

SUB Hamburg



A/603356

Argumentation in Political Interviews

Analyzing and evaluating responses
to accusations of inconsistency

Corina Andone
University of Amsterdam

John Benjamins Publishing Company
Amsterdam / Philadelphia

Table of contents

Preface	VII
CHAPTER 1	
Introduction	1
1.1 Responding to an accusation of inconsistency in a political interview	1
1.2 A pragma-dialectical perspective on argumentation	6
1.3 Objectives and method of the study	11
1.4 Organization of the study	13
CHAPTER 2	
Analytically relevant responses to an accusation of inconsistency	15
2.1 Introduction	15
2.2 Communicative and interactional purposes of an accusation of inconsistency	15
2.3 Responses to an accusation of inconsistency	21
2.4 Conclusion	32
CHAPTER 3	
The political interview as an argumentative activity type	33
3.1 The institutional goal of political interviews	33
3.2 The initial situation	39
3.3 Starting points	46
3.4 Argumentative means	52
3.5 The possible outcome	57
3.6 Conclusion	59
CHAPTER 4	
Strategic maneuvering in response to an accusation of inconsistency in a political interview	61
4.1 Accusations of inconsistency in a political interview	61
4.2 Retracting a standpoint in response to an accusation of inconsistency	63
4.3 Exploiting commitments to win the discussion	70
Pattern 1: 'it depends'	73
Pattern 2: 'we need to be clear'	83
Pattern 3: 'there is a world of difference'	93
4.4 Conclusion	98

CHAPTER 5

**The reasonableness of responses to an accusation of inconsistency
in a political interview** 101

5.1 The reasonableness of confrontational strategic maneuvering 101

5.2 Soundness conditions 106

5.2.1 Soundness condition of openness 106

5.2.2 Soundness condition of relevance 113

5.2.3 Soundness condition of clarity 120

5.3 Conclusion 123

CHAPTER 6

Conclusion 125

6.1 Main findings 125

6.2 Implications for further research 129

References 135

List of figures 141

Name index 143

Subject index 145