Abstract.

The aim of this M.A. thesis is to apply on the sample of five transcribed interviews with American politicians the typology of strategies devised by social psychologists P. Bull and K. Mayer (1993) for ‘non-replies’ of British politicians in the genre of a political interview and to determine whether this typology could be qualitatively correlated to specific linguistic means (the use of passive, pronominal shifts, hedges). The responses of politicians are examined within the CDA method also in relation to the macro-principles of evasion (dissimulation), coercion, legitimation and delegitimation, which are claimed to be valid in political discourse by P. Chilton (2004) in order to discover whether Bull and Mayer’s social typology could be related to these principles and to the strategies of face-management (Brown and Levinson 1987). It is expected that politicians will boost their positive image in the interview and coerce the public in the agenda shift (Clayman, Heritage 2002) through every response in the interview. A question which according to Bull and Elliott (1996) consists of face threat is also expected to be attacked; quantitative results are presented which verify this assumption. In addition, as thirty strategies were observed to have been employed by Mrs Thatcher and Neil Kinnock in general election debates of 1987 in Britain, we will also compare the frequency of British strategies with the American political discourse of 2004-2008, which is according to Clayman and Heritage (2002), less adversarial and where in consequence different strategies are likely to occur. The behaviour of politicians in interaction is likely to transform with time (Fairclough 1992) so that it gradually becomes more fine-grained. The discussion of individual strategies employed by Pres. Bush, Sen. Obama and Gov. Palin is also compared in relation to the specific context.

**Key words:** critical discourse analysis, coercion, discourse, evasion, FTA, political interview, politeness, reply, strategies