

SD/15/03

Record part of a conversation in English that takes place in one of the following situations (or similar), as outlined by Francis and Hunston (Francis, G. and Hunston, S., 'Analysing everyday conversation' in Coulthard, 1992: 123-61.):

- casual conversations between friends and family members
- child-adult talk
- commercial transactions
- professional interviews
- radio phone-ins

Transcribe part of your recording, choosing a part in which there are fairly frequent alternations of speaker.

Make an analysis of the transcribed data, using the categories proposed by Francis and Hunston (ibid. p. 125 and ff.). Present your analysis as Part I of your assignment, preferably in table form.

Comment on how easy it was to fit your data to the categories and the usefulness of this kind of analysis for understanding the kind of communication you have analysed. Present your commentary as Part II of your assignment.

(**Advice:** Work like this can be very time-consuming. Attempt only as much data as you can transcribe in about 2 hours. To allow for the work involved in analysing your transcript, the total word count for the commentary need not exceed 2,500 words, although you can use the full 4,000 words if you wish. Your unanalysed transcription must be included as an appendix.)

1. Introduction

In the early 1960s, a group of linguists started to turn their attention to real, spoken language in use. Using recordings of teaching scenarios (Sinclair and Coulthard 1992) doctor-patient exchanges (Coulthard and Montgomery 1981), therapy sessions (Labov and Fanshel in Stubbs 1983, p150) and telephone conversations (Sacks 1992), they set about attempting to understand how people managed real time interactions. They asked questions such as; how does the listener know how to interpret an utterance? How do conversationalists manage turn taking? What are the norms as regards responses to utterances, politeness, telling anecdotes, starting and ending interactions, and marking transitions within interactions etc..

In their 1975 paper "*Towards an analysis of discourse. The English used by teachers and pupils*", Sinclair and Coulthard set out to investigate the underlying structure of spoken discourse. They used the ideas set out in Halliday's "categories of the theory of grammar" (Coulthard 1977, 120), which recognises a hierarchy of levels of grammar from *morpheme*, *word*, *group*, and *clause*, to *sentence*, as inspiration for a system to categorize elements of conversation structure. They adopted a rank scale, with the categories *act*, *move*, *exchange*, *transaction* and *lesson* and found that an overwhelming majority of interactions in their study did in fact display a consistent pattern. An exchange, they claim typically consists of an Initiation (I), a Response (R), and often a Feedback (F) – later changed to Follow-up. In the original paper, the Follow-up often took the form of teacher evaluation of student's utterances.

However, this study was based on English as spoken in the classroom, where the teacher occupies a privileged role as dominant speaker, and although it revealed valuable information about the conventions of interactions in pedagogical settings, a system designed to analyse such a specific type of discourse may not necessarily be suited to other forms of spoken discourse where speakers are on more equal footings and have different goals.

Francis and Hunston (in Sinclair and Coulthard 1992) propose an extended version of the Sinclair and Coulthard model, which also adopts findings on rules of intonation (Coulthard and Brazil 1979) in dialogue to analyse general, informal conversations. In this model they retain the units of *act*, *move* and *exchange* but consider the levels of *transaction* and *interaction* (a replacement for *lesson*) problematic, and thus base their analysis on the former three categories. They find that the Sinclair-Coulthard model can be successfully adapted to deal with casual conversations and that their data also display a typical I / R / (F) structure, although follow-ups rarely take the form of evaluations, but instead might express acknowledgement or perform a phatic function.

This assignment will seek to apply Francis and Hunston's adapted model to yet another type of discourse – a formal interview – to investigate how well the model deals with this type of interaction, whether it can reveal structural patterns, and how these might reveal further aspects of the mechanisms behind spoken discourse.

2. Methodology

2.1. Choice of Text

For reasons regarding ease of transcription and the need for a high-quality recording, a professional television interview was chosen for this analysis, an interview between television presenter and journalist Jon Stewart (henceforth referred to as J) and senator Bernie Sanders (B) that was broadcast on The Daily Show in 2014. The show dealt with political and current affairs from a comedy perspective and featured regular interviews. A main danger with using such a recording for discourse analysis is the risk that the interview was scripted, thus affecting the naturalness of the interaction. However, the interview was recorded in front of a live audience, and appears to have been filmed in one take. The interview also displays characteristics of naturally occurring spoken language including false starts, repairs, pauses for thought mid-sentence and overlapping speech, which generally inspire confidence that although the questions may have previously been discussed, there was no script for the interaction. The data also has the advantage of providing both audio and visual information, which renders transcription easier, and records gestures such as handshakes. Two sections of the interview were chosen where there were frequent alternations of speaker.

2.2. Definition of Key Terms

This analysis is carried out using Francis and Hunston's model. Their paper contains detailed descriptions of the various subcategories of acts, moves and exchanges which, due to space constraints, are not reproduced here. However it is felt that the larger categories of act, move and exchange should be defined here.

2.2.1. Acts, Moves and Exchanges

Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) established the terms as part of a rank scale, whereby lower items represent constituent parts of higher items and thus reflect their structure. They aimed to describe a limited set of items for each category.

Act is the lowest unit of discourse, which by definition has no internal structure and has a similar relationship to moves as do morphemes to words (Coulthard 1981). Acts group together to form moves, which are the minimum contribution an interlocutor can make to a conversation. A move can consist of one act, or multiple acts. Moves then come together to form exchanges, which are defined as having a minimum of two moves which represent elements of structure of the exchange, including an obligatory initiation (I) and response (R) which is predicted by the initiation, followed by an optional follow-up (F), or multiple follow-ups (I – R (– Fⁿ)). A further allowable pattern is I – R / I – R (– F), where I/R indicates a response to an initiation which itself predicts a further response, such as answering a question with another question. Specific types of moves are restricted to specific elements of structure (Francis and Hunston 1992), with for example, an informing move only able to occupy the I or R slot. An analysis conducted using this model attends not to semantics, topics or time, but instead to revealing the underlying structure of a section of discourse.

3. Results: Dialogue Analysis Using the Rank Scale

Line	Speaker	Act	Element Of Structure	Move	Element Of Structure	Exchange	Exchange Number	
1	J	Please welcome to the program, Senator Bernie Sanders!	Directive To Audience / Greeting ⁱ	H	Opening	I	Structuring	1a
2	A	(cheers)	Behave / Summons ⁱⁱ	H	Behave	R		
3	B	(enters stage)	Reply Summons	H	Answering	R		
4	J	Sir!	Greet	Pre-Head	Opening	I	(Structuring)	1b ⁱⁱⁱ
5	J	(gets up shakes hand)	Greet	H				
6	B	(shakes hand)	Reply Greet	H		R		
7	J	How are you sir?	Greet	Pre-Head	Opening	I	(Structuring)	1c
8	J	Nice to see you.	Greet	H ^{iv}				
9	J	(gestures to seat)	Directive To Bernie	H				
10	B	(sits where indicated)	Behave	H	Behave	R		
11	J	Thank you for joining us.	Greet	H	Opening	I	(Structuring)	1d
12	B	My pleasure	Reply Greet	H	Answering	R		
13	J	Ah,	Framer	H	Framing		Boundary Exchange	2
14	J	the book is called “the Speech”. It’s actually just a relatively faithful transcription of the err eight and half hour	Informative	Pre-Head	Inform	I	Inform /Elicit? ^v	3
15	J	what do you call it, mini-filibuster that you delivered [there?]	Marked Proposal	H	Elicit			
16	B	[Mmm]	Engage	N/A	N/A			
17	B	(nods) It’s a filibuster.	React	H	Inform	R		
18	B	Fully fledged filibuster.	Comment	Post-Head				
19	J	a fully fledged	Reformulate	H	Acknowledge	F		
20	B	eight and a half hours is real time, yeah.	Comment	H	Acknowledge	F		
21	J	that’s real time:	Concur	H	Acknowledge	F		

Line	Speaker	Act	Element Of Structure	Move	Element Of Structure	Exchange	Exchange Number	
22	J	err and they don't do those any more [really]	Marked Proposal	H	Elicit	I	Elicit / Inform	4
23	B	[no] no	Concur	H	Inform	R		
24	J	they, they always say it. They profess they will but they don't	Comment	H	Inform	Ir		
25	B	right	Concur	H	Acknowledge	F		
26	J	err.. and you were : basically using it to protest the budget deal the Democrats and the Republicans reached on: err the tax cut,	Marked Proposal	H	Elicit	I	Elicit / Inform	5
27	J	err not the tax cut, the budget cut	Comment		Post-Head			
28	B	Well err what that was about	Marker		Pre-Head	Inform	R	
29	B	was the agreement between the president democratic leadership and the Republicans which continued Bush's tax breaks for the very, very wealthy.	Informative	H				
30	B	Which: at a time of the huge deficit didn't make a whole lot of sense to me	Comment		Post-Head			
31	J	Bernie, how can you how can you?=-	Protest	H	Acknowledge	F		
32	A	(cheers)	Endorse	H	Acknowledge	F		
33	J	[Now that's not encouraging] (wags finger at audience)	? ^{vi}	?	?	?		
34	J	How can you punish the most productive amongst us with=	Inquire Part 1	H	Elicit	I	Elicit	6
35	A	(laughs)	Endorse	H	Acknowledge	F/ ? ^{vii}		
36	B	(laughs)	Engage	N/A	N/A	N/A		
37	J	with what I think we all know are job cutting and killing tax cuts.	Inquire Part 2	H				
38	J	They are job producers sir. I=	Comment		Post-Head			
39	A	(laughs)	Endorse	H	Acknowledge	F/ ?		
40	J	I'm really quite shocked that you would go on record in this manner	Comment		Post-Head			
41	B	Well:	Marker		Pre-Head	Inform	R	
42	B	sorry to shock you Jon.	Informative	H				

Line	Speaker	Act	Element Of Structure	Move	Element Of Structure	Exchange	Exchange Number
43	B : ah	Framer	Head	Framing	I	(Structuring - Announces Mini Lecture)	7
44	B but the reality is today we have a middle class that in many respects is collapsing,	Informative	H	Inform	I	<i>Mini-Lecture</i>	8
45	median family income is declining,	<i>Exemplify</i>	Post-Head				
46	in the last ten years we've lost 50 000 factories in this country,	<i>Exemplify</i>	Post-Head				
47	many of them shutting down and going to China, millions of good paying manufacturing jobs,	<i>Exemplify</i>	Post-Head				
48	and in the midst of all this the wealthiest people in this country are doing phenomenally well	<i>Informative</i>	H				
49	we have the top 1% earning more income than the bottom 50%,	<i>Exemplify</i>	Post-Head				
50	the top 400 individuals in this country own more wealth than the bottom 150 million Americans.	<i>Exemplify</i>	Post-Head				
51	J <i>You're welcome.</i>	Reply Greet ^{viii}	H	Acknowledge	R		
52	B (laughs)	React	H	Acknowledge	F		
53	A (laughs)	React	H	Acknowledge	F		

Break in Dialogue

Line	Speaker	Act	Element Of Structure	Move	Element Of Structure	Exchange	Exchange Number	
54	J	I think ... you'd be hard pressed in those statements to find a majority of Americans that would disagree with that and I think the Republicans would frame their argument as "these are issues of ... er ... freedom and government inefficiency", and they can frame it in a certain way that a majority of Americans would agree with that.	Informative	Head	Inform	I	Inform / Elicit	9
55	J	But I think we can [also]	Starter (Incomplete)	Pre-Head	Inform (Incomplete)	I		
56	B	[Honestly] Jon	Starter	Pre-Head	Inform	R		
57	B	I don't think that's correct	Informative	H				
58	B	... I think that at the end of the day the vast majority of the people support Medicare=	Comment	Post-Head				
59	J	[no ... I, I think that's correct]	React	H	(Acknowledge)	(F)		
60	B	[support social] security. You go and ask anybody about the wisdom of giving tax breaks a trillion dollars in tax [breaks]=	Comment Cont.	Post-Head	Inform			
61	J	[right]	Engage	N/A	N/A	N/A		
62	B	which is what the Ryan plan is to the wealthiest people in this country while you cut back on education=	Comment Cont.	Post-Head				
63	J	[right]	Engage	N/A	N/A	N/A		
64	B	[and] environmental protection: very few people agree with that	Comment Cont.	Post-Head				
65	J	no :	React	H	Acknowledge	F		
66	J	I : err absolutely I meant it more in the framing of : err allowing people to keep more of what they earn you know when they frame it the way=	Informative	H	Inform	Re-Initiate	(Re-Initiate)	10
67	B	[right]	Engage		N/A			
68	J	[of] "it's your money"=	Informative Cont.	H				
69	B	[Yep]	Engage		N/A			
70	J	[and] your like it's kind of all our money=	Informative Cont.	H				
71	B	[right]	Engage		N/A			

Line	Speaker	Act	Element Of Structure	Move	Element Of Structure	Exchange	Exchange Number
72	J : erm	Framer	H	Framing	I	Structuring	11
73	J but the idea I guess I'm getting to is :	Starter	Pre-Head	Inform	I	Inform / Elicit	12
74	J we will run into an entitlement crisis at some point	Informative / Inquire Part 1	H				
75	B uhum...	Engage		N/A			
76	J as the population ages, as medical costs skyrocket. How DO you address that and it is a real issue?	Informative / Inquire Part 2	H	Elicit			
77	B [Good.] OK.	Receive	Pre-Head	Opening	R	(Structuring)	
78	B Let's separate when you talk about entitlements. First of all	Metastatement	H	Opening		Mini Lecture	12b
79	B despite what you see on television every night social security is not broke,	Informative	H	Inform			
80	B it is not going bankrupt,	Paraphrase	Post-Head				
81	B social security has a 2.6 trillion dollar surplus.	Exemplify	Post-Head				
82	B They can pay out every benefit owed to every eligible American for the next 26 years at which point it pays out 78% of benefits	Informative	Post-Head				
83	J right	Engage	N/A	N/A	N/A		
84	B so social security is one issue...	Meta-Statement (Incomplete)	Pre-Head	Opening	I (Incomplete)		
85	J well	Marker	Pre-Head	Inform	I	Inform	13
86	J that ... that.. money is not ... the government has used the money that is there for other things=	Informative	H				
87	B [Yes]	Engage	N/A	N/A	N/A		
88	J there's an "I Owe You" there that the government has written saying : "heh : ugh" (shrugs shoulders looks apologetic)	Informative Cont.	H		I		
89	A (laughs)	Endorse	H	Acknowledge	R		
90	B [BUT] (high tone)..	Marker	H	Opening (Interrupted)	R		
91	J [that] ... that is the case	Comment	Post-Head	Inform	I?		
92	B that is the case ^{ix}	React	H	Inform	R		

Line	Speaker	Act	Element Of Structure	Move	Element Of Structure	Exchange	Exchange Number
93	B	BUT remember,	Marker	Pre-Head	Framing	I / IR ^x ?	14 Inform (Incomplete)
94	B	from the inception of this country our government has never yet defaulted on a debt so [it is]...	Informative	H	Inform		
95	J	[I] I think that's coming May 25 th	Informative	H	Inform	I	Side Sequence
96	A	(laughs)	Engage	H	N/A		
97	B	(laughs)	Engage	H	N/A		
98	B	That's an interesting issue,	Endorse	H	Acknowledge	R	
99		that's another issue	Conclusion	H	Framing?		
100	J	right	Acquiesce	H	Acknowledge	F	
101	B	but in [fact] ^{xi}	Informative (Interrupted)	?	Inform (Interrupted)	IR	
102	J	[even] 78%	Starter	Pre-Head	Inform	I	15 Inform
103	J	you know how do you say to somebody who's 40 years old right now "social security is in great shape, until you need it"?=	Informative	H	Inform		
104	B	[OK]	Engage	N/A	N/A	N/A	
105	J	[and] then you'll get 78%,					
106	J	you know and then	Marker	Post-Head	Inform		
107	J	when you say we've never defaulted, how many people thought : Jewish guy from Brooklyn's going to end up being the socialist senator from Vermont,	Comment		Inform		
108	J	you know,	Marker	Post-Head	Inform		
109	J	there's a lot of things happen that	Comment	Post-Head	Inform		
110	B	[yeah]	Engage	N/A	N/A	N/A	
111	J	[people] wouldn't expect..	Informative Cont.	H		I	

Line	Speaker	Act	Element Of Structure	Move	Element Of Structure	Exchange	Exchange Number
112	B	but : here's the answer.	Meta-Statement	H	Framing	R	<i>Mini Lecture (Structuring)</i> 15b
113	B	I mean how do we : your real question is "how do we make social security vibrant and solvent for the next 75 years?	<i>Informative</i>	H	Inform		
114	J	[right]	<i>Engage</i>				
115	B	[which is] what the actuaries want,	<i>Comment</i>	Post-Head			
116	B	you know what we should do?	<i>Inquiry (Rhetorical)</i>	H			
117	B	You do exactly what Obama said during the campaign.	<i>Informative</i>	H			
118	B	Right now a millionaire pays the same amount of money into the social security trust fund as someone who makes 106 000 dollars ... lift that cap, start at 250 000 dollars [your problem is solved]	<i>Comment</i>	Post-Head			
119	A	(cheers)	<i>React</i>	H	<i>Acknowledge</i>	F	
120	J	would you?	Neutral Proposal (Incomplete)	?	Elicit?	I	Elicit / Inform (Incomplete) 16
121	J	This is [something that has always been an issue to me]	Informative (Incomplete)	?	Elicit / Inform?	I	
122	B	[No]	Reject	H	Answering	R	

Line	Speaker	Act	Element Of Structure	Move	Element Of Structure	Exchange	Exchange Number
123	B	[by the way, I'd like to say that]	Meta-Statement	H	Opening	I	Inform 17
124	B	[in fairness,] Medicare is a different issue	Conclusion		Post-Head		
125	J	right	Acquiesce	H	Answering	R	
126	B	[it is as much]	Informative (Incomplete)				
127	J	[as medical costs skyrocket that is when...(inaudible)]	Informative (Incomplete)				
128	B	right	Engage / Acquiesce?	H	Acknowledge		
129	B	Then we have to ask.. Jon..	Starter	Pre-Head	Framing	R/I	Mini Lecture 17b
130	B	why is it that in America today we are the only nation in the world that doesn't have a national healthcare program guaranteeing healthcare to all people and yet with 50 million uninsured we are spending almost twice as much per capita on healthcare as any other nation.	<i>Inquiry (Rhetorical)</i>	H	Inform	R/I	
131	B	That's the issue that we have to tackle and the answer is ...	<i>Starter</i>	Pre-Head	Framing		
132	B	not uncoincidentally,	<i>Aside</i>	?			
133	B	we are the only country in the industrialised world that allows for-profit insurance companies to play a dominant role,	<i>Informative</i>	H	Inform		
134	B	and the function of insurance companies is not to provide healthcare, it is to make money...	<i>Informative</i>	H			
135	B	and I believe,	<i>Starter</i>	Pre-Head	Inform		
136	B	and we are trying to do this in Vermont,	<i>Aside</i>	?			
137	B	if we move toward a Medicare for all single payer program we can save huge sums of money on administration, on profiteering on bureaucracy and CAN control healthcare costs	<i>Informative</i>	H			
138	J	so , so ..	^{xii} ?	?	?	?	
139	A	cheers	Endorse	H	Acknowledge	F	
140	J	lets talk about why that (inaudible) happen	Meta-Statement	H	Frame	I	Boundary Exchange 18
141	B	(nods)	Acquiesce	H	Answering	R	

Line	Speaker	Act	Element Of Structure	Move	Element Of Structure	Exchange	Exchange Number	
142	J	and again this gets back to you know uh uh some issues that I was talking about...	Starter	Pre-Head	Frame	I	Inform	19
143	J	a very ideological and divided Congress that has difficulty settling on uh er any kind of program that made even the simplest of fixes is dragged out over a long period of time, is lost in the [(inaudible) bureaucracy]	Informative	H	Inform			
144	B	[No, no]	Protest	Pre-Head	Inform	R		
145	B	(raises finger)	Protest	Pre-Head				
146	B	no I don't agree with you	Protest	H				
147	J	alright	Acquiesce	H	Acknowledge	F		
148	B	OK.	Framer	H	Frame	I	Boundary Exchange	20
149	B	I think that the issue is	Starter	Pre-Head	Inform	I	Inform	21
150	B	you have one party, the Republican party completely dominated by big money including the private insurance companies and the drugs companies,	Informative	H				
151	B	the democrats... they are different, they are only HALF-dominated by the big money	Comment	Post-Head				
152	A	(laughs)	Endorse	H	Acknowledge	F		
153	J	well	Marker	Pre-Head	Inform	R		
154	J	they're dominated by other moneyed [interests]	Informative	H				
155	B	[yes]	Engage	N/A	N/A	N/A		
156	J	maybe, it may be lawyers or it may be something else but I think it's unfair to say the Republicans are driven by, by moneyed interests and Democrats are not..	Comment	Post-Head				
157	J	I think there is... that pollution	Informative	H	Inform	I	Inform	22
158	B	absolutely [yes]	React	H	Acknowledge	R		
159	J	[it's err very difficult], it's spread out through the whole river	Informative Cont.			I		
160	B	it is	React	H	Acknowledge	R		

Line	Speaker	Act	Element Of Structure	Move	Element Of Structure	Exchange	Exchange Number
161	B	but I also think it's fair to say	Framer	Pre-Head	Frame	I	23
162		and I speak as the longest serving independent in American Congressional history=	Informative (Incomplete)	Pre-Head	Inform	Inform (Interrupted)	
163	J	Is that true?	Neutral Proposal	H	Elicit	I	24
164	B	Yup	React	H	Inform	R	
165	J	Is that right?	Neutral Proposal	H	Elicit	I	(Clarify)
166	B	Yeah ..	React	H	Inform	R	(Re-Clarify)
167	B	read the back page (points to book)	Direct	H	Directing	R/I	
168	J	(picks up book, opens and nods – exaggerated gesture for audience)	Behave	H	Behaving	R	
169	A	(cheers)	Endorse	H	Acknowledge	F	
170	B	and I think that it is fair to say...	Framer	H	Frame	Re-Initiate	24b
171	B	and you're right, I'm not going to argue with you	Meta-Statement	Pre-Head	Inform	I	
172	B	that many democrats are heavily dominated by the same interests that the Republicans are err but there are many who are not, and I think that by and large if you look at the legislation that the Republicans are pushing, most of it comes from very wealthy and powerful corporate interests.	Informative	H	Inform	I	
173	J	but when you look at, you know, President Obama when he pushed this healthcare reform.. there is a huge give back to pharmaceuticals,	Informative	H	Inform	R / I	
174	B	[absolutely right]	Engage	N/A	N/A		
175	J	because they didn't allow Americans to bargain collectively if you will with pharmaceutical companies that is a direct give to moneyed interests by a Democratically controlled Congress and a Democratic President	Informative Cont.				
176	B	you are absolutely right	Concur	H	Inform	R	
177	A	(claps)	Endorse	H	Acknowledge	F	
178	J	and [there's]	Incomplete	N/A	N/A	N/A	
179	B	[and that's] ...absolutely right	Concur Cont.				
180	J	[well]	Incomplete	N/A	N/A	N/A	
181	B	and that happens time after time ...	Comment	Post-Head			

Line	Speaker	Act	Element Of Structure	Move	Element Of Structure	Exchange	Exchange Number
182	B	all I'm saying is	Starter	Inform	F / R?	(Re-Initiate?) ^{xiii}	
183	B	you've got one party right now which really quite is right-wing extremist that's the Republicans, and another party which I think occasionally tries to stand up for working people but is also heavily dominated by moneyed interests.	Informative	Inform	F / R?		24b
184	J	and... and .. in your mind after being the longest serving independent,	Starter	Elicit	I	Elicit	25
185	J	do you see that ::: can that momentum be changed especially given decisions like citizens united and these other things that further entrench .. corporate interests at the expense of other interests	Inquire		H		
186	B	The citizens united decision is a total disaster.	Informative		H		
187	B	It will mean that billionaires and corporations will be able to pour huge amounts of money into radio and television as with complete dis – with no disclosure at all,	<i>Exemplify</i>	Inform	H	R	(Mini-Lecture) 25b
188	B	with complete secrecy.	<i>Paraphrase</i>		Post-Head		
189	B	It is giving these people just huge amounts of, of power over the political process.	<i>Informative</i>		H		
190	B	The idea that anyone in their right minds would say that a corporation entitled to first amendment rights is literally beyond comprehension.	<i>Informative / Conclude</i>		H		
191	A	(cheers)	Endorse	Acknowledge	H	F	
192	J	(inaudible)... really good.::::	Terminate	Acknowledge	H	F	
193	J	Well, err.. listen	Framer	Framing	Pre-Head	I	Structuring 26
194	J	I, I wish you well, in, in your endeavours	Conclusion	Opening	H	I	

Line	Speaker	Act	Element Of Structure	Move	Element Of Structure	Exchange	Exchange Number	
195	J	you know at certain times as I watch debates on (inaudible) and you , you see how the sausage=	Informative	H	Inform	I	Inform	27
196	A	(laughs)	Endorse	H	Acknowledge	F		
197	J	is made, you, you wonder: err how: err so many:: rat turds got in the sausage, it really makes you, really makes you sometimes wonder if we have the political : competence at times : [to inaudible..]..	Informative Cont.					
198	B	[Again I think you] need to, I think that we're beginning to see that in Wisconsin. I think we need working people and the middle class to stand up and say "enough is enough, we are a country that belongs to all of us and not just a handful of very wealthy and [powerful forces"]	Informative	H	Inform	R		
199	J	[but what's interesting] about that	Starter	Pre-Head	Inform	I	Inform	28
200	J	is when the reverse of that happened, from that you know, they would say that is what the Tea Party movement is to [them,]=	Informative	H				
201	B	mm hum	Engage					
202	J	is what they consider their [working]=	Informative Cont.					
203	B	[mmm]	Engage					
204	J	class base=	Informative Cont.					
205	B	right	Engage					
206	J	rising up=	Informative Cont.					
207	B	mmm	Engage					
208	J	and saying "we're spending too much" and obviously, they now simply you know incredulous looks on their faces and.. and it's like "no that's not that's astroturfing terrible", but : they would say "no, that is our version of what [you're saying]	Informative Cont.					
209	B	[Nah uh...ah...I]	Receive	Pre-Head	Inform	R		
210	B	I agree with you, I think you're right on that	Confirm	H				

Line	Speaker	Act	Element Of Structure	Move	Element Of Structure	Exchange	Exchange Number
211	B	, but I think that when you look at polling if you asked working-class people in the Tea Party “should you convert Medicare into a voucher program, should you cut back on education, should you cut back childcare?”	<i>Comment</i>	Post-Head		(Mini-Lecture)	28b
212	B	You know what they will say?	<i>Prompt (Rhetorical)</i>				
213		“No. We don’t agree with that”.	<i>Informative</i>				
214	B	And I think one of the things that we have to do is I tell a lot of these working class Tea Party People that their interests are not the same as, you know, the Koch brothers and other billionaire families	<i>Informative</i>				
215	J	Interesting,	Endorse	H	Acknowledge	F	
216	J	alright, so	Framer	H	Framing	I	Boundary Exchange 29
217	J	and do you think that at some point one of the solutions could be one of a half wars instead of three?	Inquire	H	Elicit	I	Elicit 30
218	A	(cheers)	Endorse	H	Acknowledge	R	
219	B	(laughs)	Receive	Pre-Head	Inform	R	
220	B	Let’s bring the troops home as soon as possible	Informative	H			
221	J	(inaudible – agreement)	React	H	Acknowledge	F	
222	J	so	Framer	H	Framing	I	Boundary Exchange 31
223	J	thanks very much for spending some extra time with us	Greet	H	Opening	I	Structuring 32
224	J	(handshake)	Greet	?			
225	B	(handshake)		?		R	
226	J	I really appreciate it.	Greet	Post-Head		F	
227	J	Senator Bernie Sanders “The Speech” (holds up book). Longest standing independent in history.	Direct (Applause Expected)	H	Directing	I	Structuring 33
228	A	(cheers and claps)	Behave	H	Behaving	R	
229	J	Thank you so much (shakes hand again)	Greet	H	Opening	I	Structuring 34

-
- ⁱ This is an example of an act with two potential functions, both of which are responded to.
- ⁱⁱ Bernie only enters the stage once the audience starts to applaud, thus indicating that it is the applause which acts as summons and not Jon's previous utterance.
- ⁱⁱⁱ These have been classified as sub-categories of a same structuring exchange, as they perform the same function – that of setting up the interview. Of course they could be treated as entirely separate exchanges, but it is doubtful that this would reveal any additional information about the dialogue.
- ^{iv} Here and below, it is difficult to determine which act is the head, and which should be “pushed-down” as pre- or post-head as Bernie reacts to both the greeting (by smiling) and the direction (by sitting down) (Tsui A. 1993).
- ^v On multiple occasions J does not directly pose a question, but proffers a statement, using a declarative form, that expects a result. Given that this is an *interview*, B uses his pragmatic knowledge to interpret these as questions.
- ^{vi} It is unclear what function this utterance performs as neither B nor the audience respond to it.
- ^{vii} See main text section 3.3.1. Because the audience contribution impacts on the dialogue, by causing a pause, it can be considered as a follow-up move. However the Francis and Hunston model only allows for follow-ups to occur after a response.
- ^{viii} Knowledge of adjacency pairs reveals how this humorous effect is created. This line constitutes a second part to an adjacency pair, without a first part to predict it. The mismatch, combined with the semantic opposition (a positive response to a negative situation) creates an effect of surprise and humour.
- ^{ix} It is uncertain here whether there should be a boundary here between two exchanges or whether 14 should be considered as a re-initiation of the response that B attempted to provide in Line 90. Separating the exchanges here has the unfortunate consequence of disguising how B structures the dialogue around the adjacency pair question-answer, albeit a delayed answer.
- ^x See previous note.
- ^{xi} This is yet another attempt to provide an answer to lines 86, 88.
- ^{xii} As Sacks suggests semantically empty utterances such as this might be an attempt to pass a turn, thus encouraging B to speak further, but this is not acted upon. In any case, Francis and Hunston's model does not cover discourse acts of this sort.
- ^{xiii} As this exchange (24b) only contains one informing move and no response, it is hard to classify as a separate exchange. Francis and Hunston would probably treat this as a comment which further develops the Inform move in exchange 23, however the boundaries the model introduces between exchanges renders to links between these exchanges (with 24 and 24b reprisals of the inform function in 23) less visible.

4. Results : Problems Encountered and Insights Revealed by this Analysis

4.1. Issues concerning Acts

4.1.1. Longer Contributions to Dialogue

Although F+H's analysis seeks to define a limited but comprehensive number (32 in total) of acts, at times their framework is difficult to employ. Coulthard (1992) describes acts as being defined by their interactive function, i.e. by the response they provoke from other interlocutors. A major challenge in this analysis is determining what should be considered as "head act" and post-head or pre-head. Coulthard (1992) notes that at times an interlocutor can produce an utterance that seems to drift in its function. For example a teacher might begin an utterance with a question, comment on that question and then pose a second question. According to Sinclair, two of these acts are then "pushed down" to pre- and post-head status, and only one is the head. As Amy Tsui (1993) observes, just which act we should consider as a head, and which are pushed down depends on how the next speaker responds. In our example above, a student will most likely respond to just one of these, and most commonly the last question. Thus only the last question should be considered as a head act. This occurs in our text in line 102-111, where J's utterance is a long, two-part observation / question that drifts. It is only by looking at how B answers that it is possible to determine which part of the previous turn should be considered as head. However, I have some concerns regarding this approach, as so far the model has based itself on analysing only the *function* of parts of utterances, and yet here the function seems to be slipping into the domain of meaning, i.e. what kind of answer B provides.

A similar issue occurs when trying to determine the function of the acts in lines 34, 37 and 40. Here they are classified as a head and post head of an inquire move. However, B responds to both acts in lines 42 and 44-50, meaning that no act seems to have been "pushed down". Levinson (1983) notes that a weakness of this analysis model is its insistence on pinning down the exact function of acts that are often ambiguous and open to various interpretations.

As Coulthard admits, longer contributions where the function of the utterance seems to "drift" can be difficult to categorize and cites Pearce (1973 cited in Coulthard 1992. 134) who suggests that longer contributions might not be suitable for this type of discourse analysis because they are not interactive in the same way.

1.1.1. Acts with Multiple or Ambiguous Functions

Linked to the issues stated above, on occasion this text sees the interviewer use an utterance to address his guest, but also his audience, especially with the goal of entertaining them. Thus his "how can you?" (line 31) expressed in an exaggeratedly high tone, is at once a response to B, but also a prompt to the audience, who then laugh or cheer. This also occurs in Lines 51, 95, and 138. These "dual purpose" acts do not feature in Francis and Hunston's model, are highlighted as a potential issue by Levinson (1983. 290), and can only be captured using additional notes in the results table.

1.1.2. Mini-Lectures

The dialogue analysed here regularly features longer contributions, slipping between monologue and dialogue. J permits B to use the conversation as a platform to proclaim his political message, and as an expert public speaker, B has no difficulty in spontaneously producing what I term here as *mini-lectures*.

In order to work around the model's problems with analysing longer contributions, I have here extended the model by using a classification proposed for analysing lectures from this course (Brazil, Rogerson-Revell, Cauldwell and Speake). These sub-categories appear in italics in the table. What this reveals is the ease with which B produces an instant speech which uses structuring devices such as meta-statements, paraphrases and exemplifications and explains why his responses come across as authoritative, and convincing.

1.2. Elements of Structure of Exchanges: the I / R / F Pattern

As a whole, the interactions in this interview fitted into Francis and Hunston's predicted I – R (– Fⁿ), I – R / I – R (– Fⁿ) patterns with 29 out of 34 exchanges displaying this structure. This demonstrates that the interview structure is guided by the same principles as general conversation and teaching exchanges. However, there are a few occasions where the model does not quite fit.

1.2.1. The Need for a Re-initiation move

Exchanges 4 and 22 involve a I – R sequence followed by a further initiation, which according to the model, should not be acceptable as exchanges. As exchange 4 shows below, however, such a structure is perfectly acceptable in conversation and likely to occur relatively frequently.

Exchange 4

err and they don't do those any more [really]	I
[no] no	R
they, they always say it. They profess they will but they don't	I
right	R

An alternative would be to classify this section as two I – R exchanges, and yet intuition leads us to consider these pairs as strongly tied to each other, with the second I as a reformulation of the first. Dividing the exchange would seem to introduce an artificial division for the sake of the model alone. Stubbs (1981. 113) proposes a solution in the form of a new term *I_r*, or *re-initiation* and provides the following as an example of the naturalness of such structures in every-day interactions.

A: can you tell me where the Savoy cinema is	I
B: ooh yeah it's only round the corner here	R
A: is it	?
B: it's not too far like	R
A: cheers thanks very much ta	F

The notion of an Ir in exchanges 4 and 22 would certainly help the analysis, and reveals perhaps a structural element of discourse overlooked by the Francis Hunston model.

1.2.2. Side-sequences

Exchanges 23 and 24 could be interpreted as an exchange within an exchange, which Schegloff (2007) terms a “side sequence” and Coulthard (1981, 1992) describes as “embedding”. Line 163 highlights the information from the previous utterance for the audience, rendering it newsworthy. Francis and Hunston treat such side sequences as separate exchanges, but this would leave us with an interrupted exchange (22), which as the table shows, actually did reach completion. B’s utterances in lines 170-172, are a simply a continuation of the utterance he begins at line 161, and although the resulting exchange (22, 23 and 24) would be very much longer than anything seem in Francis and Hunston, separating it disguises the logic that shapes the interaction. Indeed Coulthard (1992) admits that embedding can be problematic in his model.

What the analysis does reveal however, is that the presence of a third party listening to the conversation can lead to clarifying side sequences that would not normally occur. It would of course be of interest to investigate whether this is a general feature of dialogues carried out in front of audiences.

Exchanges 9 and 10 also feature a very similar and problematic side-sequence. It is possible that here the notion of adjacency pairs (Schegloff 2007) might provide us with a better understanding of the forces shaping discourse. Such an approach would identify line 54 as an indirect elicitation, lines 57-64 as a response, and lines 66-70 as a correction of the initial statement with the implied message of *“you have not provided the expected second pair part because you misunderstood / I failed to correctly explain the first statement”*. In this analysis the link has been maintained by adopting Stubb’s (1981) concept of a *re-initiation* move. Whether the sequence should be treated as one or two exchanges is unclear however.

1.3. The Role of the Audience

Our text differs from many featured in the literature through the presence of an audience. The audience has no speaking rights, but the analysis reveals that it can impact on the dialogue.

1.3.1. Positioning of Follow-up Moves

Firstly, it is worth noting that both Sinclair and Coulthard and Francis and Hunston consider follow-up moves to take place after I – R, however here in this text the audience often acknowledges an utterance before a response has taken place. This is perhaps a result of their only being able to produce non-verbal responses, which might follow different rules as to when they can occur.

1.3.2. An aid to opening and Closing

Opening and closing the interview is facilitated through the audience’s applause, providing clear start and stop boundaries and permitting the conversation to be promptly terminated without impoliteness. Thus although we witness multiple greetings at the start of the conversation, possibly to allow the guest to get comfortable, unlike many conversations, some of which were

found to involve many pre- and closing sequences (Schegloff and Sacks 1973 in Coulthard 1992: 91), the interaction is ended without prevarication.

1.3.3. Audience Laughter

Francis and Hunston do not deal with laughter in their analysis. However, laughter, cheering and clapping play a significant role in this interview. As Sacks (1992: 570) noted, laughter does not obey the rules of “do not interrupt” and “only one party should speak at a time”. This means that the audience has permission to participate in the conversation through laughter and similar non-verbal acts, and to do so at any time. I have classified instances of audience applause or cheering sometimes as a “react” or “endorse” act in an acknowledging move, and sometimes as “engage”. I classify audience participation as an acknowledging move when it creates a pause in conversation or results in participants abandoning their turns because they cannot be heard. Unlike an engage, this act has an impact on the discourse that follows. Thus by including the audience reactions, this model can successfully highlight how even a party with severely restricted speaking rights can still participate in, and even to some extent shape a discourse.

A further point Sacks (1992) makes is that sometimes a laugh is expected, and moments in conversations can be found where one interlocutor *invites* the other to laugh. The ideal situation is to laugh together, and a failure of one party to laugh could be interpreted as impolite or hostile. This is also present in our interview where we see J making jokes (L31-38, L89) and B making what would be considered an inspiring mini-speech (L119) and the audience reacting positively, thus expressing an appreciation of the hosts’ efforts and conforming to the role of a “good crowd”. In this way, including audience reactions in the analysis allows us to glimpse at the dynamics between the speakers and the crowd.

1.4. The Use of Frames

1.4.1. Ending the Interview

Although the interview ends in a relatively abrupt manner, the analysis reveals a change in dialogue structure as the end draws near. Throughout most of the interview J uses only one boundary exchange (line 13). However, as the interview draws to a close, probably pre-determined by a set recording time length, J uses several boundary exchanges (lines 193-194, 216, and 222). These seem to indicate that he is taking control of the dialogue, and warning that it needs to be wrapped up soon. Thus lines 193-4, because they are followed by a further longer exchange, might set a precedent, i.e. establish J’s the right to control the interaction, line 216 uses this power to terminate a topic, and finally line 222 terminates the interaction. B appears to notice this and cooperates by providing an uncharacteristically short response to J’s last elicitation (Lines 217, 220). It would be of great interest to investigate whether this pattern is a regular feature of formal interviews. The necessity of controlling the dialogue in order to keep to time constraints may well lead to a similar use of accumulating boundary exchanges by interviewers to end television and radio interviews.

1.4.2. Announcing an extended response

Although one would assume that it is naturally the interviewer who controls the dialogue, the analysis reveals that B makes use of framing and opening moves to announce an extended answer, which might take the form of a mini-lecture. (On these latter occasions I have labelled the exchange as “structuring” in brackets because I still consider the mini-lecture to form part of the I – R exchange.) Thus, the use of framing moves effectively grants B an extended occupation of “the floor” by ensuring J’s silence. This might possibly function in a similar way to utterances such as “guess what happened to me today?” serve to request extended occupation of “the floor” in order to tell a narrative (Sacks 1992. 680) It would certainly be interesting to investigate whether interviewees regularly use framing moves to obtain the rights to give extended responses to questions, or whether this sort of technique is reserved for types of discussion where the topic is weightier and interviewees thus feel more is at stake if they do not manage to produce an extended answer, which might be a feature of scientific or political discussions.

1.5. A battle for the floor

Because the text analysed belongs to the genre “interview”, one would expect the host to control the direction of the conversation, but restrict himself to posing questions. The analysis of this interview reveals however, that J does not possess full control of the discussion, but that he contributes much more than just questions. Indeed, despite the fact that the two interlocutors sing from the same sheet when it comes to political views, and are basically conveying the same message, the analysis reveals a surprising struggle to occupy the floor.

Exchanges 12-14 are moments when the I-R-F structure breaks down. Exchange 12 and 14 are interrupted and Lines 90 and 101 reveal an attempt to produce a response and to start a new exchange that are cut off. This structural irregularity reveals how there is some uncertainty about who should occupy the role of the initiator (and control the dialogue) and who should reply. Here B is trying to take more control of the conversation, but faces resistance from J.

Admittedly, B obtains permission for his mini-lecture in exchange 12, but the final act, “so social security is one issue”, which is here classed as a meta-statement because it sums up the previous utterances and creates the expectation of a second issue to be explained, is a pre-head without a head to follow it. This is because J seizes the opportunity to take his turn, treating the act as topic transition point, and thus abruptly terminates the mini-lecture.

As regards lines 90, 93 and 101, there is uncertainty about what type of act B’s use of the conjunction “but” represents. As Schiffrin (2001) notes, such conjunctions can perform functions on several planes, and here it seems to indicate both a desire to occupy the floor, a means to announce disagreement, and an attempt to structure the discourse along the lines of argument - counter-argument. Thus these lines might also fit into the act categories “protest” or simply “informative” (as a pre-head). Once again this is an instance where the model appears to be unable to describe acts which perform more than one function.

The analysis of lines 95-101 with the act sequence *endorse, conclusion, acquiesce* highlights a further turn-taking struggle, where B agrees with but then terminates J’s topic. This represents

an attempt to reject the direction of the conversation and take control. Once again it fails however, and it is only in line 112, by clearly announcing his desire to provide a prolonged answer with the *meta-statement* “here’s the answer”, that B finally manages to launch into his mini-lecture response to the initial question.

Once this sequence is over, the struggle seems to subside. These sections are easier to code, and an I-R(-F) exchange structure re-emerges. Thus it would seem that whilst the model deals well with discourse where the participants occupy stable roles, moments of even polite conflict are problematic. The model can however be used to identify just where and how tussles for the floor occur.

1.6. Disrespecting norms of politeness

Sacks and Pomerantz (cited in Hutchby and Woofit 1998) noted that norms of politeness impact how speakers shape their responses. Preference structures, for example, mean that dis-preferred answers to questions, requests etc. are usually longer, and feature some form of introduction or explanation. In lines 122 and 144 B directly rejects the discourse direction without any preamble. This is contrary to expectations, but may well result from the status of the interviewee (a politician must appear decisive) as well as the specific environment of the interview genre. It would be interesting to note whether direct refusals occur commonly either in interviews, or from the mouths of certain types of speakers, i.e. politicians.

2. Conclusion

On the whole, Francis and Hunston’s structural analysis model is applicable to the interview dialogue studied here, but requires some adaptation and additions. This analysis confirmed that as both Coulthard (1992) and Levinson (1983) note, acts with multiple functions are difficult to classify, and that such a model has difficulties in dealing with embedding, or side sequences without losing sight of the higher-level mechanisms structuring the interaction. However, the analysis does reveal that this dialogue, of the genre *interview*, is also broadly structured around the I-R(-F) pattern, and even the breaking-down of this sequencing offers up information, indicating a struggle over who should occupy the floor and who should occupy the role of Initiator or Responder. It would certainly be of great interest to investigate whether other interview texts also are structured around the I-R-F patterns, and whether breakdowns in this are commonly due to power struggles between interlocutors. One might ask whether interviews between interlocutors with different views display more of these break-downs. Finally, the concentration of boundary exchanges found towards the end of this dialogue may be an indicator of just how a host can signal the approaching end of a dialogue, and attempt to ensure the interviewee’s cooperation. Further analyses on interviews would reveal whether this behaviour is typical of the genre generally, or one of many methods for bringing an interview to a close.

3. Bibliography

Brazil D., Rogerson-Revell P., Cauldwell R., Speake L. *Spoken Discourse Module Unit 4: Analysing Monologue and Prepared Talk*, accessed 2016 (internet resource).

Coulthard M. (1977) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* Harlow, Pearson.

Coulthard M. and Brazil D. (1979) *Exchange Structure* Birmingham, University of Birmingham English Language Research.

Coulthard M. and Montgomery M. (1981) "Originating a Description" in Coulthard, M., ed. *Studies in Discourse Analysis*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1-13

Francis, G. and Hunston, F. (1992) 'Analysing Everyday Conversation' In Coulthard, M., ed. *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge. 123-161.

Hutchby I. and Wooffitt R. (1998). *Conversation Analysis*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Levinson S. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Sacks H. (1992) *Lectures on Conversation, Volumes I & II*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Schegloff E. (2007) *Sequence Organisation in Interaction*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin D. "Discourse Markers: Language, Meaning and Context" in D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, H. Hamilton eds. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (2001) 54-71.

Sinclair J. and Coulthard M. (1992) "Towards an analysis of discourse" in Coulthard, M., ed. *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge. 1-34

Stewart J. (2014) Interview with Bernie Sanders. <http://www.cc.com/video-clips/wjezpa/the-daily-show-with-jon-stewart-exclusive---bernie-sanders-extended-interview-pt--1> and <http://www.cc.com/video-clips/fylgz1/the-daily-show-with-jon-stewart-exclusive---bernie-sanders-extended-interview-pt--2>. From *The Daily Show*, Comedy Central.

Stubbs M. (1983) *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Stubbs M. (1992) "Motivating Analyses of Exchange Structure" in Coulthard, M., ed. *Studies in Discourse Analysis*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. 107-120.

Tsui A. (1993) "Interpreting Multi-Act Moves in Spoken Discourse" in Baker M., Francis G.,

Tognini-Bonelli E. eds. *Text and technology: in honour of John Sinclair* Philadelphia, J. Benjamins Pub. Co

Appendix: Interview Transcript

- () - indicates non-verbal contribution
- [] - indicates overlapping speech
- = - indicates when one interlocutor's contribution interrupts, but does not stop the other's turn.
- ... - indicates a longer pause
- J - Jon Stewart (interviewer)
- B - Bernie Sanders (interviewee)
- A - Audience

First Transcribed Section

J: Please welcome to the program, Senator Bernie Sanders. Sir! (gets up shakes hand) How are you sir? Nice to see you. (gestures to seat)

B: (shakes hand, sits where indicated)

J: Thank you for joining us.

B: My pleasure

J: Ah, the book is called "the Speech". It's actually just a relatively faithful transcription of the err eight and half hour, what do you call it, mini-filibuster that you delivered there?

B: (nods) [Mmm] It's a filibuster. Fully fledged filibuster.

J: a fully fledged

B: eight and a half hours is real time, yeah.

J: That's real time: err and they don't do those any more really

B: [no] no

J: They, they always say it. They profess they will but they don't

B: right

J: Err.. and you were : basically using to protest the budget deal the Democrats and the Republicans reached on: err the tax cut, err not the tax cut, the budget cut

B: Well err what that was about was the agreement between the president democratic leadership and the Republicans which continued Bush's tax breaks for the very, very wealthy. Which: at a time of the huge deficit didn't make a whole lot of sense to me

J: Bernie, how can you how can you?=
A: (cheers)

J: [Now that's not encouraging] (wags finger at audience) How can you punish the most productive amongst us with=

A: (laughs)

B: (laughs)

J: with what I think we all know are job cutting and killing tax cuts. They are job producers sir. I=

A: (laughs)

J: I'm really quite shocked that you would go on record in this manner

B: Well: sorry to shock you Jon. Ah. But the reality is today we have a middle class that in many respects is collapsing, median family income is declining, in the last ten years we've lost 50 000 factories in this country,, many of them shutting down and going to China, millions of good paying manufacturing jobs, and in the midst of all this the wealthiest people in this country are doing phenomenally well, we have the top 1% earning more

income than the bottom 50%, the top 400 individuals in this country own more wealth than the bottom 150 million Americans.

J: You're welcome.

B: (laughs)

A: (laughs)

Second Transcribed Section

J: I think ... you'd be hard pressed in those statements to find a majority of Americans that would disagree with that and I think the Republicans would frame their argument as "these are issues of ... err ... freedom and government inefficiency", and they can frame it in a certain way that a majority of Americans would agree with that. But I think we can also..

B: [Honestly] Jon I don't think that's correct ... I think that at the end of the day the vast majority of the people support Medicare, support social=

J: [no ... I, I think that's correct]

B: =security. You go and ask anybody about the wisdom of giving tax breaks a trillion dollars in tax breaks=

J: [right]

B: which is what the Ryan plan is to the wealthiest people in this country while you cut back on education and=

J: [right]

B: environmental protection: very few people agree with that

J: no : I : err absolutely I meant it more in the framing of : err allowing people to keep more of what they earn you know when they frame it the way of=

B: [Right]

J: of "it's your money"=

B: [Yep]

J: and your like it's kind of all our money=

B: [right]

J: Errm but the idea I guess I'm getting to is : we will run into an entitlement crisis at some point

B: Uhum...

J: As the population ages, as medical costs skyrocket. How do you address that and it is a real issue?

B: [Good.] OK. Let's separate when you talk about entitlements. First of all despite what you see on television every night social security is not broke, it is not going bankrupt, social security has a 2.6 trillion dollar surplus. They can pay out every benefit owed to every eligible American for the next 26 years at which point it pays out 78% of benefits

J: right

B: so social security is one issue

J: well that ... that.. money is not ... the government has used the money that is there for other things=

B: [Yes]

J: there's an "I Owe You" there that the government has written saying : "heh : ugh" (shrugs shoulders, looks apologetic)

A: (laughs)

B: BUT= (high tone)..

J: [that] ... that is the case

B: That is the case, but remember, from the inception of this country our government has never yet defaulted on a debt so it is..

J: [I] I think that's coming May 25th

A: (laughs)

B: (laughs) That's an interesting issue, that's another issue

J: right

B: but in fact..

J: [even] 78% you know how do you say to somebody who's 40 years old right now "social security is in great shape, until you need it"?=

B: [OK]

J: and then you'll get 78%, you know, and then when you say we've never defaulted, how many people thought :: Jewish guy from Brooklyn's going to end up being the socialist senator from Vermont. You know, there's a lot of things happen that

B: [yeah]

J: people wouldn't expect.

B: But : here's the answer. I mean how do we... Your real question is "how do we make social security vibrant and solvent for the next 75 years=

J: [right]

B: which is what the actuaries want, you know what we should do? You do exactly what Obama said during the campaign. Right now a millionaire pays the same amount of money into the social security trust fund as someone who makes 106 000 dollars ... lift that cap, start at 250 000 dollars [your problem is solved]

A: [(cheers)]

J: would you? This is [something that has always been an issue to me]

B: [No, by the way, I'd like to say that in fairness,] Medicare is a different issue

J: right

B: it is as much..

J: [as medical costs skyrocket that is when...(inaudible)]

B: Right. Then we have to ask.. Jon.. why is it that in America today we are the only nation in the world that doesn't have a national healthcare program guaranteeing healthcare to all people and yet with 50 million uninsured we are spending almost twice as much per capita on healthcare as any other nation. That's the issue that we have to tackle and the answer is ... not uncoincidentally, we are the only country in the industrialised world that allows for-profit insurance companies to play a dominant role, and the function of insurance companies is not to provide healthcare, it is to make money... and I believe, and we are trying to do this in Vermont, if we move toward a Medicare for all single payer program we can save huge sums of money on administration, on profiteering on bureaucracy and CAN control healthcare costs

J: so , so ..

A: (cheers)

J: Lets talk about why that (inaudible) happen

B: (nods)

J: And again this gets back to you know uh uh some issues that I was talking about... a very ideological and divided Congress that has difficulty settling on uh er any kind of program that made even the simplest of fixes is dragged out over a long period of time, is lost in the [(inaudible) bureaucracy]

B: [No, no] (raises finger) no I don't agree with you

J: Alright

B: OK. I think that the issue is you have one party, the Republican party completely dominated by big money including the private insurance companies and the drugs companies, the democrats... they are different, they are only half-dominated by the big money

A: (laughs)

J: Well they're dominated by other moneyed [interests]

B: [yes]

J: Maybe it may be lawyers or it may be something else but I think it's unfair to say the Republicans are driven by, by moneyed interests and Democrats are not.. I think there is... that pollution

B: Absolutely, yes

J: [it's err very difficult], it's spread out through the whole river

B: It is, but I also think it's fair to say and I speak as the longest serving independent in American Congressional history

J: Is that true?

B: Yup

J: Is that right?

B: Yeah .. read the back page (points to book)

J: (picks up book, opens and nods – exaggerated gesture for audience)

A: (cheers)

B: And I think that it is fair to say... and you're right, I'm not going to argue with you I'm not going to argue with you that many democrats are heavily dominated by the same interests that the Republicans are err but there are many who are not, and I think that by and large if you look at the legislation that the Republicans are pushing, most of it comes from very wealthy and powerful corporate interests.

J: But when you look at, you know, President Obama when he pushed this healthcare reform... there is a huge give back to pharmaceuticals,

B: [absolutely right]

J: because they didn't allow Americans to bargain collectively if you will with pharmaceutical companies that is a direct give to moneyed interests by a Democratically controlled Congress and a Democratic President

B: you are absolutely right

A: (claps)

J: and there's

B: [and that's] ...absolutely right

J: [well]

B: And that happens time after time ... All I'm saying is you've got one party right now which really quite is right-wing extremist that's the Republicans, and another party which I think occasionally tries to stand up for working people but is also heavily dominated by moneyed interests.

J: And... and ... in your mind after being the longest serving independent, do you see that :: can that momentum be changed especially given decisions like citizens united and these other things that further entrench .. corporate interests at the expense of other interests

B: The citizens united decision is a total disaster. It will mean that billionaires and corporations will be able to pour huge amounts of money into radio and television as with complete dis – with no disclosure at all, with complete secrecy. It is giving these people just huge amounts of, of power over the political process. The idea that anyone in their right minds would say that a corporation entitled to first amendment rights is literally beyond comprehension.

A: (loud cheer)

J: (inaudible)... really good... Well, err.. listen I, I wish you well, in, in your endeavours you know at certain times as I watch debates on (inaudible) and you , you see how the sausage=

A: (laugh)

J: is made, you, you wonder: err how: err so many:: rat turds got in the sausage, it really makes you, really makes you sometimes wonder if we have the political : competence at times : [to inaudible..].

B: [Again I think you] need to, I think that we're beginning to see that is Wisconsin. I think we need working people and the middle class to stand up and say "enough is enough, we are a country that belongs to all of us and not just a handful of very wealthy and powerful forces"

J: [but what's interesting] about that is when the reverse of that happened, from that you know, they would say that is what the Tea Party movement is to them=

B: [mm hum]

J: is what they consider their working=

B: [mmm]

J: class base

B: right

J: rising up

B: mmm

J:...and saying "we're spending too much" and obviously, they now simply you know incredulous looks on their faces and... and it's like "no that's not that's astroturfing terrible", but : they would say "no, that is our version of what you're saying

B: [Nah uh...ah...I] I agree with you, I think you're right on that, but I think that when you look at polling if you asked working-class people in the Tea Party "should you convert Medicare into a voucher program, should you cut back on education, should cut back childcare?" You know what they will say? "No. We don't agree with that". And I think one of the things that we have to do is I tell a lot of these working class Tea Party People that their interests are not the same as, you know, the Koch brothers and other billionaire families.

J: Interesting. Alright. So and do you think that at some point one of the solutions could be one of a half wars instead of three?

A: (cheers / laughs)

B: (laughs) Let's bring the troops home as soon as possible

A: (cheers)

J: (inaudible – agreement) so thanks very much for spending some extra time with us (handshake) I really appreciate it. (to audience) Senator Bernie Sanders "The Speech" (holds up book). Longest standing independent in history. Thankyou so much (shakes hand with B)

B: (shakes hand)

A: (cheers)