

John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from Language and Dialogue 8:3
© 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible only to members (students and faculty) of the author's/s' institute. It is not permitted to post this PDF on the internet, or to share it on sites such as Mendeley, ResearchGate, Academia.edu.

Please see our rights policy on <https://benjamins.com/content/customers/rights>

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

Please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website: www.benjamins.com

Interviewing for accountability

Ideological framing and argumentation

Damian J. Rivers and Andrew S. Ross

Future University Hakodate (Japan) | University of Sydney (Australia)

During the National Policy Institute's national conference in Washington D.C. on Saturday November 19th, 2016, Richard Spencer delivered a speech in praise of the election victory of President Donald Trump. Shortly after the conference, Spencer was an invited guest on the *News One Now* programme in which he participated in a 32-minute interview with black journalist, host and managing editor Roland Martin. Drawing attention to the ideological aspects of the Martin/Spencer interview performance, we adopt the analytical lens of the Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Musolff 2014; Reisigl and Wodak 2009; Wodak 2001, 2009) to explore argumentation as a discursive strategy through *topoi* or argumentative warrants (Reisigl and Wodak 2009; Wodak 2009, 2011, 2015; Wodak and Boukala 2015).

Keywords: accountability, argumentation, news interview, *topoi*

1. Preamble

One of the most conspicuous topics addressed within current media discourse concerns the rise to prominence of the sociopolitical collective known as the alternative right, or 'alt-right'. The media attention cast toward the alt-right was most recently amplified by violent confrontations with ANTIFA (an anti-fascist collective) in Charlottesville, North Carolina during August 2017. Although a movement with no apparent or formalized structure, the alt-right as a sociopolitical collective gyrates around the National Policy Institute (NPI), "an independent organization dedicated to the heritage, identity, and future of people of European descent in the United States, and around the world" (National Policy Institute 2017, 1). During the NPI's national conference in Washington D.C. on Saturday November 19th, 2016, Richard Spencer, the President of the institute, delivered a keynote speech in praise of the election victory of President Donald Trump. Spencer ended his

speech proclaiming, “Hail Trump! Hail our people! Hail Victory!” after which a number of audience members made Nazi salutes toward Spencer. Three days after the conference speech Spencer featured as an invited guest on the *News One Now* programme to participate in a 32-minute interview with black journalist, host and managing editor Roland Martin (author of *Speak, Brother! A Black Man’s View of America*).

Broadly contextualized by contesting the role of the news media in political reporting, we approach the 32-minute Martin/Spencer interview as an example of an accountability interview (Montgomery 2007) demonstrating an “adversarial moment in the public sphere” (McNair 2000, 84). In order to draw attention to the ideological aspects of the interview performance, we recruit the analytical lens of the Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Musolff 2014; Reisigl and Wodak 2009; Wodak 2001, 2009) to explore argumentation as a discursive strategy through topoi or argumentative warrants (Reisigl and Wodak 2009; Wodak 2009, 2011, 2015; Wodak and Boukala 2015).

2. The news media as source of opinionated fact

Highlighting the influential social role performed by the news media, Jutel (2013, 29) contends that the media functions as an organ of “social circulation and meaning making” and is therefore intricately related to the sociopolitical context. Despite the news media having never been free from ideological bias (Hall 1977), journalism casts the professional ethos of neutrality at the core of ethical practice (Fowler 1991). Consequently, conflict exists between the organizational/commercial packaging of the most sales effective news product and individual/journalistic pressures to maintain professional integrity. Borschel (2009) discusses how in recent times the institutional pursuit of financial profit has surpassed concerns with journalistic integrity and now stands as the most prominent factor underpinning contemporary news networks (see Meehan 2005). The desire for a more sales effective product has also changed the way in which news information is delivered. Such changes are inclusive of more colorful expansive studio settings, more frequent changes of topic, and more personalized involvement with the news story by the journalist. Capturing such shifts, the independent newsroom ProPublica (2017, 5) points toward a situation in which “sources of *opinion* are proliferating, but sources of *facts* on which those opinions are based are shrinking”. These observations have provided a platform for recent debates concerning fake news, alternative facts and the notion of post-truth. It is significant that Oxford Dictionaries selected the term post-truth as the 2016 word of the year, defining it as a situation where “objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals

to emotion” (Oxford Dictionaries 2016) (see Ekström and Patronas 2011; Harsin 2015).

The shift from the factual presentation of news information to the adoption of a more opinionated stance reflects the fact that more news programmes are borrowing elements from the talk show entertainment genre. While the journalistic demand for evidence-based information appears to be on the decline, the configuration of news-as-entertainment has facilitated changes in the discursive practices observable. Talk show-inspired news information programmes can be seen as more confrontational, regularly situated around adversarial moments (Clayman 1988; Clayman and Heritage 2002; Greatbatch 1988) wherein the atmosphere is belligerent, hostile and antagonistic. These features can be seen in programmes such as the O’Reilly Factor (1996–2017), Hannity (2009-present), Tucker Carlson Tonight (2016-present), Anderson Cooper 360 (2003-present) and Piers Morgan Live (2011–2014), which all engage in “staged confrontation” where the host discredits the guest creating the “exciting controversy” required to attract a greater audience (Luginbühl 2007, 1380). Such programmes often present interviews and debates in what Hutchby (2011) has termed the Hybrid Political Interview (HPI), a format that Rivers and Ross (2018) have explored further with an emphasis on the contribution of non-verbal performance (in relation to the same interview as the present article). In addition, Hess-Lüttich (2007, 1360) also describes how debates shown on TV are frequently acted out as and performed as “show conversations” “only staging ‘as-if’ debates” while demonstrating “pseudo-co-operation and pseudo-controversy – even if serious topics are at issue”. It can also be seen as symbolic of the moves toward the greater personalization of news information that the programmes listed above are named after the host, a move which further facilitates the dissemination of a consistent ideological stance sanctioned by the network.

3. The news interview as ideological confrontation

Research into the news interview has focused on a variety of components including question-answer sequences (Ekström 2001; Greatbatch 1985; Heritage 1985), the refusal to answer questions (Ekström 2009), the use of evasive responses (Harris 1991), the use of rhetorical questions (Lauerbach 2007), the affective framing of politicians (Coleman and Banning 2006) and the use of strategic forms of address (Bull and Fetzer 2006). As a discursive setting, the news interview has been characterized as “a key moment in the political news cycle, and the main context in which the journalistic tasks associated with critical publicity and representation of the public can be directly applied to politicians in the media” (McNair 2000, 84).

Within the news interview setting, the performers are required to engage in a dialogic action game characterized by back-and-forth sequences of action and reaction (Weigand 2006) which facilitate argumentation as a form of contested communication (Willard 1989). The position of the news interview as a context for the dissemination of ideological information is enhanced when considering that such a forum, and the action-reaction sequences observable, lends itself to the voicing of personal perspective. Farr (1984, 182) comments that the interview, as a public event for consumption by a second-frame audience, constitutes “a technique for establishing or discovering that there are perspectives or viewpoints on events other than those of the person initiating the interview”. Despite the previously outlined demands of neutrality within the journalistic profession, the interview setting appears more accommodating of non-neutrality, especially when engaging with contentious social or political issues. Under such conditions, it is often easy to detect personal perspective as “each thought or utterance views aspects of the world from some particular vantage-point, thus telling us something... about the actor’s background” (Linell 1998, 48).

It is commonplace for politicians and other political figures to appear within the news interview situation in order to be held accountable by the host for some reason, action or event. Speaking to the features of the accountability interview, Montgomery (2007) outlines how prior to the commencement of the interview the news segment is fronted or occasioned by an introduction which serves to provide the relevance of the upcoming interview and shape its thematic orientation. This fronting often positions the host and guest on opposing sides of a particular issue with the subsequent interview then being characterized by “fighting and controversy rather than by rational argumentation” in which the participants engage in “a double game of demanding rational argumentation and preventing it at the same time’ (Lauerbach and Aijmer 2007, 1337). With reference to the additional features of the accountability interview, Montgomery (2007, 265) draws attention to two “distinctive features of turn-by-turn talk in a public accountability interview” as being “the absence of in-turn vocalisations by the interviewer” and “a high incidence of overlap at the boundaries of turns”. Finally, Montgomery (2007, 267) describes evasiveness within the accountability interview given the potential discursive pitfalls facing the interviewee, further remarking that “evasion is on occasion a produced consequence of the discourse practices of the accountability interview”.

4. Approaches to argumentation

Individuals or groups engaged in arguments typically adopt one of two positions. On the one hand, a consensual approach to argumentation dictates that both parties allow for the possibility that one of the various outcomes, posited from either side, may end up being agreed upon as truthful, even if the truth agreed upon is false. In contrast, adversarial arguments stand as being inherently more combative and reflect a situation whereby each individual or group attempts to assert their version of truth as being the exclusive version of reality. This style of communicative interaction may be said to be more commonplace when individuals and groups are defending or contesting ideological or other deep-seated beliefs that have been crafted over time (as in the political interview). Adversarial arguments are distinctly inflexible to the point that prolonged periods of intellectual and emotional disagreement may produce violence as each group or individual attempts to impose their worldview as the only legitimate truth. Relevant to the news interview context, Moulton (1983, 158) notes how adversarial arguments often misrepresent philosophical reasoning, are overly concerned with point scoring, allow those positions articulated in opposition to be given greater recognition, and for give “undue attention and publicity to positions merely because they are those of a hypothetical adversary”.

Contemporary works on argumentation (e.g. Amossy 2009; Charteris-Black 2014; Lauerbach 2007; Weigand 2006) have evolved from Toulmin’s (1958/2003) model for the layout of arguments which proposes that arguments can be analyzed through the identification of claims, grounds (or data), warrants (linking data to claims), backing, rebuttals, and qualifiers. Toulmin (1958/2003) understood that deductive formal logic was largely insufficient when analyzing naturally occurring discourse and that within informal arguments there existed an uncertain space between the premise made and the conclusion drawn. These concerns are expressed through attention given to the enthymeme, that being, the underlying premise of an argument which is not explicitly expressed by the discourse participants (i.e. that which links the data to the claim). Lauerbach (2007, 1391) describes the enthymeme as “an incomplete argument to which the audience unconsciously supplies the missing premise”, while Gill and Whedbee (1997) contend that when speakers provide a response to an enthymeme, they are acting to reveal their own ideological beliefs and subjective worldview (see Kienpointner 2011). The enthymeme shares similar properties to indirect speech where “the speaker’s communicative intention is not realized explicitly and therefore must be inferred from the utterance and its connectedness and embeddedness in social and linguistics contexts” (Fetzer 2006, 181). The evaluation of an argument therefore involves a descriptive analysis in addition to a more inferential critical analysis given that

every argument, “being an attempt to convince an audience by rational means, inherently makes an appeal to some normative standard of reasonableness” (van Rees 2007, 1455).

The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) (Reisigl and Wodak 2009; Wodak 2009, 2011) frames argumentation as a discursive strategy used in the “justification and questioning of claims of truth and normative rightness” (Reisigl and Wodak 2009, 104) where individuals or institutions hold contrasting worldviews. It is concerned with the strategies used in the creation of a positive “self” and negative “other” as well as the discursive elements used in “us” and “them” oppositional interactions (Boukala 2016; Reisigl and Wodak 2001). The primary device utilized by the DHA in the justification and questioning of claims of truth and normative rightness is the application of the Aristotelian notion of *topoi* or argumentative warrants (Grue 2009; Walton 1996). Within the literature, *topoi* have been defined in related but slightly different ways, with Richardson (2004, 230) proposing that they are, “reservoirs of generalized key ideas from which specific statement or arguments can be generated”, while Kienpointner (2011, 226) describes *topoi* as, “search formulas which tell you how and where to look for arguments” as well as “warrants which guarantee the transition from argument to conclusion”. In the context of argumentation, *topoi* represent tools to assist in the justification of either positive or negative attributions (Wodak 2011). They function as the grounds upon which a line of argumentation is justified, but one that does not require explicit explanation in itself as it is anchored within common social attitudes and beliefs (i.e. *doxa*). Reisigl and Wodak (2009, 110) express this sentiment outlining how, “*topoi* are not always expressed explicitly, but can always be made explicit as conditional or causal paraphrases such as ‘if x, then y or y, because x’”. The focus of a *topoi* orientated analysis is not therefore with specific discursive utterances but rather with the inference and assumption underpinning such utterances as a form of argumentation. A common list of nine *topoi* has been identified within the DHA for the purpose of “trying to convince an audience of one’s interests, visions or positions” (Wodak 2009, 44). We utilize seven of these nine *topoi* within the current study, and these are outlined in Table 1.

5. Methods

Since being uploaded to Roland Martin’s YouTube channel under the header of “We’re Not Going Anywhere: Watch Roland Martin Challenge White Nationalist Richard Spencer”, the Martin/Spencer interview has been viewed over 428,000 times and has attracted over 13,500 comments (as of December 2017). This interview represents our exclusive source of data. In terms of procedure, we first

Table 1. The seven topoi used within the current study

Topoi	Argumentative Warrant
Topos of Burdening	If an institution is burdened by a specific problem, then one should act to diminish it.
Topos of Reality	Tautologically infers that with reality as it is, a particular action should be performed.
Topos of History	Because history teaches that specific actions have specific consequences, one should perform or omit a specific action in a specific situation.
Topos of Threat	If specific dangers or threats are identified, one should do something about them.
Topos of Definition	A person or thing designated X should carry the qualities/traits/attributes consistent with the meaning of X.
Topos of Justice	If persons/actions/situations are equal in specific respects, they should be treated/dealt with in the same way
Topos of Urgency	Decisions or actions need to be drawn/found/done very quickly because of an external, important, and unchangeable event beyond one's reach and responsibility.

transcribed the Martin/Spencer interview independently before comparing our transcriptions and discussing any instances of inconsistency or difference. In total 452 lines of discourse from the interview were transcribed. We then worked independently to identify what we believed to be instances of argumentation in which the warrant was not explicitly voiced and therefore dependent upon common social attitudes and beliefs (i.e. *doxa*). We then compared notes and resolved any disagreements or alternative points of view. As a final step, we interpreted the results and formulated our conclusions. Throughout the analysis and interpretation process we worked collaboratively and followed the recursive eight-step DHA analytical procedure (Wodak 2015). From our analysis, we demonstrate how the DHA topoi are drawn upon to convey and promote the respective ideological foundations of the two discourse participants in the Martin/Spencer interview.

5.1 Pre-interview framing

The Martin/Spencer interview was scheduled following the controversies arising from the NPI conference, and as such, it conforms to the parameters of the accountability interview (Montgomery 2007) where a known public figure is called to account in relation to a recent controversy. Within the accountability interview, the interviewee acts on behalf of an associated institution, movement or group, as someone holding sufficient symbolic capital to be recognized by the second-frame audience as a prominent member of it. Montgomery (2007) outlines how prior to the commencement of the accountability interview the interaction

between participants is typically fronted by a news package which serves to provide the relevance of the upcoming interview and shapes its thematic orientation. Moreover, Montgomery explains how interviewees are introduced to the second-frame audience before the onset of the interview, not via name, but rather through the use of an identifier which serves to specify the grounds from which they will speak and therefore what the purpose of the interview will be.

These characteristics are all observable within the Martin/Spencer interview which is fronted by a narrative focus on Spencer's NPI speech and the recorded Nazi salutes made by several members of the audience. Spencer is first introduced through a series of identifiers packaged within a 2:58 narrative read by Martin. Martin references the Spencer through a statement released by the US Holocaust Museum in relation to the NPI conference. Being a televised interview, the second-frame audience are shown various images and clips containing discourse that referentially frames Spencer and his affiliations. The fronting of the interview establishes an in-group (Martin + additional organizations + second-frame audience) and an out-group (Spencer + NPI). This immediately places Martin and Spencer in opposition as individuals with significant different worldviews. The opening studio visual shows Martin in a formal news position seated behind a desk besides a television screen which displays the text "WHITE SUPREMA-CISTS MEET IN D.C" alongside images of protestors holding placards adorned with the text "ALT WRONG" and "GOOD NIGHT WHITE PRIDE".

Spencer is first identified by name via the US Holocaust Museum statement while the *News One Now* programme indirectly identifies him as a white supremacist prior to this identity being affirmed or denied by Spencer. The fronting of the interview continues for a further 1:34 during which the second-frame audience are shown video clips of Spencer's NPI speech. The video extracts are pieced together in a manner intended to strengthen the oppositional divide emergent between the referential in-group and out-group. For example, a text banner is imposed across the bottom of the screen for 1:26 which reads, "WHITE NATIONALISTS HAIL TRUMP", which while conflating white supremacist with white nationalist, serves to link both labels to the serving US President, Spencer and the NPI. When the second-frame audience return to the studio, both imposed referential truth narratives remain on the screen. The interview fronting concludes with a Twitter statement posted by Jim Acosta and written by Bryan Lanza (Trump-Pence Transition Spokesperson) which is shown on screen. The statement is read by Martin although the introduction to the Tweet which reads, "Trump transition statement on alt right conference where neo Nazis and white nationalists were praising Trump's election" is not read but is otherwise displayed. The actual interview then begins and Spencer is seen on screen for the first time with a television

screen over his right shoulder affirming the previous naming practices imposed during the interview fronting.

5.2 Interview analysis

Extract (1) demonstrates the **Topos of Burdening** in which the warrant can be understood as ‘the media are burdened by the problem of fake news and the dissemination of intentional falsehoods, therefore they should be challenged in order to stop it’. This warrant is advanced through Spencer’s assertion that the media have not been truthful in reporting on him following the NPI conference (lines 4–12).

Extract (1)

- 4 RS I was talking about the lying media that have actually been lying about me for the last 24 hours.
- 5 RM So you say lying about you, what does that mean?
- 6 RS CNN claimed that I questioned whether Jews were people and things like that.
- 7 RS We published the text of my speech I did nothing of the kind. They’re doing a
- 8 RS wild exaggeration... they’re worrying about fake news? They’re engaging in fake news about me.
- 9 RM So why heil Hitler there? Why the Nazi references? Why...
- 10 RS No-one said ‘Heil Hitler’.
- 11 RM Well when we saw the video there, there were individuals there who are doing
- 12 RM that. We’ve seen photos as well of individuals at that particular conference who were using the Nazi salute.

When challenged for an explanation by Martin (line 5), Spencer offers factual evidence from a previous CNN news interview and points to claims that were made by the media not supported by the official transcript of the interview (lines 6–8). While Spencer draws on this evidence to therefore suggest that the media should refrain from lying, Martin shifts the basis of the argument to challenge Spencer’s original contention that the media were in fact lying (line 9). However, the premise of Martin’s challenge (line 9) is refuted by Spencer as not being factually correct (line 10) which acts to strengthen Spencer’s original premise that the media, including Martin by association, was lying or engaged in the dissemination of fake news. Martin then performs the same discursive move to avoid accountability, through shifting from the factually incorrect use of “heil Hitler!” to the more accurate use of the “Nazi salute” (lines 11–12).

The **Topos of Reality** is demonstrated in Extract (2) based on the warrant that ‘with American society the way that it is today, the Nazi salute should not be performed’. In the exchange surrounding the Nazi salute, which Spencer contends was performed at the NPI conference in “the spirit of fun and exuberance”

(lines 15–16), Martin questions whether Spencer’s grandfathers who fought in WWII would consider the Nazi salute an example of “exuberance” (line 47).

Extract (2)

51 *RM* So your grandfather wouldn’t say I fought against that. I fought where that’s not done in America.

52 *RS* No. I don’t think with most people are like this I think it is actually just the

53 *RS* liberal media in a collective freak-out.

54 *RM* No actually I (inaudible)...cause a freak-out. If somebody wants to call

55 *RM* themselves an American they would then say ‘No that’s not American’ so, whilst... I wanna ask you this here.

56 *RS* No well I’ll actually agree with you, I’ll find some common ground here. I do

57 *RS* think that the Alt-Right, we’ve gone from being a movement that was not

58 *RS* connected to the political mainstream, not connected to the political fray. We

59 *RS* now *are*. People are paying attention to us, people are looking at us and so I

RS actually I, I actually say ‘yes’ we need to start maybe knock some of that stuff off we need to...[interrupted]

60 *RM* Maybe? Maybe?

61 *RS* We need to think of ourselves as a mainstream movement that’s going to reach

62 *RS* people because we do have that power.

Martin challenges the idea on the unstated assumption that such a salute is not acceptable within American society given American participation in WWII (lines 51–54–55). Spencer accepts Martin’s premise and affirms that with reality the way it is in American society (i.e. the negative associations surrounding the Nazi salute), combined with the perceived shift of the alt-right movement into more mainstream politics (lines 61–62), that alt-right supporters should “maybe knock some of that stuff off” (line 59). In this instance therefore, Spencer is in agreement with the premise of argumentation raised by Martin although he selects a different rationale as to affirm his agreement (i.e. that the alt-right is now mainstream).

A second example of argumentation based on the Topos of Reality concerns Spencer’s warrant that ‘white men are being discriminated against in terms of recruitment practices therefore corrective action needs to occur’. Spencer contends that “identity matters and that race is real” (line 93). On more than one occasion, Spencer puts forward the warrant that “race is a foundation of identity, undoubtedly” (line 69) and that “white people, Europeans, form the core of American identity” (line 162). The warrant that “identity matters” and therefore attention should be given to instances of discrimination against “white men” is evidenced through Spencer’s reference to federal hiring being “geared towards not hiring more white men” (lines 190–191). Spencer further claims that “every spring these big companies, Apple, Google, Facebook release diversity reports and they will basically say ‘we are, we are focused on not hiring white men’” (lines 232–234),

in addition to voicing his belief that “these institutions are dedicated to discriminating” (line 286). The corrective action Spencer believes should occur is referenced in relation to Donald Trump – “what I want are politicians similar to Donald Trump who really want to protect the people here, who don’t think just in terms of the global population ...” (lines 275–277).

Extract (3) demonstrates the *Topos of History* in the exchange between lines 116–140, which begins by Martin enquiring as to whether Spencer defines himself as a white supremacist (line 116), a label Spencer refutes (lines 117–118). The response from Spencer between Lines 120–121 condemning historical actions surrounding imperialism, slavery and colonialism, provides the historical context and reference point for the rest of this exchange. Spencer’s primary argumentative warrant suggests that ‘the legacy of slavery has shown that whites do not need other races (i.e. blacks) to be successful’. Spencer asserts his beliefs concerning the racial superiority of white people (line 124) to which Martin questions the extent to which one race could have created a strong America (line 125). Spencer concludes immediately that this was not achieved through black people (line 126) which leads to the development of Martin’s primary argumentative warrant that ‘the legacy of slavery has shown that whites do need other races (i.e. blacks) to be successful’.

Extract (3)

116 RM No no that’s fine but I’m still gonna go back to this here. So, are you a white supremacist?

117 RS No I’m not a white supremacist absolutely. White supremacy means a white

118 RS person would want to rule over other people.

119 RM So you don’t wanna rule over other people?

120 RS I absolutely do not. We’ve had white supremacy in our past whether you think

121 RS of imperialism, slavery, colonialism, that’s been a disaster, so no I don’t want to go back to that.

122 RM So where are you trying to go, what are you saying cos in your video you said

123 RM ‘we don’t need them they need us’. Who is they?

124 RS White people ultimately don’t need other races in order to succeed, in order to be ourselves, absolutely not.

125 RM So how do you think America became the greatest economic nation without...

126 RS Not through black people.

127 RM Oh it wasn’t? It wasn’t because of free labor?

128 RS Are you talking about slavery?

129 RM Nah I’m talking about slavery and also what happened after slavery that

130 RM (INAUDIBLE) talked about that was slavery by another name so I’m trying to

131 RM understand, when you say we didn’t need it, how do you think America became the great economy that it is? How do you think that happened?

132 RS Through the genius of Europeans.

- 133 *RM* How's it the genius of Europeans when the fact of the matter is it was actually
 134 *RM* King Cotton that supplied the economic means for America to do so, and it was
 a lot of free labor from black people.
 135 *RS* Look, the whole point here is that who creates these systems, who creates these
 136 *RS* business models and businesses and inventions.
 137 *RM* Slavery wasn't a business model?
 138 *RS* Yes, it was a business model yeah.
 139 *RM* And was that one that you like or dislike?
 140 *RS* Dislike. I would absolutely reject it yeah.

Martin implies that America's economic power can be attributed to slavery whereas Spencer attributes the economic success of slavery not to the free labour of the enslaved, but rather to "the genius of Europeans" (line 132) who created "these business models and businesses and inventions" (lines 135–136). Relating the historical practice of slavery to contemporary views and beliefs, Spencer asserts that he dislikes slavery as a business model and would therefore outright reject it (line 140). The dynamics within this exchange are interesting for a number of reasons. First, Martin resorts to discussing slavery in terms of its positive influence on the economic power America has since become (lines 125–131). The implication being that "we as Americans did need slavery" in order to become a strong economic nation, yet within society this is something that almost all African Americans would vehemently disagree with. From Spencer's perspective, where he could have used the historical reality of slavery as further reinforcement of white dominance beyond the "genius of Europeans" (line 132), he instead rejects Martin's conclusion that slavery was an effective business model (line 140). Further into the interview Spencer offers a stronger condemnation of slavery in concluding, "look African slavery was an absolute disaster. Socially and morally I reject it" (line 157). This creates the unexpected situation of a black person (Martin) inadvertently arguing for slavery in the name of economic prosperity, while a white, alleged supremacist (Spencer), claims that slavery was a social and moral disaster.

Concerning the threat from competition (Martin) or the threat posed by discrimination in recruitment (Spencer), the **Topos of Threat** is evident although in both cases the argumentative warrant is refuted. In Extract (4) Martin accuses Spencer of feeling threatened by those outside of his racial in-group (i.e. non-whites) who are now catching up (lines 361–363).

Extract (4)

- 348 *RM* So you insist somehow that whites are not getting jobs in America and it's
 349 *RM* rough. Are you afraid of competition?
 350 *RS* I'm not afraid of competition. Competition can be good.
 351 *RM* Are you afraid to compete?

- 352 *RS* Hang on, are you afraid of some other television station beating you?
 353 *RM* No.
 354 *RS* Oh you're not?
 355 *RM* You know why?
 356 *RS* Because you're confident, that's great.
 357 *RM* No not just confident cos see I have a skill set. I understand what I do. See but
RM what you're telling me...
 358 *RS* Well that sounds like confidence.
 359 *RM* No no no see, but what you're telling me is this here. Richard here's what it
RM sounds like and I'm not a psychologist...
 360 *RS* Can I just finish my point?
 361 *RM* But you're afraid. You are afraid that you now are going to have to compete.
 362 *RM* You've had the head start. You've had an 80-yard head start in a hundred-meter
 363 *RM* dash and now you're upset that people are catching up. Why are you so afraid?"

While Spencer rejects Martin's suggestion, he also turns the argument around on Martin by asking him whether he is afraid, not of competition from other racial groups, but rather from other television stations (lines 352–358). While Spencer denies being afraid of competition in terms of recruitment with other races, later in the interview he contradicts his position in demonstrating a fear of East Asians on the basis that he believes them to have a superior IQ to Europeans and that, "I would want to restrict immigration of East Asians...It's about protecting my people..." (lines 423–425). This argumentative warrant, as the only legitimate point of argumentation, is more explicit than many of the others found within the interview 'because East Asians have a superior IQ to Europeans (and are therefore a threat), immigration should therefore be restricted to protect people of white European ancestry'.

The **Topos of Definition** is one of the most widely implicated in the Martin/Spencer interview as much of the discourse surrounding Richard Spencer and the alt-right concerns the contestation of terminology.

Extract (5)

- 29 *RM* Are you proud to be an American?
 30 *RS* Yes, I'm a proud citizen.
 31 *RM* Do you believe that America should have beaten Nazi Germany in World War 2?
 32 *RS* I wish that we had avoided that conflict...
 33 *RM* No no no answer my question answer my question. Should America have
 34 *RM* beaten... no you said we should have avoided it... should America have beaten
 back Nazi Germany and Adolf Hitler in WW2?
 35 *RS* Once the United States was in the war, yes absolutely they have to win it.
 36 *RM* So if we won it and we beat back Nazi Germany why would you even say 'well in
 37 *RM* exuberance people do that' ... why would you not say as an American 'that is not
 what we do in America'?

In Extract (5), Martin asks Spencer if he is proud to be an American, to which Spencer affirms, “Yes, I’m a proud citizen” (line 30). Martin then uses this affirmation of status as the basis for his contestation that the Nazi salutes witnessed at the NPI conference were more than exuberance, adding that, “so if we won it and we beat back Nazi Germany why would you even say, ‘well in exuberance people do that’... why would you not say as an American ‘that is not what we do in America?’” (lines 36–37). The argumentation warrant being that ‘a person claiming to be a proud American should not be performing the Nazi salute’, therefore implying that Spencer should not be considered as a legitimate American. In Extract (8), the use of the term “identarian” (line 65) is challenged by Martin who asks for confirmation of exactly what it is (line 66), but before Spencer can explain the definitional parameters of the term, Martin interrupts to direct the discussion back toward race (lines 67–68).

Extract (6)

63 *RM* Are you White Nationalists?

64 *RS* I don’t use the term White Nationalist. I like the term Alt-Right first off and I

65 *RS* also like the term ‘identarian’ because it gets at what I am and what I believe.

66 *RM* And what is that?

67 *RS* Identity is at the heart of my ideology so the...

68 *RM* Is race an identity?

69 *RS* Race is a foundation of that identity undoubtedly.

70 *RM* You know race is simply a creation of mankind. That’s a construct, it doesn’t exist

71 *RM* as the country doesn’t exist...

72 *RS* Who are you?

73 *RM* I know who I am. I’m Roland Martin. I’m a man.

74 *RS* Ok. Do you identify as a black man?

75 *RM* First of all, I identify as a man.

While Martin appears to want to situate race at the center of the discussion (line 68) he then invalidates race as a categorization (lines 70–71) which would question the motives behind his earlier descriptions of Spencer as a “white nationalist”. Spencer appears to pick up on the irony here and asks Martin if he identifies as a black man, a question Martin avoids answering in terms of race, instead maintaining that he identifies primarily as a man (line 75). The argumentation warrant advanced by Spencer here being ‘if someone believes that race doesn’t exist, then they will not be able to identify themselves on the basis of race’. This would seem to put Martin in an awkward position given that his own book was entitled “A Black Man’s View of America”. A discussion then develops concerning the requirements for defining oneself as a Christian. Martin’s intended argumentation warrant being ‘as someone who identifies as a Christian, Spencer should hold different beliefs’.

Extract (7)

- 91 *RM* Ok so that means that you're a Christian so how is that what you espouse, you
92 *RM* find it to be compatible with Christian ideals?
93 *RS* Most Christians throughout world history agree with me that identity matters
94 *RS* and that race is real and that they're part of an extended family but it's only this
95 *RS* tiny slice of world history like post 1965 that everyone thinks that Christianity
RS is incompatible with identity. I do not believe that.
96 *RM* Well actually if you're gonna use world history there were people who actually
97 *RM* used Christianity to justify slavery and the enslavement of people who look like
me and...
98 *RS* So why are you a Christian?
99 *RM* Why am I a Christian? Because those people actually were false Christians.
100 *RM* Those people were fake Christians. Those people were probably cultural
101 *RM* Christians where they somehow allowed culture to inform their faith as
RM opposed to their faith informing their culture but I'll actually go back to the
question I asked you...
102 *RS* Through most of Christian history there was feudalism, there was serfdom,
103 *RS* there was slavery, there was identity, there was nationalism. Are *all* of these
people unchristian but *you* are Christian?
104 *RM* No no no, those people actually chose to pimp the Bible as opposed to actually
105 *RM* believing in exactly what Jesus Christ was all about.
106 *RS* Most all Christians throughout world history were pimps...
107 *RM* No no no...
108 *RS* But *you* are a true Christian?
109 *RM* What I am saying is that as a Christian I believe in the word as opposed to this
110 *RM* false nonsense that most of those folks...but yeah they were also fake Christians
RM because they used the word to actually enslave people.
111 *RS* I'm so glad we've reached *true* Christianity in 2016.
112 *RM* Well first of all you barely identify as one so you cultural, you dance around it
and...

What follows is an extended exchange between Martin and Spencer surrounding Christianity, history, identity, race and slavery (lines 93–112). From these exchanges, we suggest that the original purpose of introducing Christianity into the discussion was to add weight to the argument against Spencer. However, Spencer was able to almost invalidate Martin's argument by establishing a counter warrant suggesting that that there have been Christians throughout history who also did not strictly adhere to Christian ideals (i.e. 'due to the fact that previous Christians who have behaved in such a manner, Spencer's beliefs are consistent with being a Christian'). In the beginning of this exchange Martin appeared confident in his use of religion, but by the end his argument was incoherent, and Spencer exaggerated this by using a sarcasm (line 111) after which, and as a sign of defeat, Martin sought to lessen the terms through which Spencer was previously

held to account (line 112). The implied warrant from Martin being ‘because Spencer first identified as only a cultural Christian, Spencer’s counter warrant is therefore invalid’.

In Extract (8), the *Topos of Justice* is underpinned by the notion of equality and can be witnessed in relation to affirmative action and claims of racial superiority and differentiated treatment. Spencer’s primary argumentative warrant asserts that ‘if equality is important in federal hiring then affirmative action should be stopped as it discriminates against white people’. Consistent with the narrative concerning federal recruitment, Spencer states that he believed the greatest beneficiary of affirmative action to be African-Americans (line 219), yet this speculation, as opposed to an assertion of fact, is condemned by Martin as evidence of a lie (line 220). This can be linked to Spencer’s complaint at the start of the interview concerning the media lying about him and his activities (line 4).

Extract (8)

204 RS Do you think that Affirmative Action is not at play in federal hiring? Give me a break.

205 RM No do you know what the greatest affirmative action policy was in this country?

206 RS Slavery? I don’t know.

208 RM No no that wasn’t affirmative action that was free labour. The greatest RM affirmative action policy in this country was the GI bill, and do you know who benefitted from GI bill?

209 RS White people.

210 RM Your grandfathers.

211 RS Yes

212 RM And you know who did not benefit from GI bill? The same black folks who

213 RM fought alongside in world war two who also bled for this country and when

214 RM they came back, so when you talk about affirmative action that is the greatest

215 RM affirmative action bill in the history of America. Do you know who’s benefitted greatest from affirmative action policies? First of all, who created affirmative action?

216 RS White people probably.

217 RM Okay Richard Nixon, President Nixon 1969. Arthur Fletcher was there as well.

218 RM Who was the greatest beneficiary of affirmative action?

219 RS The greatest beneficiary? I would say African-Americans.

220 RM That’s a lie.

Martin’s primary argumentative warrant stands in direct contrast to Spencer’s which makes this segment of the interview particularly hostile, Martin reasons that ‘if equality is an important principle in American society then action needs to be taken because white women have been the greatest beneficiary of affirmative action mandates’. Relevant to the question of news media credibility is Martin’s

non-evidence based factual representation that “White women have benefited more from affirmative action than anybody else in America. That’s a fact” (lines 226–227). This assertion of fact lacks evidence to validate it as such and therefore it stands as an opinion.

As shown in Extract (9), only one exchange reflecting the **Topos of Urgency** was observed during the interview. Martin draws clear referential lines between the racial in-group and the out-group, something that he had previously questioned Spencer about doing, to allude to the idea of white privilege or his belief that “you people have had a great head start” (line 430). On the premise of this Martin and then Spencer suggest that the other should engage in the particular action of preparation and readiness.

Extract (9)

435 *RM* But see that’s what I’m saying. When you have a head start that means you’re

436 *RM* scared to compete. See I know some other whites out there who are not white

437 *RM* nationalist who are not afraid of competition who are not afraid of this. But
here’s the reality – we’re not going anywhere.

438 *RS* Right.

439 *RM* And you might wanna suck that up and I know it’s rough, I know it’s rough, but

440 *RM* I suggest what you should be doing Richard is preparing your generation for a

441 *RM* world of competition where you have to actually, where you don’t get the head

442 *RM* start your mom and daddy gave you, that you going to start maybe not 80 yards

RM here but 30 but you know what you may want to train harder because we’re
training harder and we’re gonna catch up.

443 *RS* We’re gonna win...

444 *RM* You’re not gonna win Richard.

445 *RS* Mr Martin I wanna tell you you’ve gotta prepare yourself. You’ve dealt with a

446 *RS* bunch of guilt-ridden silly whites all your life and we are waking up, we are

447 *RS* recognizing who we are and we see an amazing future, so you better get ready.

448 *RM* Right now Richard, here’s the deal. 1619, 20-odd Africans arrived, Fort

449 *RM* Comfort Virginia ok, 1619, 397 years ago. Trust me we’re resilient, we’re not

450 *RM* going anywhere and I will tell you right here and as my frat brother (name

451 *RM* indecipherable) said in 1937, we will fight until hell freezes over and then we
will fight on the ice. You better go workout, because you’ve got a fight on your
hands.

Spencer responds to Martin’s call for readiness insisting that “we’re gonna win” (line 443) and that Martin himself had better prepare as he has “dealt with a bunch of guilt-ridden silly whites all your life and we are waking up, we are recognizing who we are and we see an amazing future, so you better get ready” (lines 445–447). Martin rises to this invitation to prepare with his own combative rhetoric in advising Spencer that he “better go workout, because you’ve got a fight on your hands” (lines 450–451). Both Spencer and Martin draw from the same argumentation

warrant, that being ‘because of an impending battle between the races, preparations should be made now to avoid defeat.’ The interview then ends abruptly.

6. Conclusion

Broadly contextualized by contesting the role of the news media in political reporting, we approached the 32-minute Martin/Spencer interview as an example of an accountability interview (Montgomery 2007) demonstrating an “adversarial moment in the public sphere” (McNair 2000, 84). Our analysis has showcased a thematic discourse analysis of the Martin/Spencer interview through the application of DHA topoi or argumentative warrants (Reisigl and Wodak 2009; Wodak 2009, 2011, 2015; Wodak and Boukala 2015). Our topoi framed has shown how the two interview participants attempted the “justification and questioning of claims of truth and normative rightness” (Reisigl and Wodak 2009, 104) based on their own ideological worldviews. As an interview bringing into contact two ideologically opposed individuals, different conceptualizations of truth and logic were observable in dialogue related to the Nazi salute, race and identity, religion and religious belief, American history and slavery, affirmative action and corporate hiring. As a means of more clearly highlighting these ideological differences in the personal perspectives voiced within the interview Table 2 shows how the interview was based upon ideological opposition.

While argumentation, “like all cooperative question-and-answer activities, is a device for the construction of socially shared consensual knowledge” (Lauerbach 2007, 1390), the Martin/Spencer interview demonstrates how the news media draws from its own ideological convictions which are often hostile toward individuals, guests and perspectives that do not align with its desired narrative. In this case, the *News One Now* programme fronted by the host and managing editor Roland Martin, manipulated a situation whereby the interview with Richard Spencer was pre-framed in a manner intended to create maximum differentiation between the positively referenced in-group and negatively the referenced out-group (i.e. between the positive “us” and the negative “them”). These moves were designed to “create the appearance of reasonableness despite being executed merely to throw negative light on the opponent (Spencer) and positive light on the speaker (Martin) in the eyes of the audience” (van Rees 2007, 1459). However, in creating this contrast between Martin and Spencer, and in making the decision to have Spencer as an invited guest, the network was broadcasting an interview likely to attract considerable audience attention and can therefore be seen as commercially successful. As previously documented, this commercial success

Table 2. Martin (Interviewer) and Spencer (Interviewee) as ideological opponents

Roland Martin (Interviewer)	Richard Spencer (Interviewee)
<p>The Nazi Salute</p> <p>“...That’s offensive to Americans. That’s offensive to American soldiers. That’s offensive to WW2 veterans who actually fought in that war...”</p>	<p>The Nazi Salute</p> <p>“...in the sense when it’s done in the context of the alt-right it’s done in a spirit of fun and exuberance”</p>
<p>Race and Identity</p> <p>“...race is simply a creation of mankind. That’s a construct, it doesn’t exist...”</p>	<p>Race and Identity</p> <p>“Race is a foundation of that identity undoubtedly”</p>
<p>Religion and Religious Belief</p> <p>“You can’t call yourself a cultural Christian and then say I struggle with faith”</p> <p>“...there were people who actually used Christianity to justify slavery and the enslavement of people who look like me and...”</p> <p>“What I am saying is that as a Christian I believe in the word as opposed to this false nonsense that most of those folks... but yeah they were also fake Christians because they used the word to actually enslave people”</p>	<p>Religion and Religious Belief</p> <p>“I’m a cultural Christian...”</p> <p>“...many of us struggle with faith but at heart I’m a Christian”</p> <p>“Most Christians throughout world history agree with me that identity matters and that race is real and that they’re part of an extended family but it’s only this tiny slice of world history like post 1965 that everyone thinks that Christianity is incompatible with identity. I do not believe that”</p>
<p>American History and Slavery</p> <p>“Ok yeah but you deny the reality though that that’s what allowed America to become the economic power because America supplied ninety-one percent of the world’s cotton and so as a result of that, that’s how Americans able to fund the industrial revolution. It was because of free labor from black people”</p>	<p>American History and Slavery</p> <p>“White people ultimately don’t need other races in order to succeed, in order to be ourselves, absolutely not”</p> <p>“White people could have figured out another way to pick cotton”</p> <p>“I think that white people, Europeans, formed the core of American identity”</p>
<p>Affirmative Action and Corporate Hiring</p> <p>“White women have benefitted from affirmative action more than any other group. So, when you’re saying, ‘oh my goodness affirmative action white folks aren’t getting hired by the federal government’, that’s a lie!”</p> <p>“If whites are dominating jobs in banking and whites are dominating jobs on Wall Street, if whites are dominating hedge funds, if whites are dominating NFL owners and NBA owners, if whites are dominating the major sectors how in the world can you somehow say, ‘oh my god it’s rough for us white people out here?’ It’s not!”</p>	<p>Affirmative Action and Corporate Hiring</p> <p>“The greatest beneficiary? I would say African-Americans”</p> <p>“Federal hiring is geared towards not hiring more white men”</p> <p>“It doesn’t surprise me at all that whites succeed. We have succeeded throughout the centuries. We are a people of great genius and ambition, so none of that surprises me...What I’m more worried about right now are younger people. These institutions are actively, explicitly trying to discriminate against them in terms of hiring”</p>

often comes at the expense of journalistic integrity in maintaining the professional ethos of neutrality and Martin's performance served to highlight this point.

We also have to recognize Martin's role as a spokesperson for the audience-at-large and in turn the external requirement for him to therefore stay close to accepted normative standards in terms of opinion and personal perspective. For instance, it would certainly not reflect positively on Martin if he were not to firmly challenge the appropriateness of the Nazi salute within modern day American society. By the same token, Spencer was under pressures to perhaps disprove or behave differently from normative standards of the alt-right movement meaning that he was required to show more restraint and greater calm when engaged in discussions of race and identity as a means of representing himself as a "regular person" (Clayman and Heritage 2002, 341). Indeed, in Extract (2) Spencer spoke directly to the need for members of the alt-right "to start to maybe knock some of that stuff off" (referencing the Nazi salute) and his interview performance can therefore be seen in some ways as a public relations attempt at challenging normative opinions of the alt-right. These points indicate the extent to which the interview participants were producing discourse for the second-frame audience as a means of furthering their own respective agenda, and this should be seen as a core feature of the new interview as a "fundamentally specialized form of social interaction produced for an overhearing audience and restricted by institutionalized conventions" (Heritage 1985, 112).

On the basis of our observations, we wonder whether in fact non-ideologically framed rationality in discourse is possible under such circumstances given the ideological backgrounds of the two participants and the issues under discussion. Matters of race, identity, history and discrimination appear to be so fundamentally related to conceptualizations of the self, that entering into discussion without personal bias and emotion seems potentially impossible. The ability to be discursively and emotionally tolerant of diversity of opinion and to maintain professional integrity while also resisting commercial pressures to engage in conflict as a form of entertainment remains a substantial task facing the news media. In conclusion, and given the increasing number of questions being asked of the mainstream media, we encourage future studies which utilize the DHA topoi within the context of political interviews, particularly between such ideologically opposed participants.

References

- Amossy, Ruth. 2009. "The New Rhetoric's Inheritance: Argumentation and Discourse Analysis." *Argumentation* 23: 313–324. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-009-9154-y>
- Borschel, Audrey. 2009. *Preaching Prophetically when the News Disturbs*. St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press.
- Boukala, Salomi. 2016. "Rethinking Topos in the Discourse Historical Approach: Endoxon seeking and Argumentation in Greek Media Discourses on 'Islamist Terrorism'." *Discourse Studies* 18(3): 249–268. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614456166634550>
- Bull, Peter and Anita Fetzer. 2006. "Who are we and who are you? The Strategic use of Forms of Address in Political Interviews." *Text & Talk* 26(1): 3–37. <https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2006.002>
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2014. *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-36833-1>
- Clayman, Steven. 1988. "Displaying Neutrality in Television News Interviews." *Social Problems* 35: 474–492. <https://doi.org/10.2307/800598>
- Clayman, Steven and John Heritage. 2002. *The News Interview*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511613623>
- Coleman, Renita and Stephen Banning. 2006. "Network TV News' Affective Framing of the Presidential Candidates: Evidence for a Second-Level Agenda-Setting Effect through Visual Framing." *Je&MC Quarterly* 83: 313–328. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107769900608300206>
- Ekström, Mats. 2001. "Frågor, svar och icke-svar i politiska intervjuer: En samtalsanalys" ["Questions and Answers in Political Interviews"]. *Nordicom Information* 23(3): 57–74.
- Ekström, Mats. 2009. "Announced Refusal to Answer: A Study of Norms and Accountability in Broadcast Political Interviews." *Discourse Studies* 11(6): 681–702. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445609347232>
- Ekström, Mats and Marianna Patronas. 2011. *Talking Politics in Broadcast News*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.42>
- Farr, Robert. 1984. "Interviewing: An Introduction to the Social Psychology of the Interview." In *Psychology for Managers*, ed. by Peter Cooper and Cary Makin, 176–194. London: Macmillan.
- Fetzer, Anita. 2006. "Minister, we will see how the public judges you": Media References in Political Interviews." *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(2): 180–195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.06.017>
- Fowler, Roger. 1991. *Language in the News*. London: Routledge.
- Gill, Ann and Karen Whedbee. 1997. "Rhetoric." In *Discourse as Structure and Process*, ed. by Teun van Dijk, 157–184. London: Sage.
- Greatbatch, David. 1988. "A Turn-taking System for British News Interviews." *Language in Society* 17: 401–430. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500012963>
- Grue, Jan. 2009. "Critical Discourse Analysis, Topoi and Mystification: Disability Policy Documents from a Norwegian NGO." *Discourse Studies* 11(3): 285–308. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445609102446>
- Hall, Stuart. 1977. "Culture, the Media and the 'Ideological' Effect." In *Mass Communication and Society*, ed. by James Curran, Michael Gurevitch, and Janet Woollacott, 315–348. London: Edward Arnold.

- Harris, Sandra. 1991. "Evasive Action: How Politicians Respond to Questions in Political Interviews." In *Broadcast Talk*, ed. by Paddy Scannell, 76–99. London: Sage.
- Harsin, Jayson. 2015. "Regimes of Posttruth, Postpolitics and Attention Economies." *Communication, Culture & Critique* 8: 327–333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cccr.12097>
- Heritage, John. 1985. "Analyzing News Interviews: Aspects of the Production of Talk for an Overhearing Audience." In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, ed. by Teun van Dijk, 95–117. London: Academic Press.
- Hess-Lüttich, Ernest. 2007. "(Pseudo-) Argumentation in TV-Debates." *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 1360–1370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.04.008>
- Hutchby, Ian. 2011. "Non-Neutrality and Argument in the Hybrid Political Interview." *Discourse Studies* 13 (3): 349–365. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445611400665>
- Jutel, Olivier. 2013. "American Populism and the New Political Economy of the Media Field." *Political Economy of Communication* 1: 26–42.
- Kienpointner, Manfred. 2011. "Rhetoric." In *Pragmatics in Practice*, ed. by Jan-Ola Ostman and Jef Verschueren, 264–277. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hoph.9.17kie>
- Lauerbach, Gerda. 2007. "Argumentation in Political Talk Show Interviews." *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (8): 1388–1419. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.04.004>
- Lauerbach, Gerda and Karin Aijmer. 2007. "Argumentation in Dialogic Media Genres: Talk Shows and Interviews." *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (8): 1333–1341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.04.007>
- Linell, Per. 1998. *Approaching Dialogue: Talk, Interaction and Contexts in Dialogical Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.3>
- Luginbühl, Martin. 2007. "Conversational Violence in Political TV Debates: Forms and Functions." *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (8): 1371–1387. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.04.003>
- McNair, Brian. 2000. *Journalism and Democracy: An Evaluation of the Political Public Sphere*. London: Routledge.
- Meehan, Eileen. 2005. *Why TV is Not Our Fault: Television Programming, Viewers and Who's Really in Control*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Montgomery, Martin. 2007. "The Discourse of the Broadcast News Interview: A Typology." *Journalism Studies* 9(2): 260–277. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700701848303>
- Moulton, Janice. 1983. "A Paradigm of Philosophy: The Adversary Method." In *Discovering Reality*, ed. by Sandra Harding and Merrill Hintikka, 149–64. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Musolf, Andreas. 2014. "Metaphor in the Discourse-Historical Approach." In *Contemporary Critical Discourse Studies*, ed. by Christopher Hart and Piotr Cap, 45–66. London: Bloomsbury.
- National Policy Institute. 2017. <http://www.npiamerica.org/>
- Oxford Dictionaries. 2016. "Word of the Year 2016." <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/word-of-the-year/word-of-the-year-2016>.
- ProPublica. 2017. "About Us." <https://www.propublica.org/about/>.
- Reisigl, Martin and Ruth Wodak. 2001. *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism*. London: Routledge.
- Reisigl, Martin and Ruth Wodak. 2009. "The Discourse-Historical Approach." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. Introducing Qualitative Methods*, ed. by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 87–121. 2nd ed. London: Sage.
- Richardson, John. 2004. *(Mis) Representing Islam: The Racism and Rhetoric of British Broadsheet Newspapers*. Amsterdam. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.9>

- Rivers, Damian J. and Andrew S. Ross. 2018. "An Integrated Approach to Non-Verbal Performance in the Hybrid Political Interview." *Journal of Pragmatics* 132: 59–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.05.012>
- Toulmin, Stephen. 1958/2003. *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Rees, M. Agnes. 2007. "Discourse Analysis and Argumentation Theory: The Case of Television Talk." *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (8): 1454–1463. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.04.005>
- Walton, Douglas. 1996. *Argumentation Schemes for Presumptive Reasoning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Weigand, Edda. 2006. "Argumentation: The Mixed Game." *Argumentation* 20: 59–87. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-006-9000-4>
- Willard, Charles Arthur. 1989. *A Theory of Argumentation*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2001. "The Discourse-Historical Approach." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (1st edition), ed. by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 63–95. London: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857028020>
- Wodak, Ruth. 2009. *The Discourse of Politics in Action*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2011. *The Discourse of Politics in Action*, 2nd edition. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2015. "Critical Discourse Analysis, Discourse-Historical Approach." *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*, 1–14.
- Wodak, Ruth and Salomi Boukala. 2015. "European Identities and the Revival of Nationalism in the European Union: A Discourse Historical Approach." *Journal of Language and Politics* 14(1): 87–109. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.14.1.05wod>

Authors' addresses

Damian J. Rivers
 Faculty of Systems Information Science,
 Center for Meta-Learning
 Future University Hakodate
 116-4 Kameda-Nakano, Hakodate, Hokkaido,
 041-0803
 Japan
rivers@fun.ac.jp

Andrew S. Ross
 University of Sydney
 A22 – Old Teachers' College
 Australia
andrew.s.ross@sydney.edu.au

Biographical notes

Damian J. Rivers is an Associate Professor at Future University Hakodate, Japan. He holds a PhD and MA in Applied Linguistics and an MSc in Social Psychology. He is co-author of *Beyond Native-Speakerism: Current Explorations and Future Visions* (2018, Routledge), editor of *Resistance to the Known: Counter-Conduct in Language Education* (2015, Palgrave Macmillan) and co-editor of *Isms in Language Education: Oppression, Intersectionality and Emancipation*

(2017, Mouton De Gruyter) and *The Sociolinguistics of Hip-Hop as Critical Conscience: Dissatisfaction and Dissent* (2017, Palgrave Macmillan) among others.

Andrew S. Ross is a Lecturer at University of Sydney, Australia. He holds a PhD from the University of Canberra, where he also worked as a lecturer in TESOL and sociolinguistics. His current research interests lie in the area of the discourse of politics and new media, social media, and sociolinguistics. Most recently he has co-edited the volume *The Sociolinguistics of Hip-hop as Critical Conscience: Dissatisfaction and Dissent* (2017, Palgrave Macmillan). His work has also appeared in various journals including *The Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, *The Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* and *Discourse, Context and Media*.