UNIVERSITÄT AUGSBURG
Universitätsbibliothek

OPEN ACCESS
OPUS AUGSBURG

Quoting in political discourse: professional talk meets ordinary postings

Anita Fetzer, Elisabeth Reber

Angaben zur Veröffentlichung / Publication details:

Fetzer, Anita, and Elisabeth Reber. 2015. "Quoting in political discourse: professional talk meets ordinary postings." In *The pragmatics of quoting now and then*, edited by Jenny Arendholz, Wolfram Bublitz, and Monika Kirner-Ludwig, 97–124. Berlin: de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110427561-006.

Nutzungsbedingungen / Terms of use:

licgercopyright

Dieses Dokument wird unter folgenden Bedingungen zur Verfügung gestellt: / This document is made available under these conditions:
Deutsches Urheberrecht
Weitere Informationen finden Sie unter: / For more information see:
https://www.uni-augsburg.de/de/organisation/bibliothek/publizieren-zitieren-archivieren/publiz/

Anita Fetzer and Elisabeth Reber

4 Quoting in Political Discourse: Professional Talk Meets Ordinary Postings

Abstract: This paper examines the different forms and functions of quotations in political discourse, comparing their instantiations in a corpus of political TV interviews and online comments on political interviews which are reproduced on the same website. Its methodological framework is an integrated one, feeding on pragmatics and interactional linguistics.

Quoting is seen as a context-dependent, multi-layered communicative practice which can be realised in various linguistic forms, and those forms can have multiple functions. As regards their form, the quotations in the interviews comprise (1) the quoter, (2) the ascribed source of the quoted stretch of discourse, (3) a verb of communication or possible functional synonym which is assigned the status of quotative, and (4) the quoted. The quotations in the online comments show a more telescoped format, generally lacking a verb of communication. As regards their function, they are deployed to express alignment or disalignment with political positions and policies, but at the same time are used to enact particularised participation frameworks.

Keywords: quotation, dis/-alignment, argumentation, political discourse, participation framework, perlocutionary effect

1 Introduction[1]

This paper analyses the practice of quoting in the context of political discourse in the traditional media (TV interviews and panel interviews) and in the new media (online discussion forums), giving particular consideration to the question of how quotations are used strategically to construct, deconstruct and reconstruct ideological coherence of political agents and the party they represent in the media and across the media. To capture the inherent dynamics of mediated and medialised political discourse, the practice of quoting is examined from a pragmatic perspective, accounting for implicatures and perlocutionary effects, and from a formal perspective, describing the specific linguistic formatting of the quotations

1 This analysis was presented at the "3rd International Conference on Quotation and Meaning – Quoting Now and Then" (19–21 March 2012). Thanks are due to the participants of the conference and to the editors and reviewers for their valuable input.

in the two data sets. Further attention is given to sequential aspects, considering in particular the negotiation of the validity of quotations, which comprises the quoter and source and their participant roles. The contrastive approach allows us to provide a fine-grained micro analysis of the context-specific distribution of the linguistic marking of self- and other-quotation, and demonstrates the communicative function and enactment of discursive frames across the two domains (interviews and online discussion forums).

1.1 Political Discourse

The interviews and online discussion forums under investigation can be attributed to the wider field of political discourse. Political discourse is a multifaceted notion, which comprises discourse about politics on the one hand, and discourse by politicians on the other. However, not every instance of discourse produced by one or more politicians may count as political discourse, just as not every discourse about politics may count as political discourse either. What are the necessary and sufficient conditions for a stretch of discourse to count as political discourse? Political discourse in our westernised mass democracies is public discourse, it is institutional discourse, and it is – to a large extent – professional discourse. This is because the traditional concept of politics is anchored to the public domain of society. Since political discourse is also mediated and medialised discourse (Fairclough 2006), it interfaces with micro domains, entering the private spheres of life through the media, and in medialised mass democracies, this is the only way in which most people ever encounter politics (cf. Fairclough 1995, Fetzer/Lauerbach 2007, Fetzer/Weizman/Reber 2012).

Political discourse in the media is a complex phenomenon: it is institutional discourse, it is media discourse, and it is mediated and medialised discourse. As institutional discourse, it differs from everyday conversation in that it is subject to institutional constraints. As media discourse, it is different from other types of institutional discourse by being, above all, public discourse addressed to a mass media audience. As mediated and medialised political discourse, it is the outcome of the encounter between two different institutional discourses: (1) those of politics and the media, feeding on the inherent constraints of mediated discourse, i.e. the communication through a medium and thus the uncoupling of space and time, and the movement of meaning from one text, discourse or event to another, with the constant transformation of meanings, and (2) of medialised discourse, i.e. the professionalisation of politics and management of the mediation of political 'messages' by spin doctors or political branding, for instance (Fairclough 2006).

Political discourse uses various discourse genres, such as statements and speeches in the contexts of election campaigns, summit meetings, business meetings or party conferences; interviews in the context of TV or printed media; and multi-party discourse in the context of panel interviews and parliamentary debates. Political discourse may also employ reports, analyses, commentaries, editorials or letters to the editor, to name but the most prominent ones. All of these discourse genres are employed strategically to 'talk politics' and to talk about politics. Moreover, these discourse genres do not occur in a void but rather are embedded in journalistic news discourse and may be repeated as sound bites in later programming. Ordinary people may also participate in mediated political discourse in audience participation programmes, such as panel interviews, standing in for the interviewer and asking questions, or by members of the home audience, calling in or sending emails. Most recently, the evolution of the internet has brought about new forms of communication and opened up new arenas for political discourse, e.g. social networks (Kushin/Kitchener 2009), online discussion forums, twitter or blogs (cf. Atifi/Marcoccia 2012 for an overview of the different types of computer-mediated political discourse). As with all new forms of discourse, this technical development has led to the formation of context- and culture-specific conventions of language use in the different kinds of mediated and medialised political discourse, as is the case with quotations, for instance (cf. Buchstaller et al. 2010, Johansson 2007). Against this backdrop, the present paper provides a contrastive analysis of the forms and functions of quotations in two types of political discourse: pre-election interviews and online discussion forums.

1.2 Data

Our data consist of a corpus of pre-election interviews broadcasted by the BBC and ITV (1997–2003) and of news blogs/sites which contain written transcripts of TV interviews and discussion forums, which feature the users' responses towards the interviews (2008/2010).

The televised data comprises 20 interviews with the leaders of the major political parties. These data were recorded and transcribed according to interactional principles, adhering as closely as possible to the speakers' wording of their conversational contributions and to the turn-taking mechanism (cf. Fetzer/Bull 2006, Fetzer/Johansson 2010). This corpus was manually tagged with regard to the relevant linguistic structures and then hand-counted in order to capture subtle aspects of analysis. As the focus of the investigation lies on the verbal forms and functions of quotations in their local linguistic context, the transcription presented here adheres to orthographical standards to facilitate readability.

The collection of computer mediated discourse (CMD) consists of a total of 101 comments, posted in two online discussion forums; one featured by Lynn Sweet's blog on the web site of Chicago Sun-Times, which offers the transcript of the Obama Interview with Bill O'Reilly (2008) broadcasted on Fox News and the subsequent comment section (87 comments),[2] and the other by a page on the news site msnbc.com, where the transcript of an NBC News Obama Interview (2010) with Brian Williams was made available in the form of a video clip and transcript (14 comments).[3] In spite of the different members' labels used for the online discussion forums, *viz.* "comments" and "discuss this post", both constitute similar communities of practice (Wenger 1998) in that they show a "sustained pursuit of a shared enterprise" (ibid, 45), namely the expression of alignment and disalignment with the conversational contributions in the interview and in other comments.[4]

Furthermore, the communicative situation may be described as non-synchronous, one-to-many, public and – at least to some extent – anonymous. While users have to give their email addresses when registering for these discussion forums, a nickname suffices for identification on this web interface. In this respect, the comments examined are more anonymous than letters to the editor, where the full name and address needs to be supplied.

1.3 Methodology

The methodological frame of reference adopted in this research is informed by compositionality, drawing on the pragmatic premises of intentionality of communicative action and conversational implicature, and on the interactional-linguistic premises of language as a socially situated form, the unit of investigation of speech activity, and linguistic variation, i.e. variations and alterations are not random or arbitrary but communicatively functional and meaningful (Gumperz 1992).

The starting-point of the study was the observation that participants deploy quotations in the online comments in order to refer to the interview, which is

2 http://blogs.suntimes.com/sweet/2008/09/foxs_bill_oreilly_obama_interv.html, last accessed 18 April 2012.

3 http://www.nbcnews.com/id/38907780/ns/nbcnightlynews/t/full-transcript-obama-interview-nbc-news/#.UTRpvFf09Vs, last accessed 18 April 2012.

4 Online discussion forums may not only be hosted by news blogs/sites but also by other potentially non-political websites, e.g. YouTube (Jones/Schieffelin 2009). What they have in common is that they enable the user to respond to specific web content on a web site and other users' posts on the same site.

reproduced on the same website. This means that the original wording of what is presented as a quotation can be retrieved directly from the shared discursive context of the comment. This contrasts with political interviews and even more so with everyday interaction, where the source of quotation may not be retrievable for all conversational parties in the same way. Nevertheless, the quotable (that is, the chunks of speech to be quoted in the comments) and the quotation are enacted in different discursive frames in the websites examined (Goffman 1986, cf. Fetzer 2006 for a model of frames of reference in political interviews). This is reflected in Goffman's seminal work on "Frame Analysis" (1986), especially his notion of framing and reframing, as well as in Burger's (2005) analysis of the media-specific use of language in media interviews, and by Heritage's research on the media-specific use of back-channels in interviews (Heritage 1985). Fetzer's investigation of the obligatory references to the media frame in the opening and closing sections of an interview as well as the strategic use of references to the media frame in the topical sections also explores how the quotable and quotation are enacted in different discursive frames (Fetzer 2006). They have all shown that the interviews between interviewer (IR) and interviewee (IE) are not actually directed towards the direct communication partner, i.e. IR and IE, but rather towards the media audience.

The multi-layeredness of media communication is captured best by a multi-frame discourse scenario, as is illustrated in Figure 1 below, and exemplified with the following exchange between the IR Jonathan Dimbleby (JD) and the IE Tony Blair (TB), which provides the local context of excerpt 1a analysed and discussed in section 2.1. The first-frame interaction comprises the face-to-face interaction between JD and TB (1), which is represented by the TV broadcast (1a); this face-to-face interaction between the first-frame participants may be further supplemented by an optional internet video ((1b)) and a transcript ((1c)) available on the TV station's website. In excerpt 1, the IE asks the IR if he is expected to elaborate on a discourse topic which they have been discussing, targeting the first-frame interaction. The IR agrees with the IE and then quotes Peter Mandelson, an ally of the IE, inviting the IE to comment on the quotation. The use of the quotation as well as parts of the IE's response display a dual orientation: towards the first-frame participants (IE and IR), and towards the media audience. This is reflected in the generalized form of address 'why not just judge us on what we do', which is recycled and recontextualised several times:

Excerpt 1[5]

1TB Do you want me to stay [inc]?

JD More or less, yes. On- on- *ON SPIN*, you know, *PETER MANDELSON SAID THE OTHER DAY,* there's been too much spin, there ought to be more vision. *DO YOU ACCEPT THE CHARGE* that there's been too much spinning?

TB Well, I- I sometimes think we're more, sort of, spun against than spinning, in the sense that people have this huge thing about it all. But in the end, *WHY NOT JUST JUDGE US ON WHAT WE DO?* I mean, *JUDGE US ON WHAT WE DO*. I'm perfectly happy *TO BE JUDGED ON WHAT WE DO*, because I will defend the record that we have. And, you know, you- you talk a lot about presentation and everything. Look, l- l- let's t- t- try and- er- get- get to the heart of this. In today's age, it's a twenty four hour media age. And, you know, news comes in and out and it develops very, very quickly .... (Ask Tony Blair 5 May 2001)

To adapt and extend the frame of reference to CMC as illustrated below by Figure 1, the first-frame interaction (1) comprises the studio setting and first-frame participants, i.e. IR and IE of the TV broadcast interview (1a), or alternatively, the internet video (1b) and/or the transcript provided by the website (1c). The second-frame interaction consists of the first frame interacting with the media audience, i.e. audience watching the televised interview or the computer-mediated interview as a video or reading it as a transcript (2). The third-frame interaction comprises the users as audience, commenting on the interview between the first-frame participants on a website provided by the TV channel, or alternatively in some face-to-face interaction (3). The fourth-frame interaction is composed of audience members responding to the third-frame commentators commenting on the interview (4), and the fifth-frame interaction includes those audience members referring to the fourth-frame interaction (5). This multi-frame discourse illustrates the multi-layeredness of CMD which goes beyond the dual frame of reference of traditional media communication:

5 *Relevant cues* for the analysis are printed *in italicised small capitals*, and the quoted material is underlined.

(1) 1st frame: IR + IE
(1a) TV broadcast
((1b) internet video)
((1c) Transcript)
(2) 2nd frame: first frame + audience
(3) 3rd frame: commentators + first frame
(4) 4th frame: commentators + commentators (+ first frame)
(5) 5th frame: commentators and readers of comments
(6) etc. …

Figure 1: multi-frame discourse scenario

Our paper examines the forms and functions of quoting as context-sensitive instantiations, which are deployed strategically to achieve particular goals in a complex multi-frame discourse scenario. It is structured as follows: the next section examines practices of quoting in discourse and applies the results obtained to an investigation of mediated political discourse, and the final section summarises and concludes the paper.

2 Practices of Quoting in Mediated Political Discourse

This section begins with a discussion of quotation in discourse, and applies the results obtained to an examination of the forms and functions of quotation in the political interviews (2.1) and in the online comments (2.2), and ends with a contrastive analysis of the two (2.3).

Quotations can be represented overtly, e.g. by quotation marks and/or the use of a *verbum dicendi*, or non-overtly, i.e. they may not be marked at all as quotations.[6] Lexico-grammatical devices which introduce what follows as a quotation have been labeled quotatives (e.g. Buchstaller 2013, Buchstaller/van Alphen 2012). According to Mathis and Yule (1994), "the omission of a quotative [i.e. so-called 'zero-quotatives']" can be functional in everyday conversation in that it "may be used to achieve a dramatic effect which cannot as easily be achieved

6 In spoken discourse, prosodic cues may also support the identification of reported portions of speech and the staging of narrative figures in reported dialogues (Klewitz/Couper-Kuhlen 1999). Visual gestures, such as so-called air quotes, can further be assigned the status of a pragmatic marker or "contextualisation cue" (Gumperz 1992), showing how current speech is intended by the speaker and how the speaker intends the addressee to interpret it.

with the presence of a full quotative form" or even "to reflect the urgency of the interaction being reported" (ibid, 67). Along these lines, Günthner (2005) provides empirical evidence that speakers in everyday conversation may "[remodel] the past text according to the situative communicative intention and [imprint their] perspective onto the reconstructed event" (ibid, 293). This suggests that (especially direct) quotations should be seen as situated products of remodelling and imprinting, serving particular communicative goals in non-mediated discourse (cf. e.g. the contributions to Buchstaller/van Alphen 2012). Furthermore, all types of quotation require the contextualisation and recontextualisation of the quoted, to use Linell's terminology (1998), or pragmatic enrichment, to employ relevance-theoretic terminology (Sperber/Wilson 1986). In a relevance-theoretic frame of reference, quotation is differentiated along the lines of the fundamental distinction between *mention* and *use*: the former does not allow the use of indexicals while the latter allows their use.

Quotations generally serve to import context into situated discourse in that they make unbounded context importation bounded by spelling out the source of the quoted material and their contextual embeddedness in regard to its temporal, local and discursive coordinates (cf. Fetzer 2011). The importation of particular contextual information, which is required for the interpretation of the stretch of discourse to be quoted, invokes particular contextual frames, in accordance with which the quoted is interpreted. At the same time, the quoted is assigned the status of *quote-worthiness*, to adapt a term from Bell (1991), or of *quotability*, to adopt a term from Clayman (1995), and considered relevant to the ongoing discourse, thus contributing to the negotiation and joint construction of discourse coherence and to the negotiation and construal of discursive common ground (Fetzer 2007). The functions of quotations in CMD are generally similar to those in non-mediated discourse. For instance, Severinson Eklundh (2010) describes "quoting as a way to provide a context or important information relevant to the current message" (ibid, 18). Context importation of this kind can be used strategically as a means of stance-taking in online discussion forums (cf. also Bös/Kleinke this volume, Severinson Eklundh 2010). Bublitz/Hoffmann (2011) observe that direct quotations may serve to simulate dialogicity in CMD: "If multiple direct speeches are presented in adjacent positions, they simulate the turn-taking structure of real-life dialogues" (ibid, 442).

The following analysis of the forms and functions of quotations in political discourse (excluding prosodic and visual aspects) is informed by the form-based requirements for quotation, i.e. quoter, source, quoted, and indexical references to the contextual coordinates of the quoted, the communicative functions of quotation examined above as well as the indexical nature of quotation, and adapts them accordingly. In the two types of mediated political discourse under

investigation, the stretch of discourse which is constructed as quoted speech can generally be retrieved from prior discourse and may be accounted for by the participants in communication, making explicit the source of the quotation and its temporal and local embeddedness.

2.1 Quotations in Political Interviews

This section presents the results of a study on the forms and functions of quotation in televised political interviews, paying particular attention to the participation framework with respect to self- and other-quotation.

Self- and other-quotations import some prior conversational contribution into a new (or different) discourse by placing it in a different context, thereby recontextualising form, function and content. Inherently connected with the importation of the quoted and its ascribed source is its evaluation, i.e. the quotation is assigned the status of quote-worthiness or quotability, which may imply a possible re-evaluation, such as the re-affirmation of its relevance but also its deconstruction.

In discourse in general, and in political discourse in particular, quotations are used strategically to import context into the ongoing discourse and to express the quoter's attitude towards the ascribed source of the quotation and/or towards its content. However, it is not only the content of the quotation which is of relevance, but also the attitude of the present speaker in her/his role as quoter towards the ascribed source, content, illocutionary force and context. In media discourse, quotations allow the quoter to align and disalign with particularised sets of the mass audience because the quoted is not only directed at the first-frame participants, the face-to-face addressee(s), but also, if not primarily, at the mediated audience, or second-frame participants, as has been illustrated in the discussion of Figure 1 above. Because of these contextual constraints and requirements, the ascribed source of the quotation is generally made explicit, e.g. proper name, affiliation, party programme, or a more indeterminate entity, and communicated to the mass audience. This does not only serve as a means of identification; rather, by making explicit the identity of the source, the present speaker assigns it the status of quote-worthiness, and by the strategic selection of a quotative which makes explicit the illocutionary force of the quoted, the quoter implicates her/his evaluation of the stretch of discourse to be quoted, as is the case with, e.g., the more neutral verb *say* and the more specific ones *make the point* or *admit*. Moreover, in the political interviews at hand, the quoters generally make their intended perlocutionary effects explicit and assign them the status of an object of

talk for both the first-frame participants and the second-frame participants. This may, of course, be taken up by third-, fourth-, and further-frame interactants.

In the mediated political interviews, both IR and IE use quotations to challenge their communication partner's argumentation, if not their credibility. There is, however, quite a difference between the use of self-quotation and the use of other-quotation. The former is employed to strengthen the argument of self or of the political party self represents, as is the case in Excerpts 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 below. In the interviews, self-quotation tends to be used in particularised contexts, i.e. only when self intends to reassert her/his credibility. The infrequent use of self-quotation in the British media interview data is in line with the modesty principle (Leech 1983). What is more, the function of the self-quotation is not influenced by its formatting as direct or indirect quotation in the data at hand. Other-quotation needs to be differentiated with regard to the status of other: other as an ally, as is the case with Excerpt 1 above and its extracted quotation in 1a below, or other as a political opponent. Both forms of other-quotation tend to be employed to confront the politician with what s/he said at some prior stage in the ongoing interview, or what s/he said or is supposed to have said in some prior interview or speech. The strategic employment of other-quotation, especially recycling what other said/wrote before, is less constrained than the use of self-quotation. It is generally used to challenge a politician's argumentation, signifying a lack of coherence and/or credibility on her/his side.

Excerpt 1a contains an other-quotation formatted as a direct quotation. The IR uses the quotation to import context into the ongoing interview, entextualising[7] an ally of the IE and assigning the ally (Peter Mandelson, a former spin doctor of the Labour government) the status of an object of talk. The quotative, which represents the illocutionary force of the ascribed source, is neutral ('say'), and the original local and temporal embeddedness is left underspecified ('the other day'). However, the quoter's attitude towards the content ('too much spinning') is made explicit and the intended perlocutionary effect ('charge') is assigned the status of an object of talk in the meta-comment 'do you accept the charge that there's been too much spinning'; through the use of the perfective aspect, the IR extends the quoted's domain of validity to include present time:

7 The use of 'entextualisation' in this contribution differs from that promoted by Park/Bucholtz (2009) who define entextualisation primarily in terms of institutional control and ideology. It shares their stance of approaching entextualisation in terms of "conditions inherent in the transposition of discourse from one context into another" (ibid, 489), while accommodating both local and global contexts, and their dialectical connectedness.

Excerpt 1a[8]

IR PETER MANDELSON SAID *THE OTHER DAY*, there's been too much spin, there ought to be more vision. Do you accept the charge that there's been too much spinning? (Ask Tony Blair 5 May 2001)

Other-quotations are not only anchored to particularised allies or political opponents, they can also be attributed to indeterminate sources. Excerpt 2 formatted as a direct quotation is such a case with the ascribed source 'people' and the neutral quotative 'say'. The quoted material displays features of spoken language ('well look here'). As above, the other-quotation is used strategically to underline the quoter's argument, which is a constitutive part of an argumentative chain, illustrating the politician's point. However, the intended perlocutionary effect of the quotation is not made fully explicit and it is not assigned the status of an object of talk, as was the case with the IR's use of other-quotation:

Excerpt 2

IE Well I want to change it, as Anne Widdecombe has set out, I I want to change this because it has a counter-productive effect. At the moment if a lorry driver discovers that people have got on to his lorry and then that, says that to the police - he gets penalised, he gets fined. Erm one firm has got fined many tens of thousands pounds as a result, so that needs changing, erm that is not an effective rule, we need to reform it so that there is a penalty for knowingly abusing the system, but that PEOPLE WHO SAY *WELL LOOK HERE*, there's an abuse of system going on, I'll tell you about it, they should not be penalised. (Ask William Hague 30 May 2001)

In mediated political interviews, unlike the quoter's interactional role, the formatting of other-quotation as direct or indirect quotation does not have an impact on their function: IRs generally spell out the intended perlocutionary effects of the quotation and assign them the status of an object of talk, while IEs use other-quotations to support their argument. Self-quotations tend to be used by politicians only and other-quotations are used by both IRs and IEs. While an IR may entextualise quotable material from particularised allies or particularised politi-

8 The focus of the analysis is on the verbal form and function of quotation. To facilitate readability, the transcription mode employed here adheres to orthographic conventions. *Relevant cues* for the analysis are printed *in italicised small capitals*, the ASCRIBED SOURCE and QUOTATIVE are printed IN SMALL CAPITALS, and the quoted material is underlined. In the data analysis, the use of personal pronouns is in accordance with natural gender.

cal opponents in order to unbalance the politician and challenge their credibility and/or argumentative coherence, the IE generally entextualises quotable material from allies or political opponents to support their argument. Both IRs and IEs may also use other-quotation with an indeterminate source in order to illustrate and underline their argument; frequently the use of such quotations is a constitutive part of an argumentative chain.

Excerpts 3 and 4 are instances of self-quotation introduced by collective self-reference with a neutral quotative ('we say') in the context of clarifying the position taken by the Conservatives in (3) and in illustrating the Conservatives' position in (4). Excerpt 5 is an instance of individual-anchored self-quotation with neutral 'say' used in a parasitic manner exploiting the 'I-say-you-say'-language game. In all of the excerpts the quoter imports context into an ongoing argumentative sequence and assigns the entextualised context the status of an object of talk which he uses to underline his argument:

Excerpt 3

IE *NO, NO* WE SAY there are other changes to tax that we would like to make but that that depends on the state of the economy (Ask William Hague 30 May 2001)

Excerpt 3 contains a direct quotation in a negatively loaded context, which is used strategically to refute the argument of the IE and at the same time support the politician's argument. This is reflected in the doubling of the negative operator 'no no' in the initial position of the turn, which refutes the IR's previous contribution ("After that you in the manifesto, Michael Portillo in interviews say there will be further cuts in the second part of that parliament") carrying the loaded presupposition that the Conservatives intend to cut taxes further. The refutation is not mitigated by any attenuation devices and indicates that the IE does not intend to discuss the matter any further.

Excerpt 4

IE Well let's look at some of those things, WE SAY we'll save one billion pounds from welfare fraud. THE GOVERNMENT HAVE ADMITTED *THAT* there are seven billion pounds in welfare fraud going on in this country, and they haven't done anything about it, and WE'RE SAYING *WHAT* you can do about it, you can give benefit inspectors the same powers as tax inspectors so we would be able to tackle a bit of the fraud in the welfare system. (Ask William Hague 30 May 2001)

Excerpt 4 contains an orchestrated interplay of direct and indirect quotations in an argumentative sequence. This contributes to the dialogicity of the argumentation as in the 'I-say-you-say' language game, underlining the IE's argument. While the collective self-quotation formatted as a direct quotation is part of an affirmative context ('we'll save one billion pounds'), the other-quotation is an instance of an indirect quotation and is part of a negatively loaded context framed by the highly negatively loaded quotative ('have admitted'), and the negative meta-comment ('they haven't done anything'). The negative other-evaluation is juxtaposed with a more positive self-quotation framed by a neutral quotative and the presentation of the solution to the problem under discussion ('we're saying what you can do about it'), which is elaborated on.

Excerpt 5

IE *WELL THAT IS WHY* I SAY you've got to respect the fact that people want to migrate economically. They want to to do better for themselves and their families. But no-one believes that you can have unrestricted of movement of populations around the world, obviously we can't do that. And that's why we have to have rules. And all I'm saying is the rules have to be firm and fairly enforced. (Ask William Hague 30 May 2001)

Excerpt 5 contains another self-quotation used parasitically in the 'I-say-you-say' language game, which provides backing for the politician's argument ('well that is why I say you've got to respect the fact that …').

The next two excerpts, 6 and 7, are instances of negotiated quotations, that is, the content and force of the quoted are not accepted by the communication partner and the quoter needs to account for the ascribed source and context.

Excerpt 6

IR_1 You see *THE THE LAST WEEK* YOU SAID *THAT* you would face the no-vote in any referendum, because of what you've just described, your allegations about how it would be, almost certain defeat. *NOW* YOU SAY there's a fighting chance

IE_1 *NO NO*, I I *WHAT* I SAID *WAS THAT* they would have, they would have a strong chance of being able to win.

IR_2 *NO NO YOU DID MORE THAN THAT FORGIVE ME*

IE_2 *NO I DID NOT SAY, DID NOT SAY ALMOST CERTAINLY*

IR_3 *IT WAS ON A PROGRAMME* that you did at *THIS TIME LAST WEDNESDAY NIGHT* YOU SAID, YOU SAID well almost certainly, the government will almost certainly win the referendum. *DO YOU WITHDRAW THE* ch, the

> the the view that you expressed then that they would almost certainly, the precise words you used, win the referendum. (Ask William Hague 30 May 2001)

In Excerpt 6, the multilayered status and embeddedness of the direct and indirect quotations surface in the argumentative sequence IR_1 – IR_3. The IR challenges the argumentation of his communication partner with the indirect quotation ('you would face the no-vote in any referendum') specified by its temporal ('last week') coordinates, contrasting it with a statement just ('now') made public, formatted as direct quotation ('there's a fighting chance') with the neutral quotative 'say'. The IE refutes the IR's direct quotation 'there's a fighting chance' in IE_1 ('no no I I what I said was that [corrected quotation]'), which is refuted by IR_2 (making explicit the generalised communicative action ('do') supplemented by an explicit reference to the politician's face wants ('forgive me'). IE_2 refutes this directly ('no I did not say did not say 'almost certainly'), spelling out the non-said. To substantiate his challenge, IR_3 spells out the location of the quoted ('on a programme') and temporal embeddedness ('this time last Wednesday night'). The degree of explicitness as regards illocutionary force and content is very high, and the status of the quoted, which has been controversial at some stage, is made explicit by 'the precise words you used'. The negotiation of the validity of the quotation about the Labour government winning the referendum gets more and more controversial and is only resolved when the IR invites a member of the audience to take on his role ('Let's bring the audience in this. Right down in the front here').

Excerpt 7 is another instance of a negotiated quotation, in which the contextual coordinates are also made explicit to underline the validity of the quoted material:

Excerpt 7

IR_1 But YOU'RE ALSO THE ONLY PARTY LEADER WHO SAYS, *AS YOU SAID TO ME-*

IE_1 Indeed I did.

IR_2 *NOT SO LONG AGO*, erm, *WHEN* I ASKED YOU WHETHER users of cannabis were criminals, YOU SAID, I don't regard them as criminals. AND YOU SAY – I'm right, aren't I? – you don't regard them as criminals.

IE_2 *I- I- THAT'S WHAT I SAID TO YOU*, *IN A- IN ANOTHER STUDIO, IN AN EQUIVALENT PROGRAMME SOME TIME AGO, THAT IS MY PERSONAL VIEW*. It is not the position of the Liberal Democrats, let me be quite clear about this (Question Time Special – challenge the leader 17/05/2001)

Excerpt 7 is quite interesting as it shows that it is not only the content or pragmatic force of the quoted which is of relevance to importing context into an ongoing discourse, but also the footing of the ascribed source, that is either animator, principal or author (Goffman 1981). It also displays multi-layered and multi-frame quoting with a complex procedure of ascribing the source of the quoted, that is the face-to-face IE, as a constitutive member of the first-frame interaction ('you're also the only party leader who says'). Moreover, the illocutionary force of the quoted material is made explicit ('asked'), as is its status of the yes/no-question ('whether'). The multi-layered status of the interaction is further explicated by providing the IE's answer, formatted as mixed quotation ('you say – you don't regard them as criminals'). The linguistic realization of the quotation is also remarkable, switching between past tense (e.g., 'as you said to me'; 'indeed I did'; 'you said', 'I said') and past time (e.g., 'not so long ago'; 'in another studio') and present tense (e.g., 'you're also the only party leader who says'; 'you say'; 'that is my personal view'; 'it is not the position of the Liberal Democrats') and present time (e.g., 'I'm right, aren't I?'), displaying all of features necessary to count as the (conversational) historic present (cf. Montgomery 2007, Schiffrin 1981). As in Excerpt 6, the participants format their contributions with a high degree of explicitness, and both agree upon content, force and temporal and local embeddedness of the quotations. What is controversial, however, is the footing of the ascribed source in Excerpt 7. The IE claims that he made the statement in his role as author of the quoted ('personal view'), in Goffman's terms (1981), but not as principal, i.e. the leader of the Liberal Democrats, on whose behalf he did not make that statement ('it is not the position of the Liberal Democrats'). As above, the IR uses the other-quotation to challenge the IE's argumentative coherence and credibility.

Quotations in political interviews can be used to boost the force of an argument, thus supporting the interlocutor's argumentation, and they can be used non-supportively, challenging the coherence and credibility of the other (cf. Fetzer, Weizman and Reber 2012). Quotations in the traditional media tend to be introduced by a neutral quotative, mainly 'say', and their ascribed source and temporal and local embeddedness are generally made explicit. While the source needs to be more determinate, time and place can be left underspecified.

2.2 Quotations in Online Comments

Contrary to the quotations in the political interviews examined above, the quotations found in the news discussion forums are only rarely prefaced by an explicit reference to their ascribed source and a verb of communication. Excerpt 8 is one

of the few examples which contain the ascribed source of the quoted, a verb of communication, and the quoted.[9]

Excerpt 8

a. transcript
   (1) President Obama: ((5 lines omitted)) *A year ago today, we were still losing jobs,*
   (2) *we're now gaining them. The economy was still contracting, it's not expanding. It's*
   (3) *not happening as fast as people would like. But it's moving in the right direction.*
   (4) *And the thing we can't do is to try to go back to the same policies that created this*
   (5) *mess in the first place.*

b. comment
   (1) Transparency At Its Best
   (2) OBAMA SAID, "A year ago today, we were still losing jobs, we're now gaining them.
   (3) The economy was still contracting, it's not expanding. It's not happening as fast as
   (4) people would like. But it's moving in the right direction. And the thing we can't do
   (5) is to try to go back to the same policies that created this mess in the first place."
   ((comment continues))

In this comment, the ascribed source of the quoted is named ('Obama') and followed by a general verb of communication (tensed form of 'say', simple past) and the direct quotation, marked by double quotation marks.

Instead of a *verbum dicendi* (verb of communication) users may use a *nomen dicendi* (that is, a noun, such as *summary, announcement*) to refer to a forthcoming quotation.[10] Consider Excerpt 9:

9 The portions in *italics* are *quotables*. The direct quotations in the comments are underlined, the ASCRIBED SOURCE and VERB/NOUN OF COMMUNICATION are printed in SMALL CAPITALS.

10 Unlike Halliday's notion of 'verbiage' (Halliday/Matthiesen [3]2004, 294), which refers to what is said, our term 'nomen dicendi' refers to the action performed by an utterance.

Excerpt 9

a. transcript
   (1) MR. O'REILLY: Who is the *enemy*?
   (2) SEN. OBAMA: Al Qaeda, the Taliban, a whole host of networks that are bent on
   (3) attacking America, who have a distorted ideology, *who have perverted the faith of*
   (4) *Islam*. So we have to go after them.

b. comment
   (1) M. L. Russell | September 5, 2008 4:18 AM | Reply
   (2) The SENATOR'S SYNOPSIS of the "enemy" as being those "...who have perverted the
   (3) faith of Islam" is of concern. ((comment continues))

In this comment, the ascribed source of the quoted is the 'Senator's', with the noun of communication being 'synopsis'. Two portions of the utterance are marked as quotations of the Senator's contributions in the interview: 'enemy' and '...who have perverted the faith of Islam'. However, as becomes visible in the transcript, 'enemy' was produced as part of the interviewer's question which elicited the Senator's contribution. The commentator thus provides what may be seen as a shorthand presentation of the contents of the interview.

More frequently, there is no introductory verb of communication and no reference to the ascribed source of the quoted. Consider Excerpt 10:

Excerpt 10

a. transcript
   (1) MR. O'REILLY: So you're going to pull out and let the Islamic fundamentalists
   (2) take them over?
   (3) SEN. OBAMA: No, no, no, no. What we say is, look, *we're going to provide them*
   (4) *with additional military support targeted at terrorists, and we're going to help*
   (5) *build their democracy and provide the kinds of funding* –

b. comment

(1) nelly | September 5, 2008 7:01 AM | Reply
(2) The bottom line:
(3) OBAMA:
(4) I'll fight Iran by diplomatic means. I would never take a military option off the
(5) table, but unfortunately haven't any plains yet.
(6) What a CHANGE!!!!
(7) In Afghanistan "we're going to provide them with additional military support
(8) targeted at terrorists, and we're going to help build their democracy and
(9) provide the kinds of funding –"
(10) The same things that we're doing now!
(11) What a CHANGE!!!!
(12) And by all means I'll never admit that I was wrong about the surge in Iraq.
(13) That's also sound familiar doesn't it? Not a CHANGE at all !!!!

While the quotable (lines 3–5 of the transcript) is presented as a collective self-quotation by Obama, the comment seems to limit the source of the quoted to Obama alone (line 3 of the comment). Moreover, the status of the direct quotation in lines 7–9 can only be inferred from the context since there is no explicit verb of communication which links Obama to the quoted portions in the comment: Cues that contextualise lines 7–9 as a quotation are 1) the use of the quotation marks, and 2) their contextual placement in the discussion forum below the transcript.[11]

An example from the fourth-frame interaction (commentators + commentators (+ first frame)) shows a division of labour between a full-fledged marking (including a verb of communication and a reference to the ascribed source) on the one hand and the use of quotation marks on the other. Excerpt 11, which shows a sequence of comments, exemplifies this:

11 Note that what is presented as an allegedly direct quotation by Obama in lines (4)-(5) of the comment constitutes reported speech which seems to be fictitious, i.e. it was very likely made up by the user in order to summarise Obama's position from her/his point of view.

Excerpt 11

a. transcript
   (1) MR. O'REILLY: Who is the *enemy*?
   (2) SEN. OBAMA: Al Qaeda, the Taliban, a whole host of networks that are bent on
   (3) attacking America, who have a distorted ideology, *who have perverted the faith of Islam*.
   (4) So we have to go after them.

b. comment
   (1) M. L. Russell | September 5, 2008 4:18 AM | Reply
   (2) The SENATOR'S SYNOPSIS of the "enemy" as being those "...who have perverted
   (3) the faith of Islam" is of concern. The true faith of Islam that follows the Koran
   (4) will always be perverted - and political correctness will not protect America
   (5) against a *religion of hate*. ((comment continues))

c. comment
   (1) F. Atalay | September 5, 2008 6:28 AM | Reply
   ((7 lines omitted))
   (9) As for the POSTER who CALLS Islam a religion of hate; thank you for making my point
   (10) regarding Republicans and their preconceived notions...

d. comment
   (1) Connie | September 7, 2008 3:32 PM | Reply
   (2) True Islam is NOT a "religion of hate" and anyone who thinks so needs to go read the
   (3) Koran and speak to an American Muslim about his practice. ((comment continues))

Comment 11c shows the full-fledged structure: it contains the source of the quoted 'poster' (note that the reference to 'poster' rather than to the user's name may be treated as a more impersonal choice which creates more social distance), a verb of communication ('calls') and the quoted ('religion of hate'), which is, however, not marked off as such through quotation marks. This contrasts with comment 11d, where the quoted is again taken up in a follow-up comment, this time marked exclusively by quotation marks. The question why comments c and d show this variation may be explained by interactional reasons (comment 11c is posted in

close temporal proximity (about 2 hours later) as opposed to comment 11d (about 2 days later) or by the complex-transitive verb complementation pattern in which the quotation is embedded in 11c.[12] What is crucial here, however, is that the quoted portions are indexed in both comments by conventional devices of the written medium, which have the same function as quotatives. Because of this function, quotations which are only indexed by quotation marks in online discussion forums can hardly be classified as cases of zero-quotatives.

But why is the use of quotation marks sufficient here? The writers of these posts rely on the assumption that the material quoted from the first- and fourth-frame contributions represents a shared discursive context which may be 'reactivated' through a minimal set of contextualisation cues. Moreover, the formatting of the quotations suggests that these comments (and the quotes used there) are designed for recipients who treat the interview and the computer-mediated discourse which evolves from it as a multi-framed and shared discourse.

Turning to the discourse functions of quotations in online discussion forums, we will now discuss the role of direct quotations in users' stance-taking towards the interview and as a resource for enacting frames. To begin with the former, the major function of the online discussions forums we examined is the evaluation of the style and contents of the given interview. Similar to the interviews analysed, quoting (both direct and indirect) in the online comments has the communicative function of stance-taking and positioning. Users import context (Fetzer 2011) from the first-frame into the fourth-frame interaction (thus constructing a third frame) by quoting. They thereby construe their object of stance (Du Bois 2007) visibly to their audience, that is, the other participants in the fourth frame and the readers of the comments. When presenting a quotation in their comments, users create an object of stance with which they may align or disalign, positioning themselves in relation to that object (cf. Du Bois 2007). Consider Excerpt 11':

Excerpt 11'

a. transcript
   (1) MR. O'REILLY: Who is the *enemy*?
   (2) SEN. OBAMA: Al Qaeda, the Taliban, a whole host of networks that are bent on
   (3) attacking America, who have a distorted ideology, *who have perverted the faith of Islam*.
   (4) So we have to go after them.

12 The latter point was raised by an anonymous reviewer.

b. comment
   (1) M. L. Russell | September 5, 2008 4:18 AM | Reply
   (2) The SENATOR'S SYNOPSIS of the "enemy" as being those "...who have perverted
   (3) the faith of Islam" is of concern. The true faith of Islam that follows the Koran
   (4) will always be perverted - and political correctness will not protect America
   (5) against a *religion of hate*. ((comment continues))

In the transcript (the first-frame interaction), the IE (Obama) makes negative attributions about Al Qaeda and the Taliban ('a whole host of networks that are bent on attacking America, who have a distorted ideology, who have perverted the faith of Islam'): he constructs them as objects of stance from which he disaligns. In the subsequent discussion, the commentator imports chunks of these attributions (marked as direct quotations through double quotation marks) into her/his comment. The shared discursive context of the first-frame interview, to which all comments make reference, is thus bounded (Fetzer 2011). What is more, the quoted attributions are in turn embedded in an evaluative move: presenting them in subject position ('The Senator's synopsis of the "enemy" as being those "...who have perverted the faith of Islam"'), the user continues with an evaluative expression in a copulative construction ('is of concern'). The imported objects of talk are transformed from first-frame attributions to third-/fourth-frame objects of evaluation. Moreover, the user displays disalignment with his/her object of stance: in this way they disalign themselves from the first-frame attributions.

The data show that these kinds of processes involving the context-importation and transformation of an object of evaluation can also be observed between fourth-frame participants. The evaluative label/attribution 'religion of hate' coined there is imported by subsequent comments and becomes an object of stance in its own right. Compare comments 11'c and d:

Excerpt 11'
c. comment
   (1) F. Atalay | September 5, 2008 6:28 AM | Reply
   ((7 lines omitted))
   (9) As for the POSTER who CALLS Islam a religion of hate; thank you for making my point
   (10) regarding Republicans and their preconceived notions...

d. comment
(1) Connie | September 7, 2008 3:32 PM | Reply
(2) True Islam is NOT a "religion of hate" and anyone who thinks so needs to go read the
(3) Koran and speak to an American Muslim about his practice. ((comment continuer))

The analysis has illustrated that evaluative attributions such as e.g. 'enemy' and 'religion of hate' may be imported from one interactional frame into another and be rendered objects of stance themselves. In this sense, these quotations may be described as multilayered constructions: a chunk of discourse is imported from one interactional frame (here the first-frame interview transcript) into another one (the fourth-frame interaction between commentators) through practices of direct quoting. What may constitute an evaluative expression for stance-taking and positioning in the first frame becomes an object of stance in the fourth frame and thus an object for alignment and disalignment.

Nevertheless, users may not always make their stance and positioning so explicit: Excerpt 10' is an example of a comment where the author's stance is expressed in an ironic fashion:

Excerpt 10'
b. comment
(1) nelly | September 5, 2008 7:01 AM | Reply
(2) The bottom line:
(3) Obama:
(4) I'll fight Iran by diplomatic means. I would never take a military option off the table, but
(5) unfortunately haven't any plains yet.
(6) What a CHANGE!!!!
(7) In Afghanistan "we're going to provide them with additional military support targeted at
(8) terrorists, and we're going to help build their democracy and provide the kinds of funding –"
(9) The same things that we're doing now!
(10) What a CHANGE!!!!
(11) And by all means I'll never admit that I was wrong about the surge in Iraq.
(12) That's also sound familiar doesn't it? Not a CHANGE at all !!!!

The policy quoted (lines 7–8) was proposed by Obama in an interview which took place during his 2008 election campaign. The quoted is first assessed as 'The same things that we're doing now!' (line 9), that is, as the same policy pursued under the Republican government at the time when the interview was conducted. It is then re-assessed as 'CHANGE' (line 10), i.e. the opposite of what was stated in the previous line. By alluding to the slogan "change" from Obama's 2008 campaign and stating the opposite of what is meant, line 10 comes off as ironic.

Furthermore, quotations do not only have an important function in stance-taking but are also used as a resource for enacting discursive frames and thus particular participation frameworks.

The online comments exclusively contain other-quotations with the ascribed source of the quotation framed in third-person constructions. Straightforward examples are for instance:

Excerpt 8'
comment
OBAMA SAID, "A year ago [...]"

Excerpt 11'
comment c
As for the POSTER who CALLS Islam a religion of hate; [...]

Excerpt 8' is exemplary for cases where the user quotes what was said in the first-frame interaction without addressing the IR or IE, i.e. the sources of the quoted, in the first frame. Excerpt 11c' shows an other-quotation taken from another comment, thus serving as a resource to address both the producer of the quotation and the other participants in the fourth frame. To use Goffman's (1986) terminology, while the original producers of the quotation in Excerpt 8' may be treated as ratified but not as one particular addressee singled out of the indeterminate mass audience, the producer of the poster mentioned in Excerpt 11c' is a ratified participant in the frame. From a different angle (Levinson 1988), we may consider Obama (and the Democrats) or O'Reilly (and his followers) as indirect targets of the interaction between the users in the online discussion forum.

However, this kind of framing is not always made explicit. For instance, Excerpt 11d' shows that a lack of reference to the ascribed source of the quoted may be exploited for communicative purposes:

Excerpt 11'
comment d

(1) True Islam is NOT a "religion of hate" and anyone who thinks so needs to go read the
(2) Koran and speak to an American Muslim about his practice.

Since the quotation lacks information about its source and is not introduced by a verb of communication, it is left indeterminate with regard to its status as an other- or self-quotation in deflecting responsibility and distancing the self from the quotation.

To sum up, this formal analysis has demonstrated that quotations without source-marking and a *verbum dicendi* are most frequent in the online discussion forums. This does not mean that they are not recognisable for what they are but that they are contextualised with cues specific to the written medium, quotation marks. It is therefore argued that quotation marks represent quotatives in their own right, i.e. they constitute formal devices to introduce a stretch of speech as a quotation.

Similarly to other work (Bös/Kleinke in this volume, Severinson Eklundh 2010), direct quotations in the online discussion forums we examined function as stance objects for construing alignment/disalignment with the ascribed source of the quoted, which may, however, not always be named explicitly. Furthermore, direct quotations are used as a resource to enact specific participation frameworks, constructing the other users in the discussion forum and/or the protagonists of the interview under discussion as addressees.

2.3 Contrastive Analysis

The form-based analysis of quotations shows a context-sensitive employment in both the pre-election interviews and computer-mediated discussion forums. In the pre-election interviews, the quoted is generally prefaced by an explicit reference to the ascribed source, for instance the interviewee or some ally or opponent as is the case with the ascribed source Peter Mandelson in excerpt 1, the collective self-references in (3) and (4), the self-reference in (5), the generic other-reference 'people' in (2), and the collective other-reference 'government' in (4). While the quotative is realised by the neutral verb of communication 'say' in the self-quotations in excerpts 3, 4 and 5 and in the specific and generic other-quotations in (1) and (2), the collective other-quotation is prefaced by the evaluative quotative 'admit'. This is different to the practice of quoting in the negotiated quotations analysed in excerpts 6 and 7, where the quotative is made more specific in the

process of negotiating the validity of the quote, starting with neutral 'say' and then using the more particularised forms 'ask' and 'withdraw'. As for the additional information supplemented on the local and temporal embeddedness of the quotation, only the proper-name based other-quotation is supported by the underspecified temporal reference 'the other day' in excerpt 1. The negotiated quotations analysed in excerpts 6 and 7 contain a number of references to their local embeddedness, e.g. 'equivalent programme', 'another studio', and temporal embeddedness 'last week', 'now', and 'this time last Wednesday night'. This is necessary to secure the validity of the quoted material and reflects positively on the credibility of the quoter.

In the computer-mediated discussion forums such formats are rare. Here quotations are often exclusively indexed by quotation marks, as is the case in Excerpt 10, for instance. This provides evidence that the formatting of quotations is reflective on the discourse and contexts in which they are produced: in the interviews, the explicit anchoring of quotations contributes to the first-frame participants' construal of discursive common ground amongst themselves and their mediated audience. The sources of the quotations are entextualised and may thus be attributed to the collective discursive common ground without further negotiation. In contrast, the formatting of the quotations in the online discussion forums shows that the users assign the interview under discussion the status of shared discursive common ground.

As regards their functions, quotations are used to import context into the local situated interaction in both the interviews and online discussion forums. Users deploy these quotations as objects for alignment and disalignment, reproducing what was said in a (past) discursive frame in the current frame. In the interviews, quotations allow the quoter (i.e. the interviewer, usually a journalist, interviewee, i.e. the politician, or some other political ally or opponent) to align or disalign with particularised sets of the mass audience, e.g., specific groups of the electorate. The quotations in the comments are deployed to construct the quoters as supporters of particular political ideologies. This demonstrates that such displays are particularly functional in constructing participants' political identities in these political discourse contexts although the display of alignment/disalignment through quotations may be typical of argumentative contexts in general.

Furthermore, the analysis shows that the speakers in both interviews and online discussion forums use other-quotations to challenge the addressee's/target's argumentation, if not their credibility. Self-quotations were only found in interviews where they support self's argument by reasserting their credibility. This may be because the participants in the interviews are public figures who are accountable for what they say. By using self-quotation, they can demonstrate

that they are responsible communicators who know what they have said before. Participants in online discussion forums, by contrast, belong to an anonymous mass audience who are not generally challenged to account for their sincerity and credibility.

3 Conclusions

This analysis of quoting practices has shown that quoting is not a context-independent endeavour but a context-sensitive practice which adapts to the contextual constraints and requirements of the respective genre and medium. Quotations play an important role in stance-taking, and are used strategically in both televised political interviews and online discussion forums to align or disalign with party-political or governmental policies and affiliations. The formatting of the quotations is reflective on the participants' identities as public figures or members of an anonymous mass audience. By speaking about politics and the policies put forward in the interviews under discussion, users do not only take part in the political discourse but are also part of the process of political decision-making. Discourse processes, which have been primarily situated in the private sphere of society, are thus exposed publically in online discussion forums. Fetzer/Weizman (2006) observe:

> Contrary to the rights and obligations of a ratified coparticipant in an ordinary face-to-face interaction, the media-discourse audience is not in a position to take part in the process of negotiating meanings in a direct manner by negotiating the status of a communicative contribution there and then. Instead, the members of the audience are confronted with the product of the media interaction with which they can agree or disagree. (ibid, 144–145)

It is open to conjecture whether electronic devices such as discussion forums or twitter will bring about a change, allowing the media-discourse audience to participate more actively in the political decision-making processes of mediated, public and professional politics.

References

Atifi, Hassan and Michel Marcoccia. 2012. "Follow-ups in online political discussions", in: Fetzer, Weizman and Reber (eds), 22–34.

Bell, Allan. 1991. *The Language of News Media*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bös, Birte and Sonja Kleinke. "The complexities of thread-internal quoting in English and German online discussion fora". This volume.

Bublitz, Wolfram and Christian Hoffmann. 2011. "'*Three Men Using our Toilet all Day Without Flushing* – This May Be One of the Worst Sentences I've Ever Read': Quoting in CMC", in: Joachim Frenk and Lena Steveker (eds). *Anglistentag Saarbrücken 2010. Proceedings*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 433–447.

Buchstaller, Isabelle. 2013. *Quotatives: New Trends and Sociolinguistic Implications*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Buchstaller, Isabelle, John Rickford, Elizabeth Traugott, Tom Wasow and Arnold Zwicky. 2010. "The sociolinguistics of a short-lived innovation: tracing the development of quotative *all* across spoken and internet newsgroup data". *Language Variation and Change* 22, 191–219.

Buchstaller, Isabelle and Ingrid van Alphen (eds). 2012. *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and Cross-disciplinary Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Burger, Harald. 2005. *Mediensprache: Eine Einführung in Sprache und Kommunikationsformen der Massenmedien*. 3rd ed. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Clayman, Steven. 1995. "Defining moments, presidential debates, and the dynamics of quotability". *Journal of Communication* 45, 118–146.

Du Bois, John W. 2007. "The stance triangle", in: Robert Englebretson (ed.). *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 139–182.

Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Media Discourse.* London: Arnold.

Fairclough, Norman. 2006. *Language and Globalisation*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Fetzer, Anita. 2006. 2"Minister, we will see how the public judges you. Media references in political interviews". *Journal of Pragmatics* 38, 180–195.

Fetzer, Anita. 2007. "Reformulation and common grounds", in: Anita Fetzer and Kerstin Fischer (eds). *Lexical Markers of Common Grounds*. London: Elsevier, 157–179.

Fetzer, Anita. 2011. "'Here is the difference, here is the passion, here is the chance to be part of a great change': strategic context importation in political discourse", in: Anita Fetzer and Etsuko Oishi (eds). *Context and Contexts: Parts Meet Whole?*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 115–146.

Fetzer, Anita and Peter Bull. 2006. "Who are we and who are you? The strategic use of forms of address in political interviews". *Text and Talk* 26, 1–36.

Fetzer, Anita and Marjut Johansson. 2010. "Cognitive verbs in context: a contrastive analysis of English and French argumentative discourse". *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 15, 240–266.

Fetzer, Anita and Gerda Lauerbach (eds). 2007. *Political Discourse in the Media: Cross-cultural Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fetzer, Anita and Elda Weizman. 2006. "Political discourse as mediated and public discourse". *Journal of Pragmatics* 38, 143–153.

Fetzer, Anita, Elda Weizman and Elisabeth Reber (eds). 2012. *Proceedings of the ESF Strategic Workshop on Follow-ups Across Discourse Domains: A Cross-cultural Exploration of Their Forms and Functions, Würzburg (Germany), 31 May - 2 June 2012*. Würzburg: Universität Würzburg. http://opus.bibliothek.uni-wuerzburg.de/volltexte/2012/7165/, last accessed 28 Feb 2013.

Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Goffman, Erving. 1986. *Frame Analysis.* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Gumperz, John J. 1992. "Contextualisation and understanding", in: Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin (eds). *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 229–252.

Günthner, Susanne. 2005. "Narrative reconstructions of past experiences. Adjustments and modifications in the process of recontextualising a past experience", in: Uta Quasthoff and Tabea Becker (eds). *Narrative Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 285–301.

Halliday, Michael A. K. and Christian Matthiessen. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 3rd ed. London: Arnold.

Heritage, John. 1985. "Analysing news interviews: aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience", in: Teun A. van Dijk (ed.). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis 3: Discourse and Dialogue.* London: Academic Press, 95–117.

Johansson, Marjut. 2007. "Represented discourse in answers. A cross-linguistic perspective on French and British political interviews", in: Fetzer and Lauerbach (eds). 139–162.

Jones, Graham M. and Bambi B. Schieffelin. 2009. "Talking text and talking back: 'My BFF Jill' from Boob Tube to YouTube". *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 14, 1050–1079.

Klewitz, Gabriele and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 1999. "Quote-unquote. The role of prosody in the contextualisation of reported speech sequences". *Pragmatics* 9, 459–485.

Kushin, Matthew and Kelin Kitchener. 2009. "Getting political on social network sites: exploring online political discourse on Facebook". *First Monday* 14.
http://firstmonday.org/article/view/2645/2350, last accessed 28 Feb 2013.

Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1988. "Putting linguistics on a proper footing: explorations in Goffman's concepts of participation", in: Paul Drew, and Antony Wooton (eds). *Erving Goffman. Exploring the Interaction Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 161–227.

Linell, Per. 1998. *Approaching Dialogue*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mathis, Terrie and George Yule. 1994. "Zero quotatives". *Discourse Processes* 18, 63–76.

Montgomery, Martin. 2007. *The Discourse of Broadcast News: A Linguistic Approach.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Park, Joseph Sung-Yul and Mary Bucholtz. 2009. "Public transcripts: entextualisation and linguistic representation in institutional contexts". *Text and Talk* 5, 485–502.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1981. "Tense variation in narrative". *Language* 57, 45–62.

Severinson Eklundh, Kerstin. 2010. "To quote or not to quote: setting the context for computer-mediated dialogues". *Language@Internet* 7. http://www.languageatinternet.org/articles/2010/2665/Severinson_Eklundh.pdf, last accessed 28 Feb 2013.

Sperber, Dan and Deirdre Wilson. 1986. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wenger, Etienne. 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.