turn to a next with no overlap are common, (6) turn order is not fixed, (7) turn size is not fixed, (8) length of conversation is not specified, (9) what speakers say is not specified in advance, (9) distribution of turns is not specified in advance, (11) talk can be continuous or discontinuous, (12) turn-allocation techniques are used but not always, (13) various TCU are employed (lexical, phrasal, clausal, sentential), (14) repair mechanisms exist for managing turn-taking errors and violations (Sacks et al., 1974).

One of the main premises of conversation analysis is that any speech, even the most spontaneous, is organized. CA treats all conversations as organized structures. The most noticed and investigated aspect of the speech exchange system is the turn-taking organization, by which participants talk mostly one at a time and relate to one another during their respective turns. Analysis of how turns are constructed, what they do in relation to each other, and how they form sequences in interaction are central issues in CA. Conversation analysis is concerned with three broad areas: 1) the structure of a conversation, 2) social interaction, and 3) a context. The analysis of the context in this case means the analysis of utterances in their close connection with what was said before and after them, as well as the speaking environment (courtroom, school classroom, doctor's office, etc.) (Ulanovskij, 2016). Conversation is best understood as a sequence of turns. Ekström writes: “This methodological strategy assumes that the best way to determine what an utterance means in a certain context is to observe how others (the next speakers) relate to it through their utterances. Utterances and ‘turns’ are always in some way a methodological answer to a given situation or problem created by the previous turn” (Ekström, 2007, p. 965-966).

As was stated in the previous chapter, the main component of this system is a turn-constructive unit (TCU), the basic unit of a conversation. To be a TCU, a speech unit must be grammatically, pragmatically, and intonationally complete. For example, the phrase “With

my friend” can be considered a turn-constructural unit only if it is grammatically, pragmatically, and intonationally complete.

In the turn-taking system, each speaker is entitled to talk until he or she reaches a point of possible turn completion called a transition relevance place (TRP). Conversation analysis highlights the following signs for a TRP: pauses, falling intonation, syntactic and semantic completion (Grenoble, 2013). Speakers easily recognize these signs and start speaking, which makes a conversation happen without or with minimal overlap.

Conversation analysis in journalism studies is used to analyze interviews in a direct, systematic, and detailed way. Using conversation analysis as the method will allow researchers to scrutinize the interview transcript in order to understand how turn-taking is organized in public political interviews, to examine linguistic choices made by journalists and politicians, and analyze their relationship during the interview. Conversation analysis reveals how language and particular linguistic techniques are used to achieve the goals of a political interview. It makes it possible to examine how, with the help of joint constructions, the participants in the conversation establish contact between each other, express personal assessment, affiliation, or disagreement.

Conversation analysis is one of the approaches that needs to be considered when analyzing interviews. This analytical instrument allows researchers to examine changes in journalism and interaction in the public sphere in general. Because conversation analysis does not stick to pre-formulated hypotheses, we are open to any conclusions, and it is another benefit of conversation analysis. Our interpretation of conversational dynamics is based entirely on the evidence we find in conversation data. Only after a close analysis of interviews, will we be able to see some tendencies and trends in public political interviews today.

Applied use of conversation analysis in this study includes the following: recording material on the media, selection of episodes for analysis depending on the goals of the study, transcription of the selected episodes, analysis of the selected episodes, interpretation of the selected episodes with the goal to identify typical characteristics of communication and draw comparisons with similar cases in other conversations, reflect on the analysis and draw conclusions.

Data for the present study comes from the recordings on Russian TV and radio. Interviews that were selected for the study were conducted by two of the most and influential Russian journalists today. The first set of data are TV interviews conducted by Vladimir Pozner, a French-born Russian-American journalist who co-hosted a joint television venture “Space Bridge” with Phill Donahue during the Cold War and who now works on the Russian federal channel “Channel One”. The second set of data are the interviews conducted by Alexey Venediktov, a Russian radio journalist and editor-in-chief of the independent radio station “The Echo Moscow”.

These two journalists often conduct interviews with famous politicians. I chose to analyze political interviews because this type of interview is characterized by active discussion of sensitive topics. Common topics of political interviews include but are not limited to economy, education, immigration, finances, voting, unemployment, corruption, etc. When discussing such sensitive topics, journalists attempt to get important information and details from an interviewee. It is important to remember that political interviews always have an agenda and a particular focus on socially important matters. Political interviews are socially significant, and a journalist plays an important role in obtaining information from a politician and taking part in addressing, discussing, and solving the problem. Interviewing a politician

requires journalists to have special skills and know strategies to be able to communicate with this type of an interlocutor, unpack hidden meanings, and resolve a conflict.

A conflict is often present in political interviews. In her study, Sandler (2017) writes about confrontational interviews as a separate type of an interview. A confrontational interview is a special strategy, the purpose of which is to put an interviewee in a difficult position and encourage them to go beyond what they say in a conversation (Sandler, 2017). Sandler focuses on Vladimir Pozner's confrontational interviews and highlights their main features: provocative and prompt questions, interruptions, and psychological pressure.

Another study focused on Pozner's interviewing style was conducted by Galina Shmakova (2015). The study demonstrates that Pozner uses a number of manipulative techniques with a purpose to provoke and reveal his interviewees (Shmakova, 2015). These techniques include logical tricks, rapid change of conversational topics, interruptions, reference to previous interviews of interviewees followed by a request to explain what they meant (Pozner's favorite technique). It is proved by Galina Shmakova that Pozner, indeed, manipulates guests, puts them into awkward situations making them answer provocative questions and explain themselves (Shmakova, 2015).

While Pozner is a powerful figure on TV, Alexey Venediktov rightfully bears the title of the most influential radio interviewer, as well as one of the most famous oppositionists in Russia. Venediktov was the focus of Lenore Grenoble's study (2013) where she discussed joint constructions as one of the manipulative strategies used by Venediktov in his interviews. In addition, Grenoble states that joint constructions in radio political interviews are used with the purpose to fill in a pause and redirect or change the topic (Grenoble, 2013).

For this study, ten interviews conducted by Vladimir Pozner and Alexey Venediktov were selected. Five interviews come from *Pozner*, a TV-show where Vladimir Pozner conducts

interviews with famous figures. Another set of data comes from “Radio Echo Moscow” – interviews conducted by the journalist Alexey Venediktov. Interviews were selected from the newest to the oldest and according to the following criteria: an interviewee must be a political figure, the length of each interview varies from 45 to 70 minutes. Topics of the selected interviews include immigration, coronavirus and pandemic, voting, education, socioeconomic situation in Russia and its regions, Russian economy. Each interview was analyzed, and joint constructions were identified. Then each segment with a joint construction was manually transcribed using CA transcription notation guidelines by Ochs (1979) (see Appendix). The oldest selected interview is dated July 21, 2019, the newest, March 16, 2021. This study focuses on the use and distribution of co-constructions in the selected interviews.

The next chapter will present the analysis of joint constructions found in the selected interviews and discuss specific characteristics and purposes of joint constructions which occurred during these TV and radio public political interviews.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter examines the use and distribution of co-constructions in public political interviews conducted by Vladimir Pozner and Alexey Venediktov. Ten interviews were analyzed: five were conducted by Pozner, and another five, by Venediktov. Table 1 shows the name of each interviewee, the topic of each interview, its length, and the number of co-constructions found in each interview.

Before the analysis, it is important to note that Vladimir Pozner works in a federal TV channel. Pozner does not pose himself as an oppositionist, unlike Alexey Venediktov who is famous for his anti-Putin opposition views and is one of the most famous oppositionists in Russia today. In his interviews, Venediktov often criticizes Russian authorities and Putin's policies.

I will start by looking at the first five interviews, conducted by Vladimir Pozner in his TV program *Pozner*, then I will proceed to analyzing the radio interviews conducted by Alexey Venediktov on "Radio Echo Moscow." I will analyze and typify each co-construction that was manually transcribed using CA transcription conventions outlined by Ochs (1979) (see Appendix).

In the first interview (*Pozner*, Nov. 18, 2019), Pozner's interviewee was Konstantin Zatulin, a Russian politician, first deputy chairman of the committee of the State Duma for the CIS and relations with Russian nationals abroad. The speakers talked about compatriots in other countries, about obtaining Russian citizenship, and Russia's relations with the former Soviet republics.

Table 1

The frequency of occurrence of co-constructions.

Interviewer	Interviewee	The topic and date of the interview	Length of interview	Number of CC
Vladimir Pozner	Konstantin Zatulin	Immigration, foreign affairs (11/18/2019)	51:14	3
	Mikhail Murashko	Coronavirus (04/06/2020)	52:23	4
	Tatiana Golikova	Coronavirus (12/28/2020)	48:04	2
	Ella Pamfilova	Amendments to the Constitution, voting system in Russia (06/29/2020)	52:26	3
	Valeriy Falkov	Education during the pandemic (06/15/2020)	53:57	2
Alexey Venediktov	Mikhail Khodorkovsky	Amendments to the Constitution, Putin's policies (01/07/2021)	53:33	3
	Alexey Vorobjev	Socioeconomical situation in Moscow Oblast' (11/20/2020)	45:46	5
	Alexey Nechaev	New political party "New people," coronavirus in Moscow Oblast' (03/16/2021)	48:13	2
	Dmitry Bykov	Current political and societal situation in Russia (03/03/2021)	48:21	2
	Maxim Oreshkin	Economic situation in Russia (07/21/2019)	1:10:05	2

In the first excerpt (1) speakers talk about the process of receiving Russian citizenship. This excerpt contains two co-constructions that were possible because speakers share a common knowledge about how the Russian immigration service works and about intermediaries who help migrants obtain the Russian citizenship faster.

(1) *Pozner, V. Pozner and K. Zatulin (16:19-16:34)* – completion type, extension type.

1 KZ Tam tozhe po ocheredi hodjat ljudi i govorjat hotite bystree
 2 VP → mozhem pomoch
 3 KZ mozhem pomoch
 4 no esli est' takie ljudi kotorye mogut pomoch
 5 znachit v samom centre rabotajut ih partner
 6 kotorye v obshhem eto vse i obespechivajut
 7 VP → kotorye tozhe pomogajut.
 8 KZ da, pomogajut.

1 KZ There too people walk in turn and say do you want it faster
 2 VP → we can help
 3 KZ we can help
 4 but if there are people who can help
 5 it means that their partners who work in the center
 6 who in general provide all this
 7 VP → who also help.
 8 KZ yes, they help.

The co-construction in line 2 is a completion type, in line 7 it is an extension type. The co-construction in line 2 was formed by the question/answer sequence. Pozner picks up on Zatulin's utterance "*hotite bystree?*" (do you want it faster?) in line 1 and literally answers it in line 2 – "*mozhem pomoch*" (we can help), which, in turn, is followed by Zatulin's acceptance of Pozner's remark, and he repeats: "*Mozhem pomoch*" (we can help).

The second co-construction in line 7 is formed by using the list structure. The list contains two characteristics of people who work in immigration offices: (1) they provide intermediaries who help migrants receive the Russian citizenship faster, and (2) they themselves help migrants. What makes the list possible here is the relative pronoun *kotorye* (Nominative plural; the English equivalent of “who”). Pozner picks up on a relative pronoun *kotorye* (who) in line 6 and completes it in line 7 – “*kotorye tozhe pomagajut*” (who also help).

Co-constructions take place here because the interviewer and the interviewee share common knowledge, and the interviewer predicts what the interviewee intends to say. In addition, we can assume that Pozner intends to show the audience how work in Russian immigration offices is organized and receive either acceptance or rejection from Konstantin Zatulín. Therefore, co-constructions produced in this excerpt can be interpreted as Pozner’s attempt to reveal how Russian immigration service works. Zatulín does not argue with Pozner and easily confirms what he says.

In the next excerpt (2), speakers discuss the relations with two former Soviet republics – Armenia and Azerbaijan.

(2) *Pozner*, V. Pozner and K. Zatulín (44:00-44:06) – extension type.

1 KZ Ved’ my zhe odinakovo pytaemsja vyderzhat’ kak by
 2 i ravnoudalenie i ravnopriblizhenie
 3 VP → da no odinakovo ne nraivitsja ni tem ni drugim
 4 KZ da mozhet byt’ ne nraivitsja,
 5 no s Armeniej u nas dogovor o voennom sojuze,
 6 Azerbaijan etogo net.

1 KZ After all we are equally trying to maintain
 2 both equidistance and approximation
 3 VP → yes but it is equally not liked by both

- 4 KZ yes maybe they do not like it
 5 but we have an agreement on a military alliance with Armenia
 6 but not with Azerbaijan.

The co-construction in line 3 contains both affiliation and disagreement. Pozner agrees with Zatulín's point (*da* (yes)) but extends it by adding his disagreement. This joint construction is formed by the same mechanism as those that are formed with the word "well" (the Russian *nu*) – in this instance, the joint construction does not express affirmation. Pozner picks on the word "*odnakovo*" (equally) and adds to it: "*Da, no odnakovo ne nraivitsja ni tem, ni drugim*" (yes but it is equally not liked by both). Again, like in the previous excerpt (1), Zatulín agrees with the journalist.

I am now proceeding to the second set of co-constructions, which was derived from Pozner's interviews with Mikhail Murashko (*Pozner*, Apr. 6, 2020), the Russian doctor and politician serving as the Minister of Health of the Russian Federation since 21 January, 2020.

The first instance of co-construction occurs in the very beginning of the interview. It plays a significant role and puts Mikhail Murashko in a certain position. In line 4, Pozner says: "*a sejchas otvechaete*" (and now you are responsible). By saying this, Pozner prepares Murashko to say things carefully because he is now, indeed, responsible for the whole country.

(3) *Pozner*, V. Pozner and M. Murashko (1:49-2:03) – extension type.

- 1 MM Prihodilos' togda fakticheski v kruglosutochnom rezhime nahoditsja na svjazi ↓
 2 VP → nu raznica v tom chto vy togda ne otvechali za vse
 3 MM nu za vsju stranu net
 4 VP a sejchas otvechaete
 5 MM da a sejchas za vsju stranu.

- 1 MM Back then I had to work day and night ↓
 2 VP → well the difference is that then you were not responsible for everything

- 3 MM well not for the whole country no
 4 VP and now you are responsible.
 5 MM yes and now for the entire country.

This excerpt illustrates multiple changes within one turn-constructural unit. Pozner picks up on line 1 and adds “*nu raznica v tom, chto vy togda ne otvechali za vse*” (well the difference is that then you were not responsible for everything). He continues his own thought in line 4: “*a sejchas otvechaete*” (and now you are responsible). Murashko is put in a position in which he has no opportunity to deny that now he, as the Minister of Health, is responsible for medicine and health in the entire country. Pozner forces Murashko to accept this: “*Da, a sejchas za vsju stranu*” (yes, and now [responsible] for the entire country).

In the excerpt below (4), speakers discuss what defines the pandemic and what is not included in its definition. In the excerpt, Murashko is referring to the World Health Organization, apparently trying to say that this organization knows better how to define the pandemic. In line 2, Murashko reaches a transition relevance place, the change of speakers occurs, and Pozner completes the turn in line 3, which is followed by Murashko’s confirmation in line 4. In this excerpt the journalist takes the initiative and supplies a missing word.

(4) *Pozner, V. Pozner and M. Murashko (13:39-13:45)* – completion type.

- 1 MM Nu ja dumaju
 2 chto vsemirnaja organizatsija zdravooxranenija ↓
 3 VP → razbiraetsja
 4 MM razbiraetsja.

- 1 MM Well i think
 2 that the world health organization ↓
 3 VP → knows better
 4 MM knows better.

In the next excerpt (5), speakers talk about the average percentage of deaths caused by coronavirus.

(5) *Pozner, V. Pozner and M. Murashko (22:31-22:35)* – extension type.

1 MM V srednem gde to tri i chetyre poka

2 VP → nu eto vse taki vysokij procent

3 MM nu vysokij procent.

1 MM On average it is something like three point four so far

2 VP → well it's quite a high percentage

3 MM ok a high percentage.

Before saying that the average percentage of death from coronavirus is 3.4 percent, Murashko mentioned that this percentage is not high. Then he says in line 1: “*V srednem gde to tri i chetyre poka*” (On average it is something like three point four so far), which is immediately followed by Pozner: “*nu eto vse-taki vysokij procent*” (well it's quite a high percentage). The use of *nu* (well) projects an upcoming component that will disagree with the prior turn. Murashko is forced (which was clearly demonstrated by his facial expression) to agree with Pozner: “*nu vysokij procent*” (ok a high percentage). This excerpt illustrates how Pozner excellently completes his journalistic duty by making his interviewee say the truth that percentage of death from coronavirus is actually high, although initially the interviewee said it was not high.

In the next excerpt (6), speakers discuss methods and strategies of fighting coronavirus. Murashko says that in some countries, people do not do anything to fight the pandemic, which is followed by Pozner's disagreement.

(6) *Pozner, V. Pozner and M. Murashko (35:48-35:58)* – extension type.

1 MM → Tam zhe est' variant nichego ne delat' da kak nekotorye strany

2 VP nu etoj zhe mery ne sushchestvuet

- 3 MM nu
 4 VP nichego ne delat'
 5 MM nu nekotorye strany
 6 VP a nu eto drugoe delo.
- 1 MM → There is an option to do nothing like in some countries
 2 VP well this option does not exist
 3 MM well
 4 VP to do nothing
 5 MM well in some countries
 6 VP ah well that's different.

Similar to (3), there are multiple speakers' turns within one turn-constructive unit. Speakers discuss ways to fight coronavirus, and when Murashko says "*tam zhe est' variant nichego ne delat'*" (there is an option to do nothing like in some countries), Pozner immediately picks up on it saying "*nu etoj zhe mery ne sushhestvuet*" (well this option does not exist). This remark makes Murashko clarify his thought, which he does in line 5: "*nu nekotorye strany*" (well in some countries) – and this clarifies that "doing nothing" is not used as the method of fighting coronavirus in Russia, according to the interviewee.

The next interview I analyzed was Pozner's interview with Tatiana Golikova (*Pozner*, Dec. 28, 2020), the Russian politician and economist who has served as the Deputy Prime Minister of Russia for Social Policy, Labor, Health and Pension Provision since 2018.

The first co-construction occurs at the eighth minute of the interview, and it is a rare situation when a co-construction is completed by the interviewee. The speakers discuss an important problem of preparing doctors in the situation of the pandemic. These days, doctors are in demand like they have never been before.

(7) *Pozner*, V. Pozner and T. Golikova (7:58-8:04) – extension type.

- 1 VP Podgotovit' vracha nu eto piat' let
- 2 odnogo
- 3 TG → minimum
- 4 VP minimum.

- 1 VP To prepare a doctor well it is five years
- 2 just one [doctor]
- 3 TG → minimum
- 4 VP minimum.

Co-construction in line 3 is an extension type. This is an excellent example when the interviewee does not try to argue with the interviewer, but, on the contrary, helps him to highlight the problem of preparing doctors – the problem of time.

In the next excerpt (8), speakers discuss the number of deaths caused by coronavirus and the impact of coronavirus on the course of other diseases from which people have died. Golikova talks about the registration of acts of civil status, and she notes that Russia maintains an accurate record of diseases that caused people's death. Then Golikova begins to talk about the fact that full autopsies have become very common in the entire country (line 1), to which Pozner immediately reacts in line 2: *"Everywhere in the country?"* (vo vsej strane?), which in turn is confirmed by Golikova in line 3. The co-construction is used by Pozner to ask a question.

(8) Pozner, V. Pozner and T. Golikova (19:00-19:04) – extension type.

- 1 TG U nas stoprotsentnoe vskrytie ↓
- 2 VV → vo vsej strane
- 3 TG vo vsej strane.

- 1 TG We have one hundred percent autopsy ↓
- 2 VV → everywhere in the country
- 3 TG everywhere in the country.

The guest in Pozner's next interview was Ella Pamfilova (*Pozner*, June 29, 2020), the chair of the Central Election Commission of Russia since March of 2016. The central topic was the second amendments of the Constitution of Russia of 1993, which were proposed in January 2020. The first co-construction occurs in the beginning of the interview.

(9) *Pozner*, V. Pozner and E. Pamfilova (10:17-10:30) – completion type.

- 1 VP Vot v konstituciju v kotoruju vnosjat sejchas popravki
- 2 ona byla prinjata v devianosto tretjem godu
- 3 EP da
- 4 VP tozhe v rezultate vsenarodnogo...amm
- 5 EP → golosovanija
- 6 VP vsenarodnogo golosovanija
- 7 EP prjam tak i zapisano
- 8 VP da.

- 1 VP So the constitution which is now being amended
- 2 it was ratified in [nineteen] ninety three
- 3 EP yes
- 4 VP too in the result of nationwide...umm
- 5 EP → voting
- 6 VP nationwide voting
- 7 EP that is how it is written
- 8 VP yes.

The co-construction in line 5 is an extension type. Pozner takes a pause in line 4 and lets Pamfilova complete the utterance.

In the next excerpt (10), the co-construction in line 5 helps maintain a contact between interlocutors.

(10) *Pozner*, V. Pozner and E. Pamfilova (20:00-20:03) – completion type.

1 EP Tam net poroga javki

2 VP da da

3 EP skoliko pridet

4 VP → stolko pridet.

1 EP There is no electoral threshold

2 VP yes yes

3 EP how many [people] will come

4 VP → so many [people] will come.

In the next excerpt below (11), the speakers discuss frequent cases of provocation that take place before and during voting. In the interview, Pozner mentioned his colleague, the journalist Pavel Lobkov, who revealed that it is possible to vote twice during one electoral period. To that, Pamfilova replies that it was a provocation, however, Pozner expresses his disagreement. In excerpt (11), Pamfilova says that the actions of the journalist showed that the system is a “sieve,” although the actions themselves, according to Pamfilova, were a provocation.

(11) *Pozner, V. Pozner and E. Pamfilova (41:06-41:12)* – completion type.

1 EP Pokazat' chto eta sistema eto resheto

2 VP chto v nej est

3 EP → chto v nej est dyry da

4 VP da

5 EP da

1 EP To show that this system is a sieve

2 VP that it has

3 EP → that it has holes yes

4 VP yes

5 EP yes.

It is one thing to say metaphorically that the system is a “sieve,” but another thing is to clearly formulate that there are “holes” and weaknesses in the system. In this excerpt, Pozner makes his interviewee explicitly state that there are holes in the Russian voting system. He does not say it himself, instead, he deliberately does not finish the utterance in line 2 and Pamfilova has no choice but to finish this phrase which she does in line 3.

The last interview conducted by Pozner which will be examined in this study was with Valeriy Falkov (June 15, 2020), a Russian jurist and politician who has been serving as the Minister of Science and Higher Education of Russia since 21 January 2020.

The first co-construction occurs in the very beginning of the interview when the speakers discuss the most popular specialties for which high school graduates choose to apply in universities.

(12) *Pozner*, V. Pozner and V. Falkov (3:15-3:21) – completion type.

- 1 VF Professija jurista my s vami znaem odna iz samyh
- 2 VF→ samyh-samyh
- 3 VF da
- 4 VP da.

- 1 VF The profession of a lawyer as we all know is one of the most
- 2 VP → the most of the most [literally the best of the best]
- 3 VF yes
- 4 VP yes.

The co-construction in line 2 occurs at the beginning of the interview and helps to establish contact between the interlocutors. After line 4, both interlocutors laugh, which also helps to establish contact and set a friendly tone for the interview. It should also be noted that Valeriy Falkov himself has a degree in law.

In the next excerpt (13), speakers discuss the first reaction of Russian educational institutions to the pandemic situation. As in the previous excerpt (12), interlocutors do not argue, but, on the contrary, agree with each other, which helps to maintain the friendly tone of the interview and also demonstrate agreement and understanding between interlocutors.

(13) *Pozner, V. Pozner and V. Falkov (15:17-15:24)* – extension type.

- 1 VF Bylo mnogo predlozhenij chto nazyvaetsja
- 2 zakryt' universitety objavit' kanikuly i ujtj ↓
- 3 VP → samoe prostoe reshenie
- 4 VF samoe prostoe reshenie.

- 1 VF There were many proposals so to say
- 2 to close universities declare vacations and leave ↓
- 3 VP → the simplest solution
- 4 VF the simplest solution.

I am now proceeding to the analysis of co-constructions that were found in the interviews conducted by Alexey Venediktov. The first interview I analyzed was recorded as part of Venediktov's new radio program *Tuzy (Aces)*, where he meets with influential people from political and cultural circles.

The first guest in this program was Mikhail Khodorkovsky, a Russian businessman, publicist, public and political figure. The interview was recorded online, using video service, on January 7, 2021. Venediktov and Khodorkovsky discussed the Amendments of 2020 to the Russian Constitution, a current political issue in Russia, and Vladimir Putin's policies.

At the 14th minute of the interview, Venediktov asks Khodorkovsky to describe Putin's support group. According to Khodorkovsky, approximately 30-40 percent consistently vote for Putin and support his policies. Among these people, as Khodorkovsky notes, three groups can

be distinguished: (1) those who are afraid of the authorities, (2) state employees who receive financial support from the state, and (3) those who believe propaganda. Venediktov immediately states: “These are all miserable people...some are afraid, others receive money and are sold, and others are dumb, they believe propaganda” (the original quote: “Вот это все жалкие люди...одни боятся, другие получают деньги и продаются, а третьи – тупицы, верят пропаганде”). After this phrase, Khodorkovsky once again repeats what he said earlier, but he does in different words, and this is where the first co-construction appears.

(14) *Tusy*, A. Venediktov and M. Khodorkovsky (16:24-16:40) – extension type.

- 1 MK Navernoje, my mozhem nazvat' ljudej kotorye bojatsja
 - 2 kotorye zavisjat ot propagandy i kotorye eshche chto to ↓
 - 3 AV → kuplennye bjudzhetniki
 - 4 MK da i kuplennye.
-
- 1 MK I guess we can say it is people who are afraid
 - 2 who depend on propaganda and who are something else ↓
 - 3 AV → corrupted state employees
 - 4 MK yes and corrupted.

At the end of line 2, Khodorkovsky reaches a transition relevance place, his intonation falls, the speed of speech decreases – and Venediktov uses this opportunity to finish the utterance in line 3 where he expresses his negative attitude towards people who support Putin’s policies. Khodorkovsky agrees with Venediktov, and the co-construction in line 3 is accepted.

In the next excerpt (15) speakers discuss a possible scenario when Putin transfers his power to someone else.

(15) *Tusy*, A. Venediktov and M. Khodorkovskii (33:03-33:33) – extension type.

- 1 MK Mne dostatochno interesno kakim sposobom budet v Gosudarstvennoj dume
- 2 2021 goda predstavlena ta polovina naselenija kotoraja by xotela chtoby

3 Putin v dvatsat' chetvertom godu peredal komu-nibud' vlast'
 4 nevazhno komu no peredal aaa...iii...ja sshchitaju
 5 AV → zjuganovu
 6 MK nu nevazhno zjuganovu tak skazat' poludohlomu zhirinovskomu

1 MK I am quite interested in how the State Duma
 2 of 2021 will represent that half of the population that would like
 3 Putin in [two thousand] twenty fourth to hand over power to someone
 4 no matter to whom but hand it over uuum...and...i think
 5 AV → to zyuganov
 6 MK does not matter to zyuganov to half-dead zhirinovsky

In line 4, Khodorkovsky reaches a transition relevance place, and Venediktov uses it to ask a question by picking up on line 3. Perhaps, Khodorkovsky did not plan to list the names of the politicians to whom, perhaps, Putin would hand over his power, however, Venediktov's question makes Khodorkovsky list some names in line 6. In this line, we can also see Khodorkovsky's attitude toward a famous and scandalous Russian politician Vladimir Zhirinovsky, whom Khodorkovsky called "half-dead."

The speakers continue talking about the future of the Russian State Duma, and in the next excerpt (16) they discuss the Stalinists (people who support the totalitarian regime) and the chances for those people to join the Duma in the future.

(16) *Tuzy*, A. Venediktov and M. Khodorkovsky (45:02-45:17) – completion type.

1 MK Etih ljudej v Gosudarstvennuju dumu tak skazat'
 2 ne nado puskat' drugim sposobom ih nado prosto ammm (0.8)
 3 AV→ chto chto chto chto ih nado prosto
 4 MK ih nado podvergat' ugolovnomu presledovaniju
 5 a vy chto podumali.

- 1 MK These people to the State Duma so to speak
 2 should not be allowed in a different way they should be simply ummm (0.8)
 3 AV→ what what what what they should be simply
 4 MK they should be prosecuted
 5 and what did you think.

In line 2, Khodorkovsky takes a long pause, which gives Venediktov an opportunity to continue the utterance. This is an interesting case when Venediktov does not finish the phrase for the interlocutor but asks a follow-up question. Venediktov repeats the last few words of Khodorkovsky, forcing him to finish the utterance, which Khodorkovsky does in line 4. It is interesting that at this moment both were smiling.

The next interview I analyzed was conducted by Venediktov with Andrey Vorobjev, a governor of the Moscow Oblast, former head of the “United Russia” faction and one of the vice presidents of the State Duma. The interview was recorded on November 10, 2020 in the radio studio. During the interview, speakers discuss a political and socioeconomic situation in the Moscow Oblast and the pandemic issues.

Venediktov’s attitude was not friendly in this interview. In every possible way, he tried to challenge the interviewee and express his opposing point of view. The first joint construction occurred at the beginning of the interview when speakers were talking about the pandemic and the methods that are used to protect people from coronavirus. The protection methods used in Moscow and the Moscow Oblast are different, and Venediktov’s question is why they are different.

(17) *Interview*, A. Venediktov and A. Vorobjev (4:56-5:03) – completion type.

- 1 AnV My imeem druguju plotnost’ naselenia eto ochevidno
 2 serebrjanye prudy nel’zja sravnivat’ s...aam

3 AV→ s patriarshimi prudami.

1 AnV We have a different population density it is obvious

2 silver ponds should not be compared to...ummm

3 AV→ to patriarch's ponds.

Silver ponds is the administrative center of the Serebryano-Prudsky District of the Moscow Oblast, and Patriarch's ponds is a residential area in downtown Moscow, one of the most elite ones. Both areas are indeed different in terms of population and the level of wealth. Vorobjev reaches a transition relevance place, and Venediktov completes the turn in line 3 by supplying missing words.

In the next excerpt (18), the economic situation in the Moscow Oblast is discussed, more specifically, its regional budget.

(18) *Interview*, A. Venediktov and A. Vorobjev (12:30-12:50) – extension type.

1 AnV Moskovskaja oblast' poslednie aaa s chetyrnotsatova goda aaam my stabilno

2 pribavljaem gde-to pitidesiat milliardov rublej v god nashemu bjudzhetu

3 AV→ za shchet

4 AnV rosta ekonomiki rabochih mest.

1 AnV The Moscow region is the last uh since the fourteenth year uh we consistently

2 add about fifty billion rubles a year to our budget

3 AV→ from

4 AnV economic growth jobs.

When talking about the budget of the Moscow Oblast in lines 1 and 2, Vorobjev does not reach a potential TRP, however, the syntax of the utterance allows Venediktov to quickly add a question to clarify how exactly the budget of the Moscow Oblast is made.

The next excerpt (19) discusses the population of Moscow Oblast and influx of people to the region.

(19) *Interview*, A. Venediktov and A. Vorobjev (14:23-14:30) – extension type.

- 1 AnV vsja Rossija priezhaet
- 2 AV→ za rabotu
- 4 AnV rabota
- 5 AV za rabotu
- 6 AnV chashche vsego eto rabota
- 7 ucheba zatem rabota.

- 1 AnV all of Russia arrives
- 2 AV→ for work
- 4 AnV work
- 5 AV for work
- 6 AnV more often it is work
- 7 study then work.

Similar to the previous excerpt (18), Vorobjev does not reach a transition relevance place, however, syntax of the sentence allows Venediktov in line 2 to ask a question why exactly people arrive in Russia.

The infrastructure of the Moscow Oblast and the large amount of roadwork are discussed in the excerpt (20). When talking about the numerous projects and roadworks that are being carried out in the Moscow Oblast, Vorobjev says that this process is “beautiful,” which is met by Venediktov’s surprised reaction: “Beautiful?!” Vorobjev explains his point by saying that they are making progress, and any progress is always beautiful. What happened next is in the excerpt below (20).

(20) *Interview*, A. Venediktov and A. Vorobjev (18:56-19:04) – completion type.

- 1 AnV Beda kogda
- 2 AV → kogda zhiteli prihodjat i govorjat
- 3 ty che tut ponastroil benzinom vonjaet my tut zhili v zelenoj zone
- 4 takie voprosy tozhe byli

- 1 AnV The trouble is when
- 2 AV → when residents come and say
- 3 what have you built here it stinks of gasoline we lived here in the green zone
- 4 there were also questions like this.

Similar to the previous examples, Vorobjev does not reach a transition relevance place, but Venediktov gets an excellent opportunity to pick up on line 1 and continue it. We can be sure that this is not what Vorobjev was going to say when he started line 1 “*Beda kogda*” (The trouble is when). Venediktov challenges his interviewee by picking up on line 1 and making the point that residents are actually unhappy about numerous works being done all over the Moscow Oblast (and this is what the real trouble is), despite that Vorobjev thinks that it is progress, and it is “beautiful.” The co-construction in line 2 drastically changes the course of the interview. In this excerpt, Venediktov does an excellent job addressing and defending the interests of people who live in the Moscow Oblast.

Venediktov and Vorobjev continue arguing about socioeconomical events in the Moscow Oblast. The journalist makes his point that the decisions made by the Moscow mayor’s office run counter to what the residents of the Moscow oblast actually want. The next excerpt (20) is syntactically similar to the previous one when the interviewee does not reach a transition relevance place, but the syntax of the utterance allows Venediktov to continue the utterance started by Vorobjev.

(21) *Interview*, A. Venediktov and A. Vorobjev (44:00-44:10) – extension type.

- 1 AnV Esli ty vnikaesh v vopros ty v nem razbiraeshsia
- 2 AV → no kogo to obidish vse ravno kogda prinimaesh reshenie

- 3 polovina obizhennyx. vy eto ponimaete
 4 AnV my staraemsja chtoby vse-taki obizhennyx bylo menshinstvo
 5 AV nuuu menshinstvo byvaet pravo.
- 1 AnV If you look carefully at the question you understand it
 2 AV → but you will offend someone anyway when you make a decision
 3 half is offended do you understand that
 4 AnV we try to reduce the number of offended
 5 AV well the minority happens to be right sometimes.

Venediktov's next interviewee was Alexey Nechaev, a Russian politician, businessman, chairman of the "New People" political faction since August 8, 2020. The interview was conducted in person in the radio studio on March 16, 2021. Mostly, the speakers talked about the new fraction, how it was organized and financed, and the pandemic. The first co-construction in this interview occurred at the 18th minute when two speakers talk about changes in the Russian political area and a new, young generation of politicians.

In excerpt (22), the speakers discuss changes of eras in connection with changes in the leadership of the country. The point Nechaev makes is that when the era of Putin came, the politicians who were famous and popular during the era of Yeltsin became quickly forgotten. Venediktov takes a turn and notes that it happened to everyone except the leaders of the three most famous political factions in Russia that were supported by Yeltsin.

(22) *Personalno vash*, A. Venediktov and A. Nechaev (17:40-17:49) – extension type.

- 1 AN Pomnite kogda prishla epoha putina to ljudi epohi yeltsina
 2 nu krome konechno zhirinovskogo zjuganova eshche neskolkih ljudej
 3 AV → krome rukovoditelej treh partij.
- 1 AN Remember when the putin era came the people of the yeltsin era
 2 well except of course zhirinovsky zyuganov a few more people
 3 AV → except for the leaders of the three factions.

One of the questions asked by Venediktov concerned the steps, primarily economic steps, that are taken to fight coronavirus. The journalist asks how Nechaev would solve problems in the situation of the pandemic: as the federal government or as the mayor of Moscow. Nechaev does not answer the question directly and attempts to avoid answering it.

(23) *Personalno vash*, A. Venediktov and A. Nechaev (40:17-40:19) – completion type.

1 AN Kak govoritsja esli by ja byl takoj umnyj

2 AV→ gde by ja byl.

1 AN As they say if I were so smart

2 AV→ where would I be.

Venediktov sees that Nechaev does not give a direct answer and expresses his sarcasm in line 2, which syntactically matches the utterance made by Nechaev. Later, Venediktov brings Nechaev back to the question and forces him to answer it. The sarcasm, expressed by Venediktov in line 2, clearly demonstrates that the journalist was dissatisfied by the interviewee's response.

In one of the *Tuzy* series, the interviewee was the Russian writer and literary critic Dmitry Bykov, who is very famous for his anti-Putin attitude. The interview was conducted in person on March 3, 2021. The speakers discussed the current political situation in Russia and some historical events that took place in Russia in the past. Even though both Venediktov and Bykov stand against the Russian authorities, they had no understanding during the interview and the overall conversation did not go well.

There were only two instances of a co-construction that occurred in the middle of the interview, and even in this excerpt (24) we can see that Bykov does not agree with what Venediktov says. In the excerpt, the speakers discuss Gorbachev's policies and nationalism.

(24) *Tuzy*, A. Venediktov and D. Bykov (23:00-23:05) – extension type.

- 1 DB Ponimaete možno bylo skazhu vam nacionalizm vtoptat togda
- 2 AV → tankami
- 3 DB da
- 4 AV tolko tankami
- 5 DB net neobjazatelno tankami
- 6 nu možno bylo neskolko ideologov etogo dela pokazatelno sudit
- 7 AV → i rasstreljat na ploshchadi
- 8 DB neobjazatelno rasstrelivat.

- 1 DB You see it was possible I tell you to trample on nationalism
- 2 AV → with tanks
- 3 DB yes
- 4 AV only with tanks
- 5 DB no not necessarily with tanks
- 6 well it was possible to publicly condemn several ideologues of this case
- 7 AV → and shoot [them] in the square
- 8 DB not necessarily to shoot.

The co-constructions in lines 2 and 7 were both rejected by Bykov. Despite the fact that Bykov does not agree with Venediktov, the latter does not miss the opportunity to express his negative and somewhat aggressive attitude toward nationalism and people involved in it.

The last interview I analyzed was conducted by Alexey Venediktov with Maksim Oreshkin, a Russian economist and politician who served as the Minister for Economic Development from November 30, 2016 to January 15, 2020. On January 24, 2020, he was appointed Economic Adviser to President of Russia, Vladimir Putin. The interview was conducted in person on July 21, 2019.

The overall tone of the interview was calm and friendly. There were no interruptions, overlaps, or expressive language. It was clear that Venediktov respects his guest and does not

try to challenge him. The first joint construction occurred toward the end of the interview. The speakers were talking about the dependency of the Russian economy on economy systems of other countries. The co-construction in line 3 is formed when Venediktov asks a question about this dependency.

(25) *Interview*, A. Venediktov and M. Oreshkin (40:56-41:20) – extension type.

- 1 MO Zdes ochen legko mozhno otvetit na etot vopros
- 2 za poslednie piat let sila zavisimosti serezno sokratilas
- 3 AV → potomu chto
- 4 MO chetyre strukturnye reformy kotorye my sdelali
- 5 mehanizm pokupki i nakoplenija valuty v sverennyh fondah
- 6 informatsionnoe targetirovanie plavajushhij valjutnyj kurs.

- 1 MO It is very easy to answer this question
- 2 over the last five years the strength of dependency has been decreased significantly
- 3 AV → because
- 4 MO four structural reforms that we made
- 5 the mechanism for buying and accumulating currency in reconciled funds
- 6 information targeting floating currency.

Oreshkin reaches a potential transition relevance place, and the syntax of the utterance in line 2 allows Venediktov to continue it with “*potomu chto*” (because) in line 3 and lead the interviewee to explain the reasons for the dependency of the Russian economy on other countries.

The next excerpt (26) is syntactically the same as the previous one. The speakers discuss the economy in Saudi Arabia and its leadership in the oil industry. They begin talking about the Soviet Union and its weak position on the oil market. In line 1, Oreshkin reaches a transition relevance place, and Venediktov, being curious about why the Soviet Union was the weakest

in the oil market, extends line 1 by saying “*potomu chto*” (because), which requests that Oreshkin identify reasons, and he does it as the interview progresses – the Soviet Union was the weakest in the oil market because it depended on the level of the economy of other countries, including Saudi Arabia.

(26) *Interview*, A. Venediktov and M. Oreshkin (42:10-42:18) – extension type.

- 1 MO I slabym zvenom na neftjanom rynke byla rossiya sovetskij sojuz ↓
- 2 AV → *potomu chto*
- 3 MO *potomu chto* zavisimost ot urovnja.

- 1 MO And the weak link in the oil market was russia the soviet union ↓
- 2 AV → because
- 3 MO because of the dependency on the level.

This chapter presented the detailed analysis of each co-construction found in the selected interviews. In 10 selected interviews, most of which was approximately from 50 to 60 minutes long, 26 excerpts with co-constructions were found. In sum, 28 co-constructions were found in these 26 excerpts: 19 of an extension type, and 9 of a completion type. The next chapter will summarize the findings and offer possible implications.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In one of his recent interviews, Vladimir Pozner said: “It has always been believed that a journalist does not take sides, a journalist gives you information. Let’s say, I did everything to obtain it, this is not my opinion, this is just for you, please draw your own conclusions.” This is how Vladimir Pozner described the principle of American journalism, to which he seems to adhere in his own work. Perhaps, that is why interviews conducted by Pozner are often polite and friendly – the journalist simply obtains information for the audience without expressing his subjective opinion and assessment. Such professional behavior influenced how joint constructions were used and distributed in the selected interviews conducted by Pozner – they were used to express disagreement and correct facts (excerpts (2), (3), (5), (6)), to obtain information (excerpts (8), (9), (11)), to establish contact with interviewees (excerpts (12)), to express solidarity and agreement (excerpts (1), (7), (10), (13)), to supply a missing word (excerpts (4)).

Interviews conducted by Alexey Venediktov have a different dynamic: they are characterized by active discussion and expressiveness, the use of expressive language. One of the reasons why there is an active discussion is because the audience can ask questions via phone or email during all interviews. In the interviews conducted by Alexey Venediktov, joint constructions were used to ask follow-up questions (excerpts (15), (16), (18), (25), (26)), to request clarification (excerpt (19)), to supply missing words (excerpt (17)), to express disagreement (excerpt (21)), personal assessment and sarcasm (excerpts (14), (20), (22), (23), (24)).

These differences between Pozner's and Venediktov's professional behavior can be explained by their personal characteristics, which affect their linguistic behavior, which, in turn, influence their manner of conducting interviews and communicating with interviewees.

It is important to mention that Vladimir Pozner was born in France and spent his childhood and adolescence in Europe and the United States. According to him, before he moved to Russia at the age of 16, he did not speak Russian at all. This influenced Pozner's linguistic behavior. The American manner of communication is characterized by increased politeness and rules of decency (Pinto, 2011). Polite behavior in social interactions prompts one to listen to a speaker's utterance until the end.

Alexey Venediktov, on the other hand, was born and raised in Russia, and, according to him, he does not speak English. In Russian conversation, as noted by Graudina and Shiriaev (1999), interruptions and overlap often take place. A high degree of participants' emotionality, a demonstration of their solidarity, agreement, and expression of their own assessments of interlocutor's speech are common features in Russian dialogues and polylogues (Graudina & Shiriaev, 1999). In addition, according to the observations Graudina and Shiriaev have made, interruptions occur more often in conversations between men than those between women. In Venediktov's manner of speaking, we can find many features of Russian communicative style. Venediktov often does not try to hide his personal assessments of events or disrespect towards his interviewees, which cannot be said about Pozner.

The linguistic behavior of the two journalists is different in numerous ways: the manner of questioning, the use of expressive language, the overall tone of the interviews, the attitude toward interviewees. Word choice is another difference between the two journalists. While Pozner stays in the framework of decency, Venediktov does not miss the opportunity to use negative and even rude words to express his opinion. The manner of speaking, asking

questions, and even reacting to responses are different in interviews conducted by Pozner and Venediktov, and this influences how joint constructions are used and distributed in interviews conducted by the two journalists.

When analyzing joint constructions, there are aspects that cannot be ignored. These include the personality of interlocutors, their attitudes toward each other, cultural and social norms. As noted in the epigraph by Tatiana Chernigovskaya, the overall tone and content of a conversation depend on many factors. And although the journalists, whose work has been analyzed in this study, can be considered experts that carry out their work despite difficulties that may arise, we cannot ignore such aspects of political interviews as journalists' attitude towards interviewees, interviewees' behavior, the presence or absence of mutual understanding between interlocutors, and other factors.

After analyzing 10 interviews, 26 excerpts with co-constructions were found. In these excerpts 28 co-constructions were identified, 19 of which are of the extension type, and 9 of the completion type. 14 co-constructions were found in TV interviews, 14 co-constructions were found in radio interviews which suggests that joint constructions occur on radio and TV with the same frequency. What is different is the purpose with which Pozner and Venediktov use opportunities of joint constructions.

It is significant that out of the 14 co-constructions which occurred in Venediktov's interviews, 11 are extensions. What does it suggest? Co-constructions of the extension type are formed when a speech participant augments an already complete utterance made by another speaker. This suggests that Venediktov does not miss the opportunity to add his comment to an already complete statement. This might be an expression of a personal assessment (as in (14), (20), (21), (22)), or a request to extend what was said by interviewees (as in (18), (25), (26)).

In the interviews conducted by Pozner, the number of extensions and completions were almost the same – 8 and 6 respectively. Pozner’s common technique is to start an utterance and let interviewees finish it. Pozner uses this technique with a specific purpose – he gives interviewees an opportunity to say what they want to say, or to go beyond what they already said. Sometimes, Pozner makes them say what needs to be said, as for example, in excerpt (13). In other cases, Pozner is the one who ends the utterance, and it is always accompanied by the approval of the interlocutor, which speaks of Pozner’s authority and knowledge of interview matters. Pozner, as can be seen in the examples presented in Chapter 4, actively creates a welcoming atmosphere in his TV interviewees.

In Venediktov’s interviews, typically, he is the one who completes an utterance started by interviewees. He does it in order to ask follow-up questions, express his disagreement or negative assessment, to supply a missing word. Venediktov’s active position can be explained by the following. One feature of Venediktov’s interview, which makes a fundamental difference from Pozner’s interviews, is that during the interview on “Radio Echo Moscow,” listeners can ask questions, and these questions are then addressed to interviewees. Following listeners’ questions, Venediktov attempts to obtain as much information as possible for the audience, like, for example, in the interview with the governor of the Moscow Oblast Andrei Vorobjev. This can explain why the journalist actively participates in the discussion. In this sense, interviews conducted by Venediktov are more dynamic, and we can often see an active exchange of utterances between speakers.

Another important difference between the two journalists is their political views. While Vladimir Pozner works for a federal news channel and has no opportunity to express a negative attitude toward the government policies, Venediktov works for an independent radio station,

poses himself as an oppositionist and can express his opinion about the Russian government and authorities, like in excerpts (14), (22), (24).

Another thing that affects the use and distribution of co-constructions is the speed of interlocutor's speech. When interlocutors speak clearly and slowly, it is easier to build a joint construction. This can be seen in Pozner's interview with Konstantin Zatulin who spoke slowly and clearly, and it was easier for Pozner to build joint constructions. When interviewees' speech is too fast, it becomes more difficult for joint constructions to occur.

It is also important to note that journalists may not always use joint constructions because they may affect the response and can make interlocutors lose their track of thoughts. Vladimir Pozner often lets his interviewees speak fully, and the audience decides for themselves whether or not interviewees tell the truth. This approach reflects Pozner's opinion about the profession of journalism discussed in the very beginning of this chapter.

Shared knowledge is another factor that makes joint constructions possible when conversational participants can make their guess and complete a response. Then that response will either be accepted or rejected by another interlocutor. This could be seen in Pozner's interviews with Konstantin Zatulin and Valeriy Falkov (excerpts (1), (12), (13)).

A type of co-construction can tell us a lot about the overall tone of a conversation. For example, 3 out of 4 joint constructions (excerpts (3), (5), (6)) in the interview with Mikhail Murashko were a *nu* (well) type, which demonstrates disagreement. This tells us that interlocutors could not find understanding and reach some level of agreement in a number of matters.

Another interesting tendency demonstrates that co-constructions during radio interviews usually start to occur closer to the middle part of the interview (see Table 2).

Table 2

The time of occurrence of co-constructions in each interview (min:sec).

TV/radio interview, interviewee	CC #1	CC #2	CC #3	CC #4	CC #5
Konstantin Zatulin (TV)	16:19	44:00			
Mikhail Murashko (TV)	1:49	13:39	22:31	35:48	
Tatiana Golikova (TV)	7:58	19:00			
Ella Pamfilova (TV)	10:17	20:00	41:06		
Valeriy Falkov (TV)	3:15	15:17			
Mikhail Khodorkovsky (radio)	16:24	33:03	45:02		
Alexey Vorobjev (radio)	4:56	12:30	14:23	18:56	44:00
Alexey Nechaev (radio)	17:40	40:17			
Dmitry Bykov (radio)	23:00				
Maxim Oreshkin (radio)	40:56	42:18			

This demonstrates that co-constructions in radio interviews start occurring when participants reach some sort of comfort and pass the warm-up stage. On TV, on the contrary, co-constructions are used more often in the first part of the conversation, during the warm-up stage. In the middle part of the conversation, when participants find a common language, a journalist usually becomes less active and does not try to complete phrases for interviewees letting them take their time to think and be themselves. In the future, this tendency will need to be tested to make a more solid conclusion.

Co-constructions in political interviews are used for a variety of purposes. How exactly co-constructions will be used depend on interlocutors involved in a conversation. Lenore Grenoble (2013) noted that in conversations between friends co-constructions are used to

express solidarity and agreement, and in political interviews they are used for manipulation and redirecting a topic (Grenoble, 2013). However, our analysis has shown that even in interviews with politicians, co-constructions can be used to express solidarity and agreement, to establish contact with the interviewee, and to maintain a friendly tone of the interview.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The purpose of this study was to analyze the use of co-constructions in Russian public political interviews. In this study, we looked at co-constructions, the opportunities of which were used by both journalists and interviewees. Two of the most famous and powerful Russian journalists and ten interviews they conducted were the subject of this study. In sum, 28 co-constructions were found, 19 of the extension type, and 9 of the completion type.

From the analysis, it is possible to highlight several distinct purposes that co-constructions serve in Russian public political interviews. They are used (1) to obtain necessary information, (2) to correct facts provided by interviewees, (3) to ask questions, (4) to establish contact with interviewees and maintain it during the interview, (5) to express agreement and affiliation, (6) to express disagreement and negative assessment, (7) to supply a forgotten word or string of words.

The results of the analysis have shown that the frequency of occurrence of co-constructions on TV and radio interviews is the same. No differences were found in the use of co-constructions in terms of the type of the interview (be it a TV or radio interview). However, differences were caused by journalist' personalities, and from the analysis it can be said that one's personality affects how and why co-constructions are used.

From the type of co-constructions used in the interview we can draw some conclusions about the overall tone of the interview. For example, co-constructions that involve *nu* (well), or *da, no* (yes but) and illustrate disagreement, show that there was a lack of agreement between interview participants. Co-constructions used by the journalist to ask questions demonstrate a high level of involvement of the journalist in the topic of the interview.

The study has shown that there are many factors that affect the use and distribution of co-constructions including language background, political views, personal characteristics. In the future, it will be interesting to explore how other factors such as gender, age, and race affect the use of co-constructions in political interviews.

This study has shown the relevance of using conversation analysis as the analytical method in journalism studies. As the method, conversation analysis allowed the author of this study to see in a very detailed and systematic way how language, specifically joint constructions, can be used by interview participants to reach variety of goals, be it obtaining information, showing solidarity, or expressing negative assessment. The use of conversation analysis as the method allowed the author to see the current tendencies and trends in journalism and specifically in political sphere. In the future, more interviews will need to be analyzed in order to have a better understanding of how co-constructions are used and distributed in public political TV and radio interviews.

APPENDIX A

Transcription conventions (Ochs, 1979).

- . Falling intonation, not necessarily at the end of a sentence
- , Continuing intonation
- ↓ Sharp fall in pitch
- (.) A micropause, usually lasting less than 0.2 seconds
- (0.3) Duration of a pause or silence
- : Lengthening of the sound preceding the colon
- [Overlap.

REFERENCES

- Авраамов, D. S. (2003). Профессиональная этика журналиста. Учебное пособие [Professional ethics of a journalist. Tutorial].
- Bales, R. F., Krippendorff, K., & Bock, M. A. (2009). Interaction process analysis. *The Content Analysis Reader*, 75-83.
- Ekström, M. (2007). Conversation analysis in journalism studies. *Journalism Studies*, 8(6), 964-973.
- Garfinkel, H. (1996). Ethnomethodology's program. *Social psychology quarterly*, 59(1), 5-21.
- Graudina, L. K. & Shiriaev, E. N. (1999). *Культура русской речи* [The culture of Russian speech]. Norma.
- Grenoble, L. A. (2013). Talking out of turn:(co)-constructing Russian conversation. In *Approaches to Slavic Interaction* (pp. 17-33). John Benjamins.
- Isupova, O. G. (2002). Конверсационный анализ: представление метода [Conversation analysis: method presentation]. *Sociology: methodology, methods, mathematical modeling (Sociology: 4M)*, (15), 33-52.
- Jacoby, S., & Ochs, E. (1995). Co-construction: An introduction. http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/anthro/faculty/ochs/articles/Jacoby_Ochs_1995_Co-Construction.pdf
- Korbut, A. (2015). Говорите по очереди: нетехническое введение в конверсационный анализ [Turn-talking: non-technical introduction to conversation analysis]. *Sociological Review*, 14(1), 120-141.

- Kuzmina, M. A. & Jufkina, S. B. (2017). Психологические способы воздействия на собеседника в ток-шоу Первого канала «Вечерний Ургант» и «Пусть говорят» [Psychological methods of influencing the interlocutor in the First Channel TV-show Evening Urgant and Let Them Talk]. *Ogarjov-Online*, (6 (95)).
- Lerner, G. H. (1991). On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. *Language in Society*, 20(3), 441-458.
- Lukina, M. M. (2003). Технология интервью [Methods of interview]. *М.: Aspekt Press*, 191, 98.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1996). *Phenomenology of perception*. Motilal Banarsidass Publisher.
- Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. *Developmental pragmatics*, 10(1), 43-72.
- Pervyj Kanal. (2019, November 18). *Guest Konstantin Zatulin. Pozner. 11/18/2019* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rip3JBaLTLA>.
- Pervyj Kanal. (2020, April 6). *Guest Mikhail Murashko. Pozner. 04/06/2020* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ra3HifnS4Uk>.
- Pervyj Kanal. (2020, December 28). *Guest Tatiana Golikova. Pozner. 12/28/2020* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TJ9z303R7gY>.
- Pervyj Kanal. (2020, June 15). *Guest Valeriy Falkov. Pozner. 06/15/2020* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kLx8j_byzNc.
- Pervyj Kanal. (2020, June 29). *Guest Ella Pamfilova. Pozner. 06/29/2020* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=spoiFNesMzQ&t=242s>.

- Pinto, D. (2011). Are Americans insincere? Interactional style and politeness in everyday America. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/274339384_Are_Americans_insincere_Interactional_style_and_politeness_in_everyday_America
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50 (4): 696–735.
- Sandler, L. L. (2017). Интервью-конфронтация как способ коммуникативного взаимодействия в программе “Познер” [Confrontation interview as a way of communicative interaction in the program “Pozner”]. *The age of information*, 2(2), 56-58.
- Shostak, M. I. (1998). Журналист и его произведение [A journalist and his work]. Gendalf, Moscow.
- Stephenson, A., Reese, D., & Beadle, M. (2013). Broadcast announcing worktext: A media performance guide. Taylor & Francis.
- Wooffit, R. (2006). Origins and orientations. *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis. A comparative and critical introduction. London: Sage.*
- Shmakova, G. A. (2015). Стратегии конфронтации и сотрудничества в интервью В. Познера [The strategies of confrontation and cooperation in V.Pozner’s interviews]. *Journalistic Yearbook*, (4), 192-197.
- Tintin, L., & Sinu, C. (2016). Политическое интервью как жанр дискурса СМИ [Political interview as a genre of media discourse]. *Medialinguistics*, (4), 14.

Ulanovskij, A. M. (2016). Феноменология разговора: метод конверсационного анализа [Phenomenology of conversation: a method of conversation analysis]. *Psycholinguistic issues*, (1 (27)).

Venediktov, A. (2019, July 21). *Interview*. Moscow, Russia: Radio Echo Moscow. Retrieved from: <https://echo.msk.ru/programs/beseda/2467999-echo/>

Venediktov, A. (2020, November 10). *Interview*. Moscow, Russia: Radio Echo Moscow. Retrieved from https: <https://echo.msk.ru/programs/beseda/2739180-echo/>

Venediktov, A. (2021, January 7). *Tuzy*. Moscow, Russia: Radio Echo Moscow. Retrieved from https: <https://echo.msk.ru/programs/tuz/2769758-echo/>

Venediktov, A. (2021, March 3). *Tuzy*. Moscow, Russia: Radio Echo Moscow. Retrieved from: <https://echo.msk.ru/programs/tuz/2799290-echo/>

Venediktov, A. (2021, March 16). *Personalno vash*. Moscow, Russia: Radio Echo Moscow. Retrieved from: <https://echo.msk.ru/programs/personalnovash/2805458-echo/>

Zheltukhina, M. R. (2016). Медиадискурс [Mediadiscourse]. *Discourse-Pi*, 14(3-4).