
| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Evasiveness in Greek Political Interviews: A Case Study in Conversation Analysis

Panagiota Kyriazi

Postgraduate Student from the Department of Language and Linguistics, University of Essex, Colchester, United Kingdom

Corresponding Author: Panagiota Kyriazi, **E-mail:** panagiota.kyriazi.u2021@gmail.com

| ABSTRACT

This paper identifies the conversational practices of evasiveness in Greek political interviews and debates through Conversation Analysis (CA) methodology. The present study is accomplished according to Clayman and Heritage's proposed model of questioning and answering dimensions in American and British news interviews. The analysis focuses on the sequential organisation of the pre-allocation type of interviews exploring how interviewers structure their questions while focusing on the practices that interviewees deploy to display resistance towards the addressed questions. By presenting transcripts from three interviews and two political debates, it is argued that Greek IEs show resistance in answering by providing partial or incomplete responses or by performing a different action than the addressed through specific turn prefaces, i.e., look-, listen-, first of all-turn beginning components and the practices of rhetorical questions and the incorporation of IR's wording. According to findings, similar practices of resistance can be found in both cross-cultural contexts with some differentiations and novel elements in the Greek corpus as well as Greek IRs' multi-unit style of questioning which seems to favour politicians' evasiveness.

| KEYWORDS

Conversation Analysis, Evasiveness, Political Interviews/Debates, Questioning, Answering.

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 15 January 2024

PUBLISHED: 07 February 2024

DOI: 10.32996/jpda.2024.3.1.1

1. Introduction

News interviews and political debates constitute a genre of institutional talking in its own right with social conventions unique to these types of broadcast talk. These conventions stem from the social roles of the interviewer (IR) and the interviewee (IE) who actively participate and frame the conversation. Adherence to these practices is what makes this type of institutional talk so robust and distinctive and at the same time, non-compliance to the norms of the "contract" between the two parties is easily recognisable and sanctionable (Clayman & Heritage, 2002).

The subject of interest in the given paper involves the examination of questioning and answering dimensions in terms of the evasiveness of Greek politicians in interviews and political debates. Evasiveness is an aspect of non-compliance to the norms of these types of talk as questions outline the agenda to be discussed and they should be addressed immediately. In cases of an incomplete answer or unsatisfying degree of responsiveness, interviewees are *normatively accountable* for not answering (Heritage & Clayman, 2010) and this becomes apparent from the subsequent talk.

To that end, Conversation Analysis (CA) is deployed as the methodological tool of analysis to monitor the actions of politicians within the turn-taking organisation of their political practices; the conversational exchange and the dynamic relationship between what is being asked and what is being said establish the degree that the Question-Answer format is successful and if not, to demonstrate which practices lead to that breach while examining backwards and afterwards of what is being said.

This research study aims to identify the conversational practices that Greek politicians utilise in broadcast interviews and debates that constitute deviations from the normative sequential order and the agreeing preference of questioning and answering in the institutional talk depending on the degree of relevance, or the *responsiveness* of an answer (Buttny, 1993).

The focus of analysis is on questioning and answering dimensions while juxtaposing the Greek corpus data with the proposed model by Clayman & Heritage (2002), in which they analyse a) the dimensions of questioning, including the structural dimension along with the content-related ways with which they are designed and addressed according to a specific purpose, and b) the answering dimensions concerning the strategies that interviewees exploit to either engage or disengage with the agenda.

The research questions of the given study pertain to a) how IRs contribute to politicians' evasiveness through their style of questioning and b) which are the conversational practices that politicians use to become resistant to complying with the addressed questions of the agenda. After the examination of the data, I discuss the extent to which the findings are in agreement with the English/American corpus and if any kind of differentiations or novel elements exist in the Greek political institutional talk.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Activity Types And The Institutional Setting

News interviews and debates are categorized into a genre of institutional dialogue that contrasts with everyday talk-in-interaction. These settings are activity types in which its members are goal-oriented and have identity constraints (Levinson, 1992). The structural properties of the institutional setting of interviews are what differentiate everyday conversation from political interviews while setting constraints on linguistic options and actions.

As Schegloff (1999) points out, the fundamental form of interaction is conversation and institutional talking is distinguishable from the former as it includes context-specific restrictions and conventionalised arrangements. Specifically, IRs are professional journalists and IEs are political public figures; both of them are accountable in a different way towards the audience, which does not have an active role but is the primary target. Journalists and politicians are governed by their master institution, being both restricted and oriented to the practice of questioning and answering, respectively (Heritage & Clayman, 2010).

The preliminary characteristic that differentiates mundane conversations from news interviews and debates is the turn-taking organisation which is the pre-allocation of questions and answers (Atkinson & Drew, 1979; Greatbatch, 1988; Clayman & Heritage 2002; 2010); actions, topics and sequential organisation is predetermined according to the participants' identities and properties. This kind of setting usually involves large-scale environments with an overhearing audience and many participants.

Specifically, as Greatbatch (1988: 4) points out, IRs and IEs are constrained to performing actions that can be recognised as questions and answers, respectively. IRs avoid producing several sorts of comments or acknowledgements that would be normally appropriate in everyday interaction and they produce extended prefatory statements to set the corresponding background. These are perceived as preparatory statements by interviewees, while openings, closings and allocation of turns are indicated by journalists.

The second most important element which differentiates political interviews from everyday interaction is the neutralistic posture that both IRs and IEs should manifest to focus on the current affairs of the political scene (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). Evidence for this principle is the avoidance of acknowledgements discourse markers, such as *continuers* (Schegloff, 1982) at possible completion of turns, which project the orientations of the participants. Therefore, when interviewers produce comments, such as "mhm", "right", "yes", "really", these lead to undesired actions (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Heritage & Clayman, 2010), while in debates, these kinds of comments are not allowed and they are resolved by the coordinator.

However, it is important to highlight that institutional talking is a product of everyday conversation resulting from a series of transformations and re-adjustments which are purpose-oriented (Greatbatch, 1988: 2). Political interviews and debates may be different than mundane conversation but they share common traits and conversational practices that reveal this original relation and so participants need to know how to handle unexpected actions, spontaneous encounters, and be aware of adjusting to moment-to-moment produced speech (Clayman & Heritage, 2002).

2.2 Clayman and Heritage's Model Of Questioning And Answering Dimensions

The proposed analysis is accomplished in comparison to the proposed model of questioning and answering dimensions in American and British news interviews by Clayman and Heritage (2002). According to their model, interviewers' questioning involves the setting of an agenda, the embodiment of presuppositions, and the incorporation of preferences. The agenda dimension covers three main domains: a) the identification of a specific topic to be discussed, and so, set the relevant area of interest, b) the actions

that interviewees are expected to perform in answering, and c) the degree of the answer's broadness as per the type of question (Heritage, 2003).

The second dimension of the presupposition's embodiment is frequently observed in journalists' questions, both prefaced and simple, in which specific presuppositions are embedded while bringing the interviewee into a difficult position of being accountable to respond not only to the question but also to the addressed implemented presupposition. For instance, in a straightforward yes/no question the interviewee needs not only to engage or disengage with the agenda, but also confirm or disconfirm the presuppositional framework that comes with it.

The third part concerns how IRs structure their questions to characterise the forthcoming answer either as preferred or dispreferred (see 2.3 below). It is what Clayman and Heritage have characterised as *prospective import*, which describes the degree of an answer's acceptance depending on the type of question being addressed and the pressure being exerted on the interviewee (Clayman & Heritage, 2002:13). Therefore, a yes/no question can be characterised as a narrow-scoped, whereas a why-type explanatory question as a broader one.

Therefore, interviewees have the option of engaging or declining the topic of the agenda, confirming or disconfirming the embedded presuppositions, and aligning or misaligning with the preferences. In cases where IEs fail to address the question, they are evasive and display a degree of resistance for which politicians are mainly accountable towards an overhearing audience (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; 2010); resistance is a double-edged practice, with a negative dimension where the interviewee fails to provide a satisfactory answer through partial or incomplete responses and a positive dimension according to which the IE performs a different action by changing the topic or the framework of the question; these constitute practices of shifting and/or readjusting the topical agenda.

Since 1950, it has been observed that journalists have become more aggressive than forbearing as they used to be during questioning practice, which raises even more the degree of accountability from the perspective of politicians (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; 2010). This observation was the basis for the pioneering study of Clayman et al. in 2006 when they proposed the Question Analysis System (QAS), which operated as a system for measuring journalists' aggressiveness in questioning practice towards presidents of the United States from 1953 to 2000.

In this study, four dimensions of aggressiveness were suggested: *initiative*, which involves the journalists' active attitude of taking initiative, *directness* i.e the degree of an IR's straightforward way of questioning, *assertiveness* which reflects the extent of an IR's personal opinion that is embedded in a question, and *adversariness* that relates to the interviewer's setting of a contrary agenda to the interviewee's, according to CA methodology (Clayman et al., 2006: 565).

2.3 Preferred & Dispreferred responses

The sequential organisation of news interviews and debates is structured upon two paired utterances: adjacency pairs. Questions and answers are paired utterances in which the first component, i.e questions, projects the relevance of the topic, and so, the second component, i.e answers, needs to be in agreement with conditional relevance and be addressed immediately by the interlocutor (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; Sacks, 1992b).

Some of the main characteristics of adjacency pairs are their two-paired composition, their production by different speakers, their subsequent order, and their distinction into first-pair parts (FPPs) and second-pair parts (SPPs) (Clift, 2016:69-70). In the case of political interviews and debates, the FPPs are the questions by the journalists who set the agenda (topic, action, scope), and the SPPs are the answers by the political figures who need to perform a relevant utterance and a contextually appropriate action.

The linguistic design of talk (*composition*) along with the sequential context (*position*) (Clift et al., 2013), which is predetermined and specifically structured in these settings, provide the overhearing audience with potential understandings and interpretations of the actual questioning and answering. The FPPs provide the degree of relevance with which the SPPs are in accordance or not, and that is why the latter are divided into preferred and dispreferred responses depending on whether they are relevant to the FPPs and whether they perform the specific activity the interlocutors have been addressed to (Pomerantz, 1984; Schegloff, 2007).

In interviews, certain types of questions project certain types of answers for the latter to be perceived as relevant and to have a satisfying degree of responsiveness; this structure is captured and understood through the preference for contiguity and agreement between questions and answers (Sacks, 1987; Buttny, 1993). For instance, a negatively structured interrogative seeks confirmation and a "yes" answer is its preferred response while delay elements and prolongation features are characterised as evidence of a dispreferred answer (Buttny, 1993:44).

3. Methodology

3.1 Conversation Analysis

The methodological tool used for this study is Conversation Analysis (CA), the origins of which date back to the early 1960s when Harvey Sacks initiated and developed his pioneering work in this field. The main object of study in CA is the interaction *per se*, along with the actions that are implemented and the behavioural patterns being performed in talk-in-interaction. The development of the prototype model of turn-taking in conversation was initiated by Sacks et. al (1974) and it comprised the essential methodological tool in CA for a plethora of following studies.

According to this model, turn-taking in various “speech exchange systems” is locally managed by its participants, based on a turn-by-turn design, influenced by interaction, and guided by the recipient’s contribution. Institutional talk shares some of these characteristics but it is also distinctive from it regarding the dimensions of turn-taking organisation, structure, sequence, semantic choices, and epistemology (Drew & Heritage, 1992).

3.2 Data and Transcription Conventions

The data is extracted from the YouTube platform, and therefore, there was no need to obtain permission from third parties, as the videos are publicly available, and no sort of transformation is implemented on the transcribed conversations. The given analysis involves several public figures and different personalities, both from the domain of journalism and politics. The data corpus comes from two types of resources; two political debates, one in 2009¹ and another in 2015², before the elections of the respective periods and three broadcast interviews, one in 2009³ and the other two in 2022⁴, between professional journalists and political figures.

The involved journalists in the debates and interviews are P. Tsimas, S. Kosioni, E. Liatsos, N. Evaggelatos, J. Pretenteris, N. Hatzinikolaou, and D. Anagnostopoulou, while the politicians come from various left and right-wing parties and political formations being cited within the main analysis. The transcription conventions used in the given study follow the Jeffersonian system (2004) to describe and capture the presented phenomena (see Appendix A for the symbols). The transcription follows the Latin alphabet instead of the Greek for purposes of ease for the readers (see Appendix B for the full transcripts). Two translations follow on from the transcription, the first one being a word-by-word translation from Greek to English to capture the meaning of each word in the given grammatical and syntactical context; the second one is an idiomatic translation in English including colloquial and idiomatic expressions of the equivalents in Greek.

3.3 News Interviews And Debates

Before proceeding to the main analysis, it is important to clarify that although both news interviews and debates belong to the genre of institutional talking, and therefore they were chosen to be analysed inseparably, they appear to have a series of similarities and dissimilarities.

To start with the similarities, both settings come from the same domain, politics; the analysis pertains to the sector of politics and current affairs of socio-economic developments, two crucial subjects traced preliminary to the institutional sectors of broadcast interviews and debates. Additionally, the sequential organisation in both cases remain the same, with the turn-taking organisation of questions and answers in preallocation design being their distinctive characteristic. Another common element of interviews and debates is the pre-arranged subjects of the agenda to be discussed neutrally. In both cases, journalists have a predetermined repertoire of questions to address and topics to touch upon, but this is only the default situation.

Regarding the differences between these settings, they appear to have some intra-differences in terms of the structure, the imposed guidelines to be followed, and the anticipated role of each participant. In particular, questions and answers in debates are conducted within a certain amount of time with strict limitations, i.e interviewers have 30 seconds to make their first question, and 15 seconds for only one follow-up enquiry, while interviewees have 1:20 to 1:30 minutes to answer the first question, and 30 seconds to answer the follow-up.

¹ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eCpnxJaVsAk&list=PLhGnrsqkiHR22hft1Opkmlvj68krDAdW&index=8&ab_channel=latinsoapsfever

2

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7s1Ru3Wofko&list=PLhGnrsqkiHR22hft1Opkmlvj68krDAdW&index=7&ab_channel=%CE%95%CE%A1%CE%A4%CE%91.%CE%95

³ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RKrw1n4vUlg&list=PLhGnrsqkiHR22hft1Opkmlvj68krDAdW&index=3&ab_channel=newstimechannel

⁴ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K2hOxr-dgzs&list=PLhGnrsqkiHR22hft1Opkmlvj68krDAdW&index=1&ab_channel=%CE%9F%CE%A0%CF%81%CF%89%CE%B8%CF%85%CF%80%CE%BF%CF%85%CF%81%CE%B3%CF%8C%CF%82 and

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_pLgRUBdY18&list=PLhGnrsqkiHR22hft1Opkmlvj68krDAdW&index=9&ab_channel=%CE%91%CE%BB%CE%AD%CE%BE%CE%B7%CF%82%CE%A4%CF%83%CE%AF%CF%80%CF%81%CE%B1%CF%82%CE%99

[AlexisTspiras](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_pLgRUBdY18&list=PLhGnrsqkiHR22hft1Opkmlvj68krDAdW&index=9&ab_channel=%CE%91%CE%BB%CE%AD%CE%BE%CE%B7%CF%82%CE%A4%CF%83%CE%AF%CF%80%CF%81%CE%B1%CF%82%CE%99)

Moreover, a professional journalist's coordination of political debates is limited to coordinating the discussion, making the openings and endings, and allocating the questions and answers to the corresponding participants. A crucial responsibility of the coordinator is to sanction IRs and IEs when they stray from the expected subjects or when they breach their time limitations, whereas in news interviews this is a duty which accounts solely for the interviewer who does the questioning. In this study, the coordinator's utterances have been omitted on purpose for economic reasons being treated as redundant for the analysis.

Even though political interviews and debates belong to the genre of institutional talk, debates are structured on a basis with more strict guidelines and regulations. Specifically, in news interviews overlaps are a common and highly anticipated phenomenon, while in debates they are forbidden and treated as problematic. Overlaps lead to various following actions, such as agreements, alignments, or confrontations, that are purposefully avoided.

4. Questioning

4.1 Incorporation Of Preferences

The extensive study of Clayman and Heritage (2002) on approximately 250 prototypical news interview broadcasts of American and British national programs revealed a range of various structural ways with which journalists set their agendas in terms of questioning. Among these, there are structures such as wh- questions, yes/no type, and polar alternatives which are found to be similar to the Greek data. However, the differentiations lie in the style of questioning and how IRs manage the topical agenda.

Questions constitute an integral part of interviews and debates as they are the first component of the preallocation format that sets out the frame for the following turns to be recognised as answers, to be projected as relevant responses to the type of the addressed question and to encapsulate a satisfying degree of responsiveness to the particular enquiry (Schegloff, 1996: 110). Hence, the type of a particular question and how the interviewer designs its structure reveals which is the preferred or dispreferred response; this is what Clayman and Heritage called the *incorporation of preferences* (Clayman & Heritage, 2002: 208-209). Different sorts of indicators that reveal a dispreferred answer are phonological characteristics, such as prolongations, delays, and reluctance traits (Buttny, 1993: 44). For example,

(1) UK Greatbatch 1986: 451: Unilateral Nuclear Disarmament

IR: Robin Day IE: Peter Shore

(Clayman & Heritage, 2002: 251)

- 1 IR: You wouldn't serve in a Cabinet committed to lu-
 2 unilateral nuclear disarmament of Britain would
 3 you Mister Shore?
 4 IE: .hh What I do believe:: er:: Mister Day (which)
 5 →I will not a:answer that question, I'm not (.)
 6 →deliberately answering that question.

Here in lines 1-3, the IR is making a declarative + tag question in negative form while seeking confirmation. Instead, a dispreferred response follows which is formulated with delay characteristics i.e., the inhale features (.hh) and prolongations (*believe::, er::*). Finally, in lines 5 and 6, the IE is explicitly expressing his resistance to answering the addressed question. In the same vein, Greek IRs design their questions in a certain way to elicit a piece of information setting the boundaries for a relevant and acceptable answer:

(2) Debate 2009, IR: E. Liatsos IE: G. Papandreou

- 1L: tora thelo na sas rotiso kirie Papandreou pos prosopika tha
 now (I) want to you ask mister Papandreou how personally will
 →**now I want to ask you Mister Papandreou how you will personally**
 2 hiristite (.) tis elinoamerikanikes shesis (0.1)
 (you) manage (.) the greek-american relationships (0.1)
manage (.) the Greek-American relationships (0.1)
 3 nomizete oti me esas prothipurgo avrio tha ala:ksi to kli'tma?
 (you) think that with you president tomorrow will cha:nge the cli'tmate?
 →**do you think that with you as a President tomorrow the vi'tbe will cha:nge?**
 4 ke ena an mu epitrepi ke i kiria Hukli
 and one if to me allows and Mrs Hukli
and one more question if Mrs Hukli allow me to
 5 tha sinehisete tin gramu tu veto sto skopiano?
 will you continue the line of the veto in Macedonia?
 →**will you continue the line of the veto in the Macedonian issue?**

- 6P: tris erotisis (.) prota apola na po oti: se oti afora tis
three questions (.) first of all to say tha::t in what concerns
→**three questions (.) first of all let me say tha::t in what concerns**
- 7 diaphragmatefsis gia to:n agogo hriazete na dume themata opos paradigmatos hari
negotiations for the: pipe need to see issues like for example
negotiations for the: pipeline that we need to see like issues for example
- 8 pos o agogos aftos tha aksiopiithi ke m- gia alus logus
how the pipe this will (be) used and w- for other reasons
how this pipeline will be used and w- for other purposes ((...))

In extract 2, Liatsos starts with an explanatory how-question in lines 1-2 (*how will you personally manage the Greek-American relationships*) and a yes/no type of question in line 3 (*do you think that with you as a President tomorrow the vibe will change?*) seeking a straightforward yes/no answer plus elaboration to explain the reasons for this declaration. Here, the question is designed more for the politician to elaborate and give an account as to why his election will lead to a socio-economic change rather than giving a minimum affirmative response as in this case his answer would be heard as evasive while withholding essential information from the audience (Clayman & Heritage, 2002: 245).

The IR has exceeded the time limitation and that is why he is asking for the coordinator's permission to make another yes/no type of question in line 5 (*will you continue the line of the veto in the Macedonian issue?*). Again, the IR takes the initiative to add a third question, indicated by the arrow, from the topical agenda asking for a direct yes/no answer as the preferred answer. The IE formulates his response in line 6 by explicitly stating the number of questions followed by a micropause. This formulation is potentially designed to be heard as a complaint towards the challenge imposed by the IR to answer a large number of questions within a limited timeframe. After that, the IE initiates his answer with a *first of all*-prefaced statement (see 5.1.3 below) while picking up on one of the three proposed topics and commenting on that instead of answering.

4.2 Embodiment Of Presuppositions

A common practice of interviewers is producing large units of talk before the actual question, as a prefatory statement, to provide useful background knowledge, to consolidate their question with other kinds of information, or to express an opinion or assertion towards the question (*quasi-factual* assertions after the question to reinforce the embedded argument [Clayman & Heritage, 2002:134]).

In prefaced statements as well as in questions *per se* there can be discerned different kinds of *presupposition embodiments*, either overt through an explicit way or covert in a more subtle manner, and they are usually detected in yes/no questions and polar alternatives. For instance:

(3) UK BBC Radio World at One: 21 Aug 1984: Exclusion Order

IR: Ann Cadwallader IE: Martin Galvin

(Clayman & Heritage, 2002: 134)

- 1IE: I went to the north I went through whatever it
2 was I went through (0.2) precisely because: I
3 want to see peace in Ireland. ((...))
8IR:→.hh Will you be coming back next year.=The
9 exclusion order still stands against yo[u].
10IE: [.hhh
11IE: Well it is up to the British,...

In the above extract, in lines 8 and 9 the IR is making a yes/no question which seems to be a rather simple enquiry, but it entails a crucial presupposition which makes it more profound; for the IE to answer positively it is presupposed that he will be free and allowed to return next year. This presupposition is subtly reinforced by the following quasi-factual assertion of the interviewer (*the exclusion order...*).

As mentioned above, the embodiment of presuppositions is frequently found in the prefatory statement the IRs are formulating to provide background knowledge and set out the appropriate context for a question to be acknowledged as a reasonable question. According to the contract between IRs and IEs, interview interaction is a collaborative activity with principles and regulations from both sides. Specifically, interviewees are being collaborative by perceiving that the prefaced statement is produced only for introductory purposes and waiting for the actual question to be made and answered (Clayman & Heritage, 2002:105).

In the following example, there is a breach of the collaborative guidelines with the IE to be commenting on the introductory statement instead of answering what he has been asked and addressing the embedded presuppositions:

(4) Interview at Delphi Economic Forum 2022, IR: D. Anagnostopoulou IE: A. Tsipras

- 1 A: katigorite tin kivernisi gia viei apolignitopiisi (.)
(you) accuse the government of violent lignite phase-out (.)
you accuse the government of the cruel ending of lignite dependence (.)
- 2 o lignitis omos den ine katholu prasinos
the lignite but not is at all green
but the lignite is not at all eco-friendly
- 3 antitheta i evropaiiki epitropi ipe pos ine prasini #i# piriniki energia.
instead the European committee said that is green #the# nuclear energy.
on the contrary the European committee said that #the# nuclear energy is eco-friendly.
- 4 tha itan tabou gia esas kirie proedre i prasini #i# piriniki energia?
would be taboo for you mister president the green #the# nuclear energy?
→**would it be untouchable for you mister President the green #the# nuclear energy?**
- 5T: tha sas apantiso sto erotima sas ala na diefkriniso (.) den katigorume tin kivernisi
(I) will to you answer in the question of your but to clarify (.) (we) do not accuse the government
→**I will answer your question but I want to clarify (.) we don't accuse the government**
- 6 mono gia ti viea apolignitopiisi↓ ala ke gia to gegonos oti den ihe
only for the violent lignite phase-out↓ but and for the fact that (it) did not have
only of the cruel ending of lignite dependence↓ but also of the fact that it didn't have
- 7 ena shedio mia ethniki energiaki stratigiki me arhi mesi ke telos
one plan one national energetic strategy with beginning middle and end
a plan a national energy strategy with a beginning middle and end (...)
- 8A: ti metra omos tha lamvanate esis ke thelame na mas pite
what measures though will take you and (we) wanted to us tell
→**what measures though would you take and we would like you to tell us**
- 9 sigkekrimena hhh idiki ritra katanalosis? foro anaprosarmogis?
specifically hhh specific limit of consumption? a tax of readjustment?
→**specifically hhh specific limit of consumption? a tax of readjustment?**
- 10 ehete ipologisi to dimosionomiko kostos?
have (you) calculated the financial cost?
→**have you calculated the financial cost?**
- 11T:(0.2) kitahte ((clears his throat)) (.) edo prin ftasume
(0.2) look (.) here before (we) arrive
(0.2) look (.) now before we reach
- 12 na:: sizitame gia to dimosionomiko kostos (.) prepi na dume oti:: a::
to:: talk about the financial cost (.) (we) should to see tha::t u::m
to:: talk about the financial cost (.) we should see tha::t u::m
- 13 iparhi opos ipame stin arhi mia:: e:: ena elima energiakis stratigikis
exists as (we) told in the beginning a:: u::m a deficiency of energetic strategy
there is as we said in the beginning a:: u::m a deficiency of energy strategy (...)

Anagnostopoulou starts with a prefatory statement in line 1 saying that the politician's oppositional party is accusing the current Prime Minister of his policy to stop depending on lignite resources and in line 3 she adds that the European Committee states that nuclear energy is more eco-friendly over lignite. In line 4, she formulates a yes/no question seeking a disconfirmation as the preferred response because of the way the question is designed with the negative word *untouchable* describing the politician's stance towards the government's policy.

The question in line 4 presupposes that Tsipras is against the environmental strategy of the current government which is given in the preface (*you accuse the government of the cruel ending of lignite dependence*). Due to this disagreement, the IE is accountable for sharing with the public his political position on this issue and suggesting alternative options. This is what the IR is trying to elicit with her question in line 4, i.e., make the politician disconfirm that nuclear energy is an untouchable policy for him and his party.

In line 5, there is a breach of the contract between the journalists and the interviewees as Tsipras is deliberately being evasive by commenting on the prefatory statement (line 1) and adding another accusation that his party holds against the existing government. This evasive practice does not remain unchallenged by the IR who reinstates the topical agenda and forces the IE to answer to the point by making a wh- question in line 8 (*what measures though would you take*), by proposing two possible answers in lines 8-9 in interrogative form with a degree of assertiveness while speaking on behalf of the audience and herself as to what they would like to hear (*we would like you to tell us...*), and by adding a relevant to her prior enquiries yes/no question in line 10. Again, Tsipras is evasive and initiates his answer in line 11 with a mini delay feature and a *look*-prefaced statement indicating a redirection of the topic by pushing it back.

4.3 Style Of Questioning

Many journalists have built their broadcasting careers due to their distinctive skills that have attached to them specific characteristics concerning their manner of questioning for which they are known and have obtained a "distinctive public persona" (Clayman & Heritage, 2002: 14). Therefore, some interviewers have become known for their adversarial and hostile questioning practice, especially after the 1950s, whereas others are more condescending and they exert less pressure on interviewees.

In the case of Greek journalists, it is found that one common practice is the production of multiple questions back-to-back, with embedded presuppositions, within a lengthy unit of talk, resulting in leaving room for the IEs to manoeuvre and reformulate the question(s) and the topical agenda. We can observe this practice in extracts 2 and 4 above, in which the IRs make three consecutive questions in their effort to exert pressure on IEs. The result is politicians being bombarded with many questions and picking up on one of the topics to shift or readjust the agenda without answering or confirming/ disconfirming the addressed presuppositions.

In the following extract, the IR makes four questions from the same topic and they are related to one another as each of these presupposes that the previous one is valid:

(5) Debate 2009, IR: N. Evaggelatos IE: K. Karamanlis

- 5E: hh tha thela na mas pite an kserete POsi ine i
hh (I) would like to us tell if (you) know how MAny are the
→**hh I would like you to tell us if you know how MAny are the**
- 6 ergazomeni sto dimosio ke TI mistho pernun (.) me
the employees in the public sector and WHAT wage do (they) take with
→**employees in the public sector and WHAT wage do they earn (.) with**
- 7 ta staz (.) ke giati eno i evropaike e-nosi epivali
the staz (.) and why while the European u-nion imposes
→**the Stage program (.) and why while the European U-nion imposes them to**
- 8 na asholude mono dekaokto mines gia na (.) apoktisin ebiria
to be occupied only eighteen months so as to (.) get experience
to be occupied only eighteen months to (.) get experience
- 9 kapii apo aftus apasholude stin idia thesi eos ke eksi hronia kaliptodas
some of them are occupied in the same position up and six years covering
of them are occupied in the same position up to six years covering
- 10 pro::dilos pat'gies anagkes ala me poli hamiloterus misthus anasfalisti
evid::ntly esta'blished needs but with very lower wages uninsured
evid::ntly esta'blished needs but with much lower wages uninsured
- 11 ke kirios omiri (.) pos to epitrepete afto?
and mainly hostages (.) how do (you) allow this?
→**and mainly hostages (.) how do you allow this?**
- 12K: na ksekatharisume kati kirie Evaggelato ((palms up))(.) ine t'apolita
let's make clear something Mister Evaggelato (.) (it) is t'absolutely
→**let's make something clear Mister Evaggelato (.) it is t'absolutely**
- 13 nomimi diadikasia ke ine diadikasia pu kirios ehi na kani ehi shesi (.) me:
legal procedure and (it) is procedure that mainly has to do has relation (.) with
a legal procedure and it is a procedure that mainly has to do is in relation (.) with
- 14 ekpedefsi ke katartisi (.) tora apo eki ke pera bori na min ine ikanopiitikos o misthos↓
education and training (.) now from there and after can to not be satisfying the wage↓
education and training (.) henceforth the wage may not be satisfying↓ (...)
- 15E: rotisa posi ine i ergazomeni me staz
(I) asked how many are the employees with staz

I asked how many employees are with the Stage program

- 16 ke ti mistho pernun ala den ine mono afti
and what wage (they) take but not only the
and what wage they earn but it's not only them (...)

In the indicated lines, four questions are highlighted, mainly explanatory, (*how MAny are the employees in the public... WHAT wage do they receive...why while the European...how do you allow this?*), of which the final one encapsulates the interrelated presupposition that all of the above questions are valid. The politician by explaining how he allows for the exploitation of young employees through this type of program, confirms the presuppositions embedded in the previous questions. Therefore, he avoids addressing the questions and instead, he refuses the responsibility by shifting the subject in line 12 where he sets in the foreground the legality of the given procedure.

The IR takes the initiative to formulate a new turn constructional unit in line 15 by affirmatively repeating two of the questions he asked that contradict the IE's effort to go off the topical agenda and imply the politician's evasive conduct is sanctionable. However, the journalist does not persist in extracting an answer and he continues with another question.

It becomes evident that Greek journalists conform to the shift that has been detected in the last 50 years in being more straightforward using complex question designs with prefaced statements, incorporating presuppositions and preferences, and taking the initiative to challenge politicians' answers. However, Greek interviewers' unique style of multi-sentence questioning contributes to the evasiveness phenomenon as they leave room for the IEs to juxtapose the embedded presuppositions, comment on any of their preferred topics and reformulate the agenda's framework.

5. Answering

5.1 Prefaced Turns

Prefaced turns are formulated to establish the relationship between the preceding and the following talk in a sequential environment where a speaker's response reveals the degree of relevance, agreement or not, stance, and knowledge or it may constitute a repair initiator ('what?' 'sorry?') when a speaker's previous turn is treated as problematic (Drew, 1997).

A characteristic case is the function of *well*-prefaced turns in the initial position (Heritage, 2015) which project a topic shift or a move away from the previous sequence and they are indicative responses in a question-answer environment of what actions will follow. At the same time, the *well*-turn initiator establishes the current speaker's side of things and his/her epistemic contribution on a collaborative basis. In this article, instances of *look-*, *listen-*, and *first of all-* prefaced turns are examined as indicators of evasive conduct in the question-answer format of news interviews and debates.

5.1.1 'Look'- prefaced turns

The following extract comes from the interview of the former Primer Minister of Grece, the political leader of the left-wing Syriza party, A. Tsipras, by the interviewer D. Anagnostopoulou and it constitutes the continuation of extract (4).

(6) Interview at Delphi Economic Forum 2022, IR: D. Anagnostopoulou IE: A. Tsipras

- 76A: (...) ipate sto kriti tivi oti: ine i katalili stigmi gia mia prosfigi sti
(you) said in the crete tv tha::t (it) is the right moment for an appeal in
you said on Crete tv tha::t it is the right moment for an appeal in
- 77 hagi .hhh thelo na mu pite giati ala ke thelo na
the Hague .hhh (I) want to me tell why but and (I) want to
→**Hague .hhh I want you to tell me why and I also want to**
- 78 mu pite pos krinete tin a:: prosfigi tis kivernisis sti hagi
me tell how (you) judge the u::m appeal of the government in the Hague
→**tell me how you evaluate the u::m appeal of the government in the Hague**
- 79 gia ta egklimata:: polemu sti mariupoli.
for the crime::s of war in the mariupol.
concerning the crime::s of the war in Mariupol.
- 80T: .hh ne kitahte: (.) se oti afora to diethnes piniko dikastirio e:
.hh yes loo::k (.) in whatever concerns the international penal cou::rt u:m
→**.hh yes loo::k (.) in whatever concerns the international penal court u:m**
- 81 profanos ke opios ehi kani egklimata polemu prepi na logodotisi (0.1)
apparently and whoever has committed crimes of war has to account (0.1)
apparently whoever has committed crimes of war has to account (for them) (0.1)

- 82 entutis ena thema ine opos gnorizete ute i rosia
however one issue is as (you) know either the Russia
however an issue as you know is that neither Russia
- 83 ute i inomenes ()po- i inomenes polities tis amerikis anagorizun (.)
either the united ()st- the United States of the America acknowledge (.)
nor the United ()st- the United States of America acknowledge (.)
- 84 ti dikeodosia aftu tu dikastiriu (0.2)
the jurisdiction this the court (0.2)
the jurisdiction of this court (0.2)
- 85 e:: se oti afora omos to megalo ethniko mas ↓zitima (0.2)
u::m in whatever concerns though the big national of ours ↓issue (0.2)
→**u::m but in what concerns our important national ↓issue (0.2)**
- 86 kita::hte nomizo oti ine aftonoito oti prepi na ehume mia (0.1)
loo::k (I) think that (it) is obvious that (we) must have one (0.1)
→**loo::k I think that it is obvious that we should have a (0.1)**
- 87 ethniki stratigiki i opia na ehi arhi mesi ke telos ke sinehia
national strategy which to have beginning middle and end and continuity
national strategy that has a beginning middle and ending and continuity ((...))

The IR is asking the politician two open-ended explanatory questions in lines 77 and 78 relating to why is the right time for an appeal in Hague for the crimes of the war in Mariupol and how the politician evaluates this action. The onset of the politician's answer in line 80 (*hh yes loo::k (.) in whatever concerns the international penal court...*) foreshadows that a dispreferred answer will follow based on the articulatory and delay features (in-breath, prolongation, micropause).

Indeed, the IE is not giving an account and he is redirecting the agenda with a look-prefaced turn in second position using the lexical components *apparently* and *whoever* in line 81 says "*apparently whoever has committed crimes of war has to account for them*" which constitutes extreme case formulations (Pomerantz, 1984; Buttny, 1993; Sacks, 1995; Sidnell, 2004) to depersonalise his assessment by providing a generally accepted statement.

Following, the IE is formulating a new TCU in line 85 through the pre-placed appositional *u::m* and the oppositional *but (u::m but in what concerns our important national issue)* projecting a disjunction with the aforementioned (Schegloff, 1987). A new topic is indeed initiated and it is formulated in line 86 using again the extreme case formulation *obvious* to legitimate his statement (*look I think that it is obvious that we should have a national strategy that has a beginning middle and ending*) with the look-prefaced turn in first position instead of the second position that it was found in line 80.

Look-prefaced turns project disaffiliation between what the current speaker is about to say and what the previous speaker just said. Nonetheless, it becomes apparent from extract (6) that a look-prefaced turn in the second position, as in line 80, conveys a degree of redirection of the proposed topic, while in the first position of a new TCU, as in line 86, it projects the relaunch of a new topic and, subsequently, a change of the topical agenda.

5.1.2 'Listen'- prefaced turns

In the following extract, Karamanlis, who was president of the centre-right New Democracy party and Prime Minister of Greece from 2004 to 2009, is asked three questions in lines 40-42 as to whether a member of his political party should have resigned or been fired after the accusations of bribery and corruption against him.

(7) Interview 2009, IR: J. Pretenteris, IE: K. Karamanlis

- 40P: ((...))o (kirios) pavlid- parameni melos tis () omadas tis neas dimokratias (.)
the (mister) pavlid- stays member of () team of the new republic (.)
(Mister) Pavlid- stays a member of () team of the party of New Republic (.)
- 41 tha eprepe na ehi paretithi? tha eprepe na ton ihate paretisi?
(he) should have resigned? (you) should have fired him?
should he have resigned? should you have fired him?
- 42 ti tha prepe na ehi gini?
what should have been done?
what should have been done?
- 43K: =akuste(.) prota apola i ipothesi stin opia <anafertihike> anafertihikate
=listen(.) first of all the case in which <referred> (you) referred

→=listen(.) first of all the case in which <referred> you referred

- 44 dierevnihtike (.) ke dierevnihtike se vathos (0.1)
(it) investigated (.) and (it) investigated in depth (0.1)
it was investigated (.) and it was investigated in depth (0.1)
- 45 ke ine apofasi vulis hori(s) na epirezete kanenas
and (it) is decision of parliament withou(t) to (be) influenced anyone
and it is the decision of the Parliament wit(h) nobody to be affected ((...))
- 55 apo eki ke pera to pos kanenas (0.1) krini ta pragmata ke siberiferete
from there and after the how anyone (0.1) judges the things and behaves
thereafter the way that anyone (0.1) evaluates the situation and behaves
- 56 i epilegi epidi mu kanate () ke meta
or chooses because you did () and after
or chooses because you did () and after
- 57 =afto ine kathara prosopiki ipothesi.
=this is clearly a personal hypothesis.
=this is clearly a personal matter.

The politician starts his answer with a listen-prefaced statement in line 43 (*listen(.) first of all the case in which you referred was investigated*) giving the impression that he will respond according to the agenda's action, i.e., confirming or disconfirming the addressed question as to what should have been done that eventually none of the suggested actions happened, as suggested by Sidnell's work on look- and listen-prefaced turns (Sidnell, 2007:404-405). Here, the listen-prefaced turn in the second position has neither a redirecting function nor a degree of responsiveness. Instead, the listen-prefaced turn is designed to readjust the agenda by providing a vague answer to reassure the journalist and the audience that the case was investigated as required (line 44).

Specifically, Karamanlis avoids giving an account by replacing his turn beginning and repairing his initiation after a micropause with a 'first of all'- preface following a different trajectory (Sidnell, 2007: 398). The IE uses an anaphoric noun (*case*) to refer to the topic in general without answering the why-type questions and he reformulates the question's framework to avoid addressing the embedded presupposition.

In this way, the politician's answer is designed not to confirm the deontic character of the questions as to what should have been done and so the IE become accountable for not acting in the right way in the past. By contrast, Karamanlis is being evasive by giving a depersonalised assessment without going into detail about what happened and shifting the responsibility to the public who can evaluate this incident as they prefer (*thereafter the way that anyone (0.1) evaluates the situation and behaves or chooses because you did () and after =this is clearly a personal matter*).

5.1.3 'First of all'- prefaced turns

In the following extract, there is a case of explicit redirection of the topic by the IE, P. Lafazanis who has served as the leader of a prior Greek left-wing political party, the Popular Unity, as he deliberately comments on something irrelevant to what he is being asked.

(8) Debate 2015, IR: S. Kosioni IE: P. Lafazanis

- 2 K: ((...)) thelo lipon na sas rotiso ean me to diko sas e shedio tha bori
(I) want so to you ask if with the your um plan (it) will can
so I want to ask you if with your um plan it will be possible
- 3 na liturgisi omala to sistima igias i >ke ta sholia<
to operate smoothly the system of health or >and the schools<
for the health system to operate smoothly or >even schools<
- 4 mias pu: i enotita eberiehi ke tin pedia.
si::nce the unit includes and the education.
since that: the section includes education as well.
- 5 .hh I i protasi sas eberiehi riska
.hh OR the suggestion of yours includes risks
.hh OR your suggestion includes risks
- 6 ta opia nomizo oti ipohreuste na ehete eksigisi proigumenos ston eliniko lao.
that (I) think that(you)are obliged to have explained previously in the Greek people.
that I think you are obliged to have explained previously to the Greek people
- 7 L: hh katarhas na simfoniso me tin kiria Zaharea >na kano kati< paradokso

- hh first of all to agree with the Mrs Zaharea >to do something< unusual
 →**hh first of all let me agree with Mrs Zaharea >to do something< unusual**
- 8 gia tin anagki (0.1) e:: o- epanastasi stin pedia (.)
 for the need (0.1) u::m th- revolution in the education (.)
for the need (0.1) u::m th- revoluTION in education (.)
- 9 opos hriazete ke epanastasi stin igia (0.4) idietera omos stin pedia.
 as needed and revolution in the health (0.4) particularly though in the education.
as revolution is also needed in health (0.4) particularly though in education.
- 10 ala:: epanastasi stin pedia (.) den ine ta idiotika (.) panepistimia
 bu::t revolution in the education (.) isn't the non-public (.) universities
bu::t revolution in education (.) isn't the non-public (.) universities
- 11 LEos (0.1) epanastasi stin pedia- [ine
 MErcy (0.1) revolution in the education- [is
for MErcy (0.1) revolution in education- [is
- 12 K: [>me sinhorite< den sas eho rotisi giafto omos (.) ↓kirie Lafazani
 [>me excuse< (I) not you have asked about this however (.) ↓Mister Lafazani
[>excuse me< but I have not asked you about this (.) ↓Mister Lafazanis

In lines 2-6, the IR asks two yes/no questions as to whether the proposed plan of the politician incorporates the smooth operation of the health and education sector anticipating a confirmation as the preferred response. However, the IE is commenting in line 7 on the question of another journalist, Mrs Zaharea, who had previously addressed a question to another politician instead of answering the question by the current journalist, Mrs Kosioni.

The politician initiates his answer with a first of all-prefaced TCU in second position that projects a redirection of the discussed topic while being aware that his action constitutes a breach of the debate conduct rules as he characterises it as “unusual” (*hh first of all let me agree with Mrs Zaharea to do something unusual*). Indeed, the IE is being explicitly evasive as he is not responding to the addressed question until the completion of his turn in line 11. The IR does not leave this evasive practice unchallenged as we can see in line 12 that she is interrupting him through an overlap saying *excuse me but I have not asked you about this* in order to reinstate him to the topical agenda as instructed by her, the IE.

We observe that first of all-, the initiator projects the way an answer is structured and the different trajectories that it will follow. First of all- prefaced turns in the second position function as temporal redirecting markers in terms of how politicians prioritise and re-prioritise the course of a turn's progression. Hence, the interviewees change the order of the IR's topical agenda by projecting their argument as more important to occupy the turn beginning of their answer and displaying the structural organisation of their turn that does align with the one posed by the journalist.

5.1.4 Rhetorical Questions

The following extracts include instances of rhetorical questions by the IE in the second position (extract 9) and in the first position of a new TCU (extract 10) both launching a different course of action due to their sequential position and the preceding questioning.

(9) Debate 2009, IR: P. Tsimas IE: G. Karatzaferis

- 1T: ((...)) eho mia meleti (.) fadazome tha tin ehete di ki esis
 (I) have a report (.) (I) imagine (you) will it have seen and you
I have a report (.) I imagine you have also seen it
- 2 ine meleti >tu institutu metana(steftiku) politik-<
 (it) is a study >the institution of immi(gra)tion)polic-<
it is a study >from the institution of immi(gra)tion)polic-<
- 3 metanasteftikis politikis ke ehi dio senaria
 immigration policy and (it) has two scenarios
immigration policy and it has two scenarios
- 4 ti tha simvi sti hora an (.) se mia mera figun OLI i metanastes;
 what will happen in the country if (.) in one day leave ALL the immigrants;
what would happen in the country if (.) in one day ALL immigrants left;
- 5 ke ti tha simvi sti hora an mia mera erthun ali
 and what will happen in the country if one day come other
and what would happen in the country if in one day extra

- 6 diakoses hilades epipleon metanastes;
twenty thousand more immigrants;
twenty thousand immigrants arrive_z ((...))
- 7 giati thelete na tus dioksume de ke kala?
why (you) want to them send away no matter what?
–**why do you want to send them away no matter what?**
- 8K: a: katarhin prepri na po oti: simera to debate gin(a)t(i)
u::m first of all (I) have to say that: today the debate happ(e)n(s)
–**u::m first of all I have to say that: today the debate is happ(e)n(i)n**
- 9 tilemahia .hh sti f(th)inoporini isimeria (.) pu simeni oti apo
tv war .hh in the au(t)umnal equinox (.) that means that from
tv war .hh in the au(t)umnal equinox (.) which means that from
- 10 tora megaloni i nihta. elpizo na min ine meGAlI ke se vathos
now grows the night. (I) hope to not be bIG and in depth
now the night will be growing. I hope not to be grEAt and in depth
- 11 i nihta gia tin elada (.) pu ksekinai tora.
the night for the Greece (.) that starts now.
the night for Greece (.) that starts now.
- 12 a:: katarhin pios ipe na tus dioksume? ipa posostosi .hh
u::m first of all who said to them send away? (I) said quota .hh
–**u::m first of all who did say to send them away? I said quota .hh**
- 13 oti ipe o Lafoden sti germania (.) posostosi.
whatever said the Lafontaine in the Germany (.) quota.
whatever Lafontaine said in Germany (.) quota.

After the long prefatory statement that the IR gave (indicated by the double parenthesis), he proceeds to a *why*-type question in line 7, asking for an explanation (*why do you want to send the immigrants away no matter what*). The IE initially redirects the topic with a preface in line 8, commenting on something completely irrelevant to the previous question that takes up 4 lines. Then, in line 12, he constructs a new TCU that is the answer to the prior (*u::m first of all who did say to send them away? I said quota*). He reprioritises the agenda using the first of all-preface and he subsequently reformulates the addressed question through a rhetorical question.

The IE does not give an account as the preferred answer to the *why*-type question. Instead, he is challenging the aforementioned accusation that is a negative assertion to the prior claim (Koshik, 2003: 52). The IE is challenging the epistemic stance of the IR through the rhetorical question that is observed at the turn beginning of his utterance in second position illustrating that he was not the person that made that statement. Hence, the politician invalidates the original claim by the journalist, i.e., that the former wants the immigrants to be deported, and he treats the accusation as untenable, and, so he does not answer it.

(10) Debate 2009, IR: P. Tsimas IE: N. Hrisogelos

- 1 T: se periodo ifesis ke ipsilis anergias
in period of recession and high unemployment
in a period of recession and high unemployment (you suggest)
- 2 na stamatisun ta dimosia erga gia dromus i den ksero ego gia ti alo
to stop the public works for roads or (I) don't know I for what else
the public works to stop for the roads or I don't know what else
- 3 pu odos epivarinun to perivalon ala prosferun ergasia;
that indeed burden the environment but offer work;
that indeed burden the environment but they offer jobs;
- 4 afto protinete?
this (you) suggest?
→**is this what you are suggesting?**
- 5 H: .hhh (0.2) sti simerini krissi (.) i nea dimokratia protini litotita
.hhh (0.2) in the today's crisis (.) the new republic suggests austerity
.hhh (0.2) in today's crisis (.) the New Republic suggests austerity
- 6 ke to pasok protini afksis' katanalosis
and the pasok suggests rise of consumption
and the Pasok suggests ris' of consumption ((...))

- 7 o tropos pu simera hrisimopiude i dapanes (.) ine enas tropos
the way that today used the expenses (.) (t)is one way
the way that today the expenses are deployed (.) is a way
- 8 pu odigi sti spatali pros mia lathos katefthinsi.
that leads to the waste towards one wrong direction.
that leads to waste towards the wrong direction.
- 9 idi gia ti refstotita tis ikonomias .hh dapanithikan terastia posa.
already for the liquidity of the economy .hh spent huge amounts.
for the liquidity of the economy .hh huge amounts have already been spent.
- 10 emis s'(afti) ti leme? iparhun tomis pu prepi na aLAKsun
we s' (this) what (we) say? exist sectors that must to CHAnge
→**what do we say about (that)? there are sectors that need to CHAnge**
- 11 gia na epivosune i: ik-odomi gia padi(g)ma i kataskeves
so that survive the: buil-ding for exam(p)le the constructions
in order to survive the: buil-ding for exam(p)le the constructions ((...))

After a long prefatory statement with background knowledge, the IR asks a yes/no type of question in line 4 relating to whether the politician is for or against the termination of public works for the sake of the environment. The IE begins his answer by quoting what other parties suggest in terms of their environmental policies (line 6). After a long prefatory statement describing how wrongly the expenses are used (lines 7-9), he makes a wh- rhetorical question in line 10 (*what do we say about that? there are sectors that need to change*) marking a transition to a different topic that he has already introduced. Following, he is self-responding to his question to make an assertion (Koshik, 2005) while making this transition seem a natural progress of the conversation.

It becomes evident that in both cases, the politicians do not respond to the addressed question by treating it as invalid and avoiding addressing the accusations imposed by the IR in their prefatory statements. The use of rhetorical questions is a practice of reformulating the topical agenda to challenge the prior negative assertion in the second position or launch a new topic in the middle of a turn. What is observed is a sequential pattern with which this practice is implemented and it is the following: (a) firstly, the IE incorporates (or not) a prefatory statement to set the ground for the insertion of a new topic, as in extract 10, (b) then the rhetorical question is formulated, and (c) lastly having the IEs self-respond to their questions and so switching roles with the journalists whose role is to set the topical agenda and ask the relevant questions.

5.1.5 Incorporation of IR's Wording

Another practice that is observed to be an evasive method by the IEs is the partial or total incorporation of the IR's units of talk to make the impression that they are answering on topic and engaging with the agenda's actions. Extract 11 establishes an instance of incorporation and repetition of more than one word by the IE.

(11) Interview 2022, IR: N. Hatzinikolaou IE: K. Mitsotakis

- 13H: ((...)) kirie proedre I entatikes (.) dehonte piesi ke simera pu milame↓
Mister President the ERs (.) receive pressure and today that (we) talk↓
Mister President the ERs (.) receive pressure until today that we are talking↓
- 14 ke to erotima ine an the adeksi to ethniko sistima igias (.)
and the question is if (it) will endure the national health system (.)
→**and the question is if the national health system will endure (.) ((...))**
- 15 to roto (.) dioti oso a: ki an nosi kanis ipiotera me tin omikron
it (I) ask (.) because as much u:m and if ails anyone more mildly with the omicron
I ask this (.) because even u:m though someone is ailing more mildly by omicron
- 16 ta krusmata ine pola↓ ((...))
the cases are many↓ ((...))
the cases are a lot↓ ((...))
- 17M: ke vlepume tin piesi simera (.) to ethniko sistima igias dehete piesi
and we watch the pressure today (.) the national health system receives pressure
→**and we see the pressure today (.) the national health system receives pressure**
- 18 ohi mono tora dehete piesi edo ke shedon (.) ikos'teseris e: mines
not only now (it) receives pressure here and almost (.) tw'nty four u:m months
not only now it has received pressure for almost (.) tw'nty four u:m months now
- 19 <adapokrinete omos.

<(it) responds though.

<it meets the needs though. (...)

- 20 ke tha ithela na do† oli afti pu mas askune kritiki simera
and (I) would like to see everyone these that us exert criticism today
and I would like to see if all these people who criticise us today
- 21 ean tha stiri†ksune pragmatika tis megales metarithmisis
if (they) will suppo†rt truly these big reformations
if they will truly suppo†rt these big reformations
- 22 pu to ethniko sistima igias ehi anagki tin epomeni mera.
that the national health system has need the following day.
that the national health system will need tomorrow.

The IR is asking indirectly a yes/no question in line 14 relating to whether the national health system will endure because of the pressure it was receiving during the pandemic followed by a long explanatory statement that has been omitted. In line 17, the IE is constructing an and-prefaced turn to structure a response in a collaborative way with the IR while making his answer seem as if it naturally belongs together with the prior talk (*and we see the pressure today (.) the national health system receives pressure not only now it receives pressure for almost twenty-four months*).

At the same time, the politician repeats the same word (*pressure*) and phrase (*the national health system*) used by the IR in a turn initial position to seem to be attending to the question and not go off-topic. The IE also returns to the same phrase towards the closure of his response in line 22 to prompt a possible turn completion, indicating he has successfully answered the question (Clayman, S., & Heritage, 2002: 247-248).

The politician initiates his answer by repeating the journalist's full noun phrase(s) without making use of the normative anaphoric reference in a local subsequent position (Schegloff, 1996b). After having the IR going first claiming the deontic authority, the IE disengages from the proposed topic to claim a degree of independence and primacy by incorporating the full noun phrase (NP), i.e., *the national health system*, instead of an anaphoric word. In sequence, IEs go second and, as such, they are called to engage or disengage with the proposed agenda; the grammatical agency of the NP repetition in a subsequent position indicates a disjunction of grammatical connection with the prior talk as the IE initiates a topic by re-introducing the reference and, finally, changing the question's framework. Therefore, the IE gives an ostensibly relevant answer with an inadequate degree of responsiveness as he relaunches the same wording independently to redirect the question's framework (Raymond et al., 2021).

6. Results

s In line with Clayman and Heritage's proposed model of questioning and answering (2002), it is found that although Greek journalists use similar structures for their questions with the American and British reporters (such as indirect, explanatory, wh-, yes/no types of questions) they seem to have a unique style of questioning that contributes to politicians' evasiveness. The data shows that Greek IRs conform with the shift that has been detected in the last 50 years in being more straightforward, using complex question designs with prefaced statements and incorporating preferences according to the QAS; however, they form multi-sentence questions back-to-back, leaving room for the IEs to manoeuvre and reformulate the questions. Greek journalists form more than one question, usually up to three as we see in the extracts, giving the politicians the possibility to challenge the embedded presuppositions instead of answering, pick their preferred topic and comment on that or readjust the agenda without giving clear answers, with an adequate degree of responsiveness.

In terms of the answering dimension, Greek politicians appear to deploy prefaced turns in turn beginning as sequential markers that launch different actions than the preferred ones in order to avoid addressing the questions and their presuppositions. It is found that look-prefaced turns in the second position foreshadow the redirection of the topic and it is designed as such to disengage with the course of action as instructed by the journalist's agenda. By contrast, look-prefaced turns in the first position of a new TCU serve to mark a relaunch of a different topic and focus on another area not introduced by the IR.

In addition, it is observed that, although listen-prefaced turns are designed to answer the addressed questions as suggested by Sidnell's work on prefaced (2007), in Greek data they function as markers in the second position to reformulate the question's framework and avoid confirming or disconfirming the presuppositions of a previous claim. Another preface that was detected and seems to come up only in the Greek news interviews/debate data is the first of all-preface that functions as an indicator for reprioritising the temporal sequence of the topical agenda leading to the reconstruction of the order as managed by the IR.

Lastly, the use of rhetorical questions in the second position appears to serve as a challenge to a previous negative assertion to invalidate its argument and, so, not answer the question and it also accomplishes the transition to a different topic at the beginning of a new TCU so as the IEs be able to self respond to their questions as constructed by themselves. Greek politicians also seem to

incorporate smaller or larger units of talk produced by the IR to claim a degree of independence by using full noun phrases instead of anaphoric references and to give an ostensibly relevant answer in terms of the topical parameters by repeating the same wording as the IR.

7. Conclusion

The aim of this study is to establish the conversational practices of evasiveness that Greek politicians deploy in news interviews and debates to avoid addressing the journalists' questions and comply with the course of actions imposed by the latter using the CA methodology. Adding to that, what is also examined is how Greek IRs structure their questions and if there is a particular style that influences IE's evasiveness.

Overall, it is found that common conversational practices of evasiveness are shared between American/British political figures and Greek politicians with some differentiations in terms of their implementation, such as the listen-prefaces and the existence of unique practices that seem to come up only in the latter, such as the first of all- prefaced turn in an initial position, which is not included in the evasive techniques of answering in the British/American data according to Clayman and Heritage's proposed model; among the novel elements, what is also introduced is the particular style of questioning of Greek journalists producing more than one question back-to-back favouring IEs' evasiveness. In all cases, as pointed out by Buttny (1993), evasive practices of answering serve the face-saving function of political public figures, hinder a potential political cost and constitute a turn-taking game of who is taking the lead of the agenda.

7.1 Limitation of the Study

Due to the physical constraints of being present at the political interviews and debates and the difficulty of obtaining the relevant permission to record the given conversations, the data is extracted from the YouTube platform in the way and format they have been uploaded by the channel owners. Therefore, the transcription of the conversations has been done according to the sound quality of the videos and the following editing in terms of the onset and the cut of each interactant as captured by the videographer(s).

8. Future Implications

This study constitutes an endeavour to establish the conversational practices of evasiveness in the political scene of Greek broadcast interviews and debates. It is a work that provides researchers with the possibility to conduct further research on the CA field and accomplish a cross-cultural examination of evasive practices from other languages with different grammatical structures and syntactical representations in the political discourse to detect similarities/dissimilarities.

Furthermore, it would be useful to examine politicians' embodied conduct and gestural behaviour concerning the degree of engagement/disengagement in the practice of answering and discover the launch of various courses of action within this type of setting. Last but not least, the investigation of evasive practices in everyday interaction would be meaningful in order to study the impact of the institutional setting, if any, in the formation of these practices and juxtapose the findings with the ones from the political setting.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements : I am deeply grateful for the invaluable support and guidance provided by Prof. Rebecca Clift, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Language and Linguistics of the University of Essex, my supervisor for my master's thesis. Her expert insights and unwavering encouragement played a pivotal role in shaping this study. This research constitutes a significant portion of the dissertation I crafted during my postgraduate studies. The University of Essex, where I pursued my academic journey, contributed immensely to the completion of this project through its constant support and abundant resources. The commitment of the academic staff to advancing knowledge in the field of Conversation Analysis has left an indelible mark on the success of this study.

ORCID Id: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-1338-0060>

References

- [1] Antaki, C. E. (1988). *Analysing everyday explanation: A casebook of methods*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- [2] Atkinson, J. M., & Drew, P. (1979). *Order in court*. Springer.
- [3] Buttny, R. (1993). *Social accountability in communication*. Sage.
- [4] Clayman, S., & Heritage, J. (2002). *The news interview: journalists and public figures on the air*. Cambridge University Press.
- [5] Clayman, S., Elliott, M., Heritage, J., & McDonald, L. (2006). *Historical Trends in Questioning Presidents, 1953-2000*. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 36(4), 561-583.

- [6] Clift, R., Drew, P., & Local, J. (2013). Why that, now?: Position and Composition in Interaction (Or: don't leave out the position in composition). *Language, music and interaction*, 211-232.
- [7] Clift, R. (2016). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Clift, R. (2020). Stability and visibility in embodiment: The 'Palm Up' in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 169, 190-205.
- [9] Drew, P. (1997). 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of pragmatics*, 28(1), 69-101.
- [10] Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. *Word*, 15(2), 325-340.
- [11] Greatbatch, D. (1986). Aspects of topical organization in news interviews: the use of agenda-shifting procedures by interviewees. *Media, Culture & Society*, 8(4), 441-455.
- [12] Greatbatch, D. (1988). A turn-taking system for British news interviews. *Language in Society*, 17(3), 401-430.
- [13] Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: the social interpretation of language and meaning*. Edward Arnold.
- [14] Heritage, J., & Drew, P. (1992). Talk at work. *Interaction in institutional settings*.
- [15] Heritage, J. (2003) 'Designing Questions and Setting Agendas in the News Interview', in P. Glenn, C. LeBaron and J. Mandelbaum (eds) *Studies in Language and Social Interaction: In Honor of Robert Hopper*, pp. 57-90. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [16] Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in action: interactions, identities, and institutions*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- [17] Heritage, J. (2015). Well-prefaced turns in English conversation: A conversation analytic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 88, 88-104.
- [18] Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols. *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*, 24-31.
- [19] Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation*. Academic Press.
- [20] Levinson, S. (1992). 'Activity types and language', in P. Drew, & J. Heritage (eds) *Talk at work: interaction in institutional settings*, pp. 66-100. Cambridge University Press.
- [21] Pomerantz, A. (1984) 'Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/dispreferred Turn Shapes', in J.M. Atkinson and J.C. Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, pp. 57-101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [22] Pomerantz, A. (1986). Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims. *Human studies*, 9(2), 219-229.
- [23] Raymond, C. W., Clift, R., & Heritage, J. (2021). Reference without anaphora: On agency through grammar. *Linguistics*, 59(3), 715-755.
- [24] Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language: Journal of the Linguistic Society of America*, 50(4).
- [25] Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and Social Organisation* (pp. 54-69). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [26] Sacks, H. 1992b. *Lectures on Conversation*, Vol. II, ed. Gail Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [27] Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 7, 289-327.
- [28] Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of "uhhuh" and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (ed.), *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics 1981*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 71-93.
- [29] Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn organization: one intersection of grammar and interaction. *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 52-133.
- [30] Schegloff, E. A. (1999). Discourse, pragmatics, conversation, analysis. *Discourse studies*, 1(4), 405-435.
- [31] Schegloff, E.A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [32] Sidnell, J. (2007). Look'-prefaced turns in first and second position: Launching, interceding and redirecting action. *Discourse Studies*, 9(3), 387-408.

Appendix A

Transcription conventions

- (.) A micropause - a pause of no significant length
- (0.1) A timed pause in tenths of a second
- [] Square brackets show where speech overlaps
- > < Arrows showing that the pace of speech has quickened
- < > Arrows showing that the pace of the speech has slowed down
- (word) Unclear section
- (()) Omitted sections
- word** Denotes a raise in volume or emphasis
- ↑ Rise in intonation

- ↓ Drop in intonation
- Entered by the analyst to show a sentence of particular interest
- WORD** Louder or shouted words
- = Will be at the end of one sentence and the start of the next. It indicates that there was no pause between them
- #word#** Hash sign indicates creaky voice
- .._i?** Markers of final pitch direction at TCU boundary
- word-** A dash indicates a cut-off. In phonetic terms this is typically a glottal stop
- £word£** Pound sign indicates smiley voice, or suppressed laughter
- °word°** Degree signs indicate syllables or words distinctly quieter than surrounding speech by the same speaker
- :: Colons - indicate a stretched sound
- .hhh** Inbreath. Three letters indicate 'normal' duration. Longer or shorter in-breaths indicated with fewer or more letters
- hhh** Outbreath. Three letters indicate 'normal' duration. Longer or shorter in-breaths indicated with fewer or more letters
- whhord** Can also indicate aspiration/breathiness if within a word (not laughter)
- w(h)ord** Indicates abrupt spurts of breathiness, as in laughing while talking

Appendix B

Transcripts

Debate 2009, IR: E. Liatsos IE: G. Papandreou

- 1L: tora thelo na sas rotiso kirie Papandreu pos prosopika tha
now (I) want to you ask mister Papandreu how personally will
now I want to ask you Mister Papandreu how you will personally
- 2 hiristite (.) tis elinoamerikanikes shesis (0.1)
(you) manage (.) the greek-american relationships (0.1)
manage (.) the Greek-American relationships (0.1)
- 3 nomizete oti me esas prothipurgo avrio tha ala!ksi to kli!ma?
(you) think that with you president tomorrow will cha!nge the cli!mate?
do you think that with you as a President tomorrow the vi!be will cha!nge?
- 4 ke ena an mu epitrepi ke i kiria Hukli
and one if to me allows and Mrs Hukli
and one more question if Mrs Hukli allow me to
- 5 tha sinehsete tin grammi tu veto sto skopiano?
will you continue the line of the veto in Macedonia?
will you continue the line of the veto in the Macedonian issue?
- 6P: tris erotisis (.) prota apola na po oti:: se oti afora tis
three questions (.) first of all to say tha::t in what concerns
three questions (.) first of all let me say tha::t in what concerns
- 7 diapragnatefsis gia to:n agogo hriazete na dume themata opos paradigmatis hari
negotiations for the: pipe need to see issues like for example
negotiations for the: pipeline that we need to see like issues for example
- 8 pos o agogos aftos tha aksiopiithi ke m- gia alus logus
how the pipe this will (be) used and w- for other reasons
how this pipeline will be used and w- for other purposes ((...))

Interview at Delphi Economic Forum 2022, IR: D. Anagnostopoulou IE: A. Tsipras

- 1 A: katigorite tin kivernisi gia viei apolignitopiisi (.)
(you) accuse the government of violent lignite phase-out (.)
you accuse the government of the cruel ending of lignite dependence (.)
- 2 o lignitis omos den ine katholu prasinos
the lignite but not is at all green
but the lignite is not at all eco-friendly
- 3 antitheta i evropaiki epitropi ipe pos ine prasini #i# piriniki energia.
instead the European committee said that is green #the# nuclear energy.
on the contrary the European committee said that #the# nuclear energy is eco-friendly.
- 4 tha itan tabouo gia esas kirie proedre i prasini #i# piriniki energia?
would be taboo for you mister president the green #the# nuclear energy?
would it be untouchable for you mister President the green #the# nuclear energy?
- 5 T: tha sas apantiso sto erotima sas ala na diefkriniso (.) den katigorume tin kivernisi
(I) will to you answer in the question of your but to clarify (.) (we) do not accuse the government
I will answer your question but I want to clarify (.) we don't accuse the government
- 6 mono gia ti viea apolignitopiisi! ala ke gia to gegonos oti den ihe
only for the violent lignite phase-out! but and for the fact that (it) did not have
only of the cruel ending of lignite dependence! but also of the fact that it didn't have
- 7 ena shedio mia ethniki energiaki stratigiki me arhi mesi ke telos
one plan one national energetic strategy with beginning middle and end
a plan a national energy strategy with a beginning middle and end ((...))
- 8A: ti metra omos tha lamvanate esis ke thelame na mas pite
what measures though will take you and (we) wanted to us tell
what measures though would you take and we would like you to tell us
- 9 sigkekrimena hhh idiki ritra katanalosis? foro anaprosarmogis?
specifically hhh specific limit of consumption? a tax of readjustment?
specifically hhh specific limit of consumption? a tax of readjustment?
- 10 ehete ipologisi to dimosionomiko kostos?
have (you) calculated the financial cost?
have you calculated the financial cost?
- 11T:(0.2) kitahte ((clears his throat)) (.) edo prin ftasume
(0.2) look (.) here before (we) arrive
(0.2) look (.) now before we reach
- 12 na:: sizitame gia to dimosionomiko kostos (.) prepi na dume oti:: a::
to:: talk about the financial cost (.) (we) should to see tha::t u::m
to:: talk about the financial cost (.) we should see tha::t u::m
- 13 iparhi opos ipame stin arhi mia:: e:: ena elima energiakis stratigikis
exists as (we) told in the beginning a:: u::m a deficiency of energetic strategy
there is as we said in the beginning a:: u::m a deficiency in energy strategy
((...))
- 76A: ipate sto kriti tivi oti:: ine i katalili stigmi gia mia prosfigi sti
(you) said in the crete tv tha::t (it) is the right moment for an appeal in
you said on Crete tv tha::t it is the right moment for an appeal in
- 77 hagi .hhh thelo na mu pite giati ala ke thelo na
the Hague .hhh (I) want to me tell why but and (I) want to
Hague .hhh I want you to tell me why and I also want to
- 78 mu pite pos krinete tin a:: prosfigi tis kivernisis sti hagi
me tell how (you) judge the u::m appeal of the government in the Hague
tell me how you evaluate the u::m appeal of the government in the Hague
- 79 gia ta egklimata:: polemu sti mariupoli.
for the crime::s of war in the mariupol.
concerning the crime::s of the war in Mariupol.
- 80T: .hh ne kitahte:: (.) se oti afora to diethnes piniko dikastirio e:
.hh yes loo::k (.) in whatever concerns the international penal cou::rt u::m
.hh yes loo::k (.) in whatever concerns the international penal court u::m
- 81 profanos ke opios ehi kani egklimata polemu prepi na logodotisi (0.1)

- apparently and whoever has committed crimes of war has to account (0.1)
apparently whoever has committed crimes of war has to account (for them) (0.1)
- 82 entutis ena thema ine opos gnorizete ute i rosia
however one issue is as (you) know either the Russia
however an issue as you know is that neither Russia
- 83 ute i inomenes ()po- i inomenes polities tis amerikis anagorizun (.)
either the united ()st- the United States of the America acknowledge (.)
nor the United ()st- the United States of America acknowledge (.)
- 84 ti dikeodosia aftu tu dikastiriu (0.2)
the jurisdiction this the court (0.2)
the jurisdiction of this court (0.2)
- 85 e:: se oti afora omos to megalo ethniko mas ↓zitimia (0.2)
u::m in whatever concerns though the big national of ours ↓issue (0.2)
u::m but in what concerns our important national ↓issue (0.2)
- 86 kita::hte nomizo oti ine aftonoito oti prepri na ehume mia (0.1)
loo::k (I) think that (it) is obvious that (we) must have one (0.1)
loo::k I think that it is obvious that we should have a (0.1)
- 87 ethniki stratigiki i opia na ehi arhi mesi ke telos ke sinehia
national strategy which to have beginning middle and end and continuity
national strategy that has a beginning middle and ending and continuity ((...))

Debate 2009, IR: N. Evaggelatos IE: K. Karamanlis

- 5E: hh tha thela na mas pite an kserete POsi ine i
hh (I) would like to us tell if (you) know how MAny are the
hh I would like you to tell us if you know how MAny are the
- 6 ergazomeni sto dimosio ke TI mistho pernun (.) me
the employees in the public sector and WHAT wage do (they) take with
employees in the public sector and WHAT wage do they earn (.) with
- 7 ta staz (.) ke giati eno i evropaike e-nosi epivali
the staz (.) and why while the European u-nion imposes
the Stage program (.) and why while the European U-nion imposes them to
- 8 na asholude mono dekaokto mines gia na (.) apoktisin ebiria
to be occupied only eighteen months so as to (.) get experience
to be occupied only eighteen months to (.) get experience
- 9 kapii apo aftus apasholude stin idia thesi eos ke eksi hronia kaliptodas
some of them are occupied in the same position up and six years covering
of them are occupied in the same position up to six years covering
- 10 pro::dilos patgies anagkes ala me poli hamiloterus misthus anasfalisti
evid::ntly esta↑blished needs but with very lower wages uninsured
evid::ntly esta↑blished needs but with much lower wages uninsured
- 11 ke kirios omiri (.) pos to epitrepete afto?
and mainly hostages (.) how do (you) allow this?
and mainly hostages (.) how do you allow this?
- 12K: na ksekatharisume kati kirie Evaggelato ((palms up)) (.) ine ↑apolita
let's make clear something Mister Evaggelato (.) (it) is ↑absolutely
let's make something clear Mister Evaggelato (.) it is ↑absolutely
- 13 nomimi diadikasia ke ine diadikasia pu kirios ehi na kani ehi shesi (.) me:
legal procedure and (it) is procedure that mainly has to do has relation (.) with
a legal procedure and it is a procedure that mainly has to do is in relation (.) with
- 14 ekpedefsi ke katartisi (.) tora apo eki ke pera bori na min ine ikanopiitikos o misthos↓
education and training (.) now from there and after can to not be satisfying the wage↓
education and training (.) henceforth the wage may not be satisfying↓ ((...))
- 15E: rotisa posi ine i ergazomeni me staz
(I) asked how many are the employees with staz
I asked how many employees are with the Stage program
- 16 ke ti mistho pernun ala den ine mono afti
and what wage (they) take but not only the

and what wage they earn but it's not only them ((...))

Interview 2009, IR: J. Pretenteris, IE: K. Karamanlis

- 40P: ((...)) o (kirios) pavlid- parameni melos tis () omadas tis neas dimokratias (.)
the (mister) pavlid- stays member of () team of the new republic (.)
(Mister) Pavlid- stays a member of () team of the party of New Republic (.)
- 41 tha eprepe na ehi paretithi? tha eprepe na ton ihate paretisi?
(he) should have resigned? (you) should have fired him?
should he have resigned? should you have fired him?
- 42 ti tha prepe na ehi gini?
what should have been done?
what should have been done?
- 43K: =akuste(.) prota apola i ipothesi stin opia <anafferthike> anafferthikate
=listen(.) first of all the case in which <referred> (you) referred
=listen(.) first of all the case in which <referred> you referred
- 44 dierevnithike (.) ke dierevnithike se vathos (0.1)
(it) investigated (.) and (it) investigated in depth (0.1)
it was investigated (.) and it was investigated in depth (0.1)
- 45 ke ine apofasi vulis hori(s) na epirezete kanenas
and (it) is decision of parliament withou(t) to (be) influenced anyone
and it is the decision of the Parliament wit(h) nobody to be affected ((...))
- 55 apo eki ke pera to pos kanenas (0.1) krini ta pragmata ke siberiferete
from there and after the how anyone (0.1) judges the things and behaves
thereafter the way that anyone (0.1) evaluates the situation and behaves
- 56 i epilegi epidi mu kanate () ke meta
or chooses because you did () and after
or chooses because you did () and after
- 57 =afto ine kathara prosopiki ipothesi (.)
=this is clearly a personal hypothesis (.)
=this is clearly a personal matter (.)
- 58 en PASI periptosi ekino pu boro na sas po ego os geniki [arhi ine OLI mas
ANYway that (I) can say to you I as general [principle is EVERYONE of us
ANYway what I can say to you as a general [principle is that EVERYONE
- 59P: [kala arh- arhigos tu komatos isasti omos
[fine lead- leader of the party (you) are although
[fine but you are lead- leader of the party yet
- 60K: =VEVEOS ime arhigos tu komatos
=OF COURSE (I) am leader of the party
=OF COURSE I am the leader of the party ((...))

Debate 2015, IR: S. Kosioni IE: P. Lafazanis

- 2 K: ((...)) thelo lipon na sas rotiso ean me to diko sas e shedio tha bori
(I) want so to you ask if with the your um plan (it) will can
so I want to ask you if with your um plan it will be possible
- 3 na liturgisi omala to sistima igias i >ke ta sholia<
to operate smoothly the system of health or >and the schools<
for the health system to operate smoothly or >even schools<
- 4 mias pu: i enotita eberiehi ke tin pedia.
si::nce the unit includes and the education.
since that: the section includes education as well.
- 5 .hh I i protasi sas eberiehi riska
.hh OR the suggestion of yours includes risks
.hh OR your suggestion includes risks
- 6 ta opia nomizo oti ipohreuste na ehethe eksigisi proigumenos ston eliniko lao.
that (I) think that(you)are obliged to have explained previously in the Greek people.
that I think you are obliged to have explained previously to the Greek people
- 7 L: hh katarhas na simfoniso me tin kiria Zaharea >na kano kati< paradokso

- hh first of all to agree with the Mrs Zaharea >to do something< unusual
hh first of all let me agree with Mrs Zaharea >to do something< unusual
- 8 gia tin anagki (0.1) e:: o- epanastasi stin pedia (.)
for the need (0.1) u::m th- revolution in the education (.)
for the need (0.1) u::m th- revolUTION in education (.)
- 9 opos hriazete ke epanastasi stin igia (0.4) idietera omos stin pedia.
as needed and revolution in the health (0.4) particularly though in the education.
as revolution is also needed in health (0.4) particularly though in education.
- 10 ala:: epanastasi stin pedia (.) den ine ta idiotika (.) panepistimia
bu::t revolution in the education (.) isn't the non-public (.) universities
bu::t revolution in education (.) isn't the non-public (.) universities
- 11 ELEos (0.1) epanastasi stin pedia- [ine
MErcy (0.1) revolution in the education- [is
for MErcy (0.1) revolution in education- [is
- 12 K: [>me sinhorite< den sas eho rotisi giafto omos (.) ↓kirie Lafazani
[>me excuse< (I) not you have asked about this however (.) ↓Mister Lafazani
[>excuse me< but I have not asked you about this (.) ↓Mister Lafazanis
- 13 L: [ne ((nods his head)) ohi pe:: parepimptodos to leo ki afto
[yes not by:: by the way (I) this say and this
[yes not by:: by the way I say this as well ((...))
- 14 igia pu me rotisate to igeonomiko sistima theli anavathmisi (.)
health that (you) me asked the health system wants upgrade (.)
health that you asked me the health system needs upgrade (.)
- 15 sim- to simerino >igeonomiko sistima< to diMOsio igeonomiko sistima
tod- the today's >health system< the PUBlic health system
tod- the today's >health system< the PUBlic health system
- 16 .hh ala anavathmisi tu igeonomiku sistimatos den bori na gini hoRIS prosopiko
.hh but upgrade of the health system can't be done withOUT staff
.hh but the upgrade of the health system can't be done withOUT staff ((...))

Debate 2009, IR: P. Tsimas IE: G. Karatzaferis

- 1T:(...) eho mia meleti (.) fadazome tha tin ehete di ki esis
(I) have a report (.) (I) imagine (you) will it have seen and you
I have a report (.) I imagine you have also seen it
- 2 ine meleti >tu institutu metana(steftiku) politik-<
(it) is a study >the institution of immi(gra)tion polic-<
it is a study >from the institution of immi(gra)tion polic-<
- 3 metanasteftikis politikis ke ehi dio senaria
immigration policy and (it) has two scenarios
immigration policy and it has two scenarios
- 4 ti tha simvi sti hora an (.) se mia mera figun OLI i metanastes;
what will happen in the country if (.) in one day leave ALL the immigrants;
what would happen in the country if (.) in one day ALL immigrants left;
- 5 ke ti tha simvi sti hora an mia mera erthun ali
and what will happen in the country if one day come other
and what would happen in the country if in one day extra
- 6 diakoses hilades epibleon metanastes;
twenty thousand more immigrants;
twenty thousand immigrants arrive; ((...))
- 7 giati thelete na tus dioksume de ke kala?
why (you) want to them send away no matter what?
why do you want to send them away no matter what?
- 8K: a: katarhin prepri na po oti: simera to debate gin(a)t(i)
u:m first of all (I) have to say tha:t today the debate happ(e)n(s)
u:m first of all I have to say tha:t today the debate is happ(e)n(i)n
- 9 tilemahia .hh sti f(th)inoporini isimeria (.) pu simeni oti apo
tv war .hh in the au(t)umnal equinox (.) that means that from

tv war .hh in the au(t)umnal equinox (.) which means that from

- 10 tora megaloni i nihta. elpizo na min ine meGAlI ke se vathos
now grows the night. (I) hope to not be bIG and in depth
now the night will be growing. I hope not to be grEAt and in depth
- 11 i nihta gia tin elada (.) pu ksekinai tora.
the night for the Greece (.) that starts now.
the night for Greece (.) that starts now.
- 12 a: katarhin pios ipe na tus dioksume? ipa posostosi .hh
u::m first of all who said to them send away? (I) said quota .hh
u::m first of all who did say to send them away? I said quota .hh
- 13 oti ipe o Lafoden sti germania (.) posostosi.
whatever said the Lafontaine in the Germany (.) quota.
whatever Lafontaine said in Germany (.) quota.

Debate 2009, IR: P. Tsimas IE: N. Hrisogelos

- 1 T: se periodo ifesis ke ipsilis anergias
in period of recession and high unemployment
in a period of recession and high unemployment (you suggest)
- 2 na stamatisun ta dimosia erga gia dromus i den ksero ego gia ti alo
to stop the public works for roads or (I) don't know I for what else
the public works to stop for the roads or I don't know what else
- 3 pu odos epivarinun to perivalon ala prosferun ergasiaz
that indeed burden the environment but offer workz
that indeed burden the environment but they offer jobsz
- 4 afto protinete?
this (you) suggest?
is this what you are suggesting?
- 5 H: .hhh (0.2) sti simerini krisi (.) i nea dimokratia protini litotita
.hhh (0.2) in the today's crisis (.) the new republic suggests austerity
.hhh (0.2) in today's crisis (.) the New Republic suggests austerity
- 6 ke to pasok protini afksis' katanalosis
and the pasok suggests ris' of consumption
and the Pasok suggests ris' of consumption ((...))
- 7 o tropos pu simera hrisimopiude i dapanes (.) ine enas tropos
the way that today used the expenses (.) (t)is one way
the way that today the expenses are deployed (.) is a way
- 8 pu odigi sti spatali pros mia lathos katefthinsi.
that leads to the waste towards one wrong direction.
that leads to waste towards the wrong direction.
- 9 idi gia ti refstotita tis ikonomias .hh dapanithikan terastia posa.
already for the liquidity of the economy .hh spent huge amounts.
for the liquidity of the economy .hh huge amounts have already been spent.
- 10 emis s'(afti) ti leme? iparhun tomis pu prepri na aLAKsun
we s' (this) what (we) say? exist sectors that must to CHAnge
what do we say about (that)? there are sectors that need to CHAnge
- 11 gia na epivosune i: ik-odomi gia padi(g)ma i kataskeves
so that survive the: buil-ding for exam(p)le the constructions
in order to survive the: buil-ding for exam(p)le the constructions ((...))
- 12 T: to erotima ine (.) stin ifesi ine se thesi i eliniki
the question is (.) in the recession is it in a place the Greek
the question is (.) in the recession is it capable the Greek
- 13 tulahiston ikonomia na ependisi (.) eki opu iparhi ena epipleon
at least economy to invest (.) there where there is an extra
at least economy to invest (.) there where there is an extra
- 14 kostos alagis tis teknologias ke ena- enas epipleon hronos apodosis
cost of change of the technology an an- an extra efficiency time
cost of change of the technology an an- an extra efficiency time

- 15 paravlepodas tin anagki na ginun grigora thesis ergasias?
overlooking the need to happen fast positions of employment?
overlooking the need for a quick creation of positions of employment? (...)
- 16 H: o monos tomeas ston opio bori na dimiurgithun thesis ergasias
the only sector in which (it) is possible to be created new positions of employment
the only sector in which new positions of employment can be created
- 17 ine o tomeas ton kinonikon ipiresion ke tis prostasias tu perivalodos
is the sector of the social services and of the protection of the environment
is the sector of the social services and of the protection of the environment (...)

Interview 2022, IR: N. Hatzinikolaou IE: K. Mitsotakis

- 13H: (...) kirie proedre I entatikes (.) dehonte piesi ke simera pu milame!
Mister President the ERs (.) receive pressure and today that (we) talk!
Mister President the ERs (.) receive pressure until today that we are talking!
- 14 ke to erotima ine an the adeksi to ethniko sistima igias (.)
and the question is if (it) will endure the national health system (.)
and the question is if the national health system will endure (.) (...)
- 15 to roto (.) dioti oso a: ki an nosi kanis ipiotera me tin omikron
it (I) ask (.) because as much u:m and if ails anyone more mildly with the omicron
I ask this (.) because even u:m though someone is ailing more mildly by omicron
- 16 ta krusmata ine pola! (...)
the cases are many! (...)
the cases are a lot! (...)
- 17M: ke vlepume tin piesi simera (.) to ethniko sistima igias dehete piesi
and we watch the pressure today (.) the national health system receives pressure
and we see the pressure today (.) the national health system receives pressure
- 18 ohi mono tora dehete piesi edo ke shedon (.) ikos'teseris e: mines
not only now (it) receives pressure here and almost (.) tw'nty four u:m months
not only now it has received pressure for almost (.) tw'nty four u:m months now
- 19 <adapokrinete omos.
<(it) responds though.
<it meets the needs though. (...)
- 20 ke tha ithela na do↑ oli afti pu mas askune kritiki simera
and (I) would like to see↑ everyone these that us exert criticism today
and I would like to see↑ if all these people who criticise us today
- 21 ean tha stiri↑ksune pragmatika tis megales metarithmisis
if (they) will suppo↑rt truly these big reformations
if they will truly suppo↑rt these big reformations
- 22 pu to ethniko sistima igias ehi anagki tin epomeni mera.
that the national health system has need the following day.
that the national health system will need tomorrow (...)
- 23 H: epomenos den anisihite mipos katarefsi to ethniko [sistima igias?
therefore (you) don't worry whether (it) will collapse the national [system of health?
therefore you don't worry that the national system of health will [collapse?
- 24 M: [ma den katerefse ke den tha katarefsi ke tora OHI den tha katarefsi
[but (it) didn't collapse and (it) won't collapse and now NO (it) won't collapse
[but it didn't collapse and it won't collapse and now NO it won't collapse
- 25 to ethniko sistima igias giafto ime apolitos veveos
the national system of health for this (I) am absolutely certain
the national health system I am absolutely certain about this (...)