



Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi  
The Journal of International Social Research  
Cilt: 9 Sayı: 46 Volume: 9 Issue: 46  
Ekim 2016 October 2016  
www.sosyalarastirmalar.com Issn: 1307-9581

## EVASION STRATEGIES USED IN TURKISH POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Sinan ÇAKIR\*  
Emel KÖKPİNAR KAYA\*\*  
Abdurrahman KARA\*\*\*

### Abstract

There is a widespread perception that politicians are frequently evasive under questioning from members of the news media (Clayman, 2001: 403). The evasion strategies like *ignoring the question*, *questioning the question* or *employing humor* are one of the most frequently analyzed aspects of the social-psychological literature on political interviews (Gnisci and Bonaiuto, 2003: 387). However, there have not been any studies that focus on the evasion strategies used in Turkish political context. The purpose of the study is to investigate the evasion strategies that are used by Turkish politicians in TV interviews in order to contribute to the studies that aim to find out the universal evasion strategies used by the politician worldwide. The methodology of the research is based on a triadic amalgamation proposed in turn by the functional approach of Bull & Mayer (1993) which was further developed by Bull (2003), the semantic-structural approach by Galasinski (2000) and finally, Clayman (2001). The corpus of the research was obtained from <http://www.siyasetmeydani.net/arsiv.asp> between April 21 and May 22, 2011, which consists of 8 political interviews delivered by leading Turkish politicians as interviewed by Ali Kırca in his TV show 'Siyaset Meydanı' just before the general elections of June, 2011. The transcription of the oral interviews contains approximately 136.934 words and the total recording of the eight videos amounts up to 1182 minutes, which makes 19 hours and 42 minutes. In the findings of the study, it was observed that 10 out of 14 evasion categories suggested by Bull (2003), Galasinski (2000), and Clayman (2001) were also applicable for the Turkish political context. In addition to the categories proposed by them, three other categories of evasion has been determined in the analysis of the data, which can be viewed as a contribution to the studies that aim to find out universal evasion strategies used by politicians. Among the 68 evasion strategies determined in the study, the most frequently used ones were *changing the textual context of the question* (16 times) and *giving an incomplete answer* (13 times). The Prime Minister, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, used remarkably more evasion strategies compared to the other politicians (22 times). Considering the fact that his party is in power and responsible for the executions, it was a foreseeable finding of the study.

**Keywords:** Political Discourse, Evasion Strategies.

### Introduction

There is often talk by non-politicians about issues such as how untruthful politicians are; how they evade questions by providing answers unrelated to questions they are asked, how they refuse to answer questions etc. It is possible to find such claims in the intellectual environments as well. As Fraser (2009) also states, a look at the literature on political linguistics reveals that there has been considerable research on vagueness, evasion, equivocation, and deception in the speech of politicians (p. 201). For instance, Clayman (2001) argues that there is a widespread perception that politicians are frequently evasive under questioning from members of the news media (p. 403). Bull (2003; 2008) also states that politicians are frequently depicted as slippery and evasive, even downright deceitful. In a similar vein, Bavelas et al. (1990) put forward that politicians in political interviews habitually equivocate and their utterance by nature is always 'ambiguous', 'vague', 'wishy-washy', 'indirect', and 'obscure'. The equivocal attribute of utterance by politicians naturally raises a question of how politicians deal successfully with the conflict between being un-cooperative and being polite in the language game of political interviews (in Li, 2008: 32). Similarly, Weilin and Xiaoping (2008) claim that politicians or spokespersons are often depicted as evasive, even deceptive in the eye of the public. They are the sort of people who will not give a straight answer to a straight question (p. 6).

Evasion is a part of equivocation. Bavelas (2009) defines "equivocation" as the communication that is ambiguous, indirect, contradictory, or evasive (p. 537). As Bavelas et al. (1988) propose, the equivocal speech occurs when a speaker has a choice between two unattractive (negative) communicative alternatives, but must still say something (p. 138). In this discussion, Gnisci and Bonaiuto (2003) assert that equivocation is linked to the answers not only by means of non-replies and the phenomenon of evasion but also by means of elaboration and implication because even if they provide replies in different ways to the questions they allow more sides than minimal answers (p. 390).

\* Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sinan Çakır, Adıyaman Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dili ve Ed. Böl. scakir@adiyaman.edu.tr

\*\* Arş. Gör. Dr. Emel Kökpınar Kaya, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dilbilimi Böl. emelkocpinar@hacettepe.edu.tr

\*\*\* Arş. Gör. Dr. Abdurrahman Kara, Erciyes Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Böl. karaabdurrahman@yahoo.com

Ng and Bradac (1993) introduce the idea of intention in the description of evasion. They state first, that it is necessary to distinguish between irrelevances in general and irrelevances that are actual evasions. An interlocutor who does not realize that he or she is making an irrelevant remark (e.g., after failing to understand a question) cannot be held responsible for evasion. As they further indicate, not all intended irrelevances are intended as evasions. An irrelevant remark that is made to make an interlocutor laugh or to disrupt the conversation is not evasive, because there is nothing to evade (in Weilin and Xiaoping, 2008: 3).

There are various linguistic strategies for politicians or spokespersons to adopt to evade journalists' sharp questions. For instance, Bull and Mayer identified 11 different forms of evasion in their study that was carried out in 1993. The so-called typology was based on eight interviews with Margaret Thatcher and Neil Kinnock from 1987, and seven interviews with John Major from 1990 to 1991. They determined 11 types of evasion strategies: 1) to ignore the question; 2) to acknowledge the question without answering it; 3) to question the question; 4) to attack the question; 5) to attack the interviewer; 6) to decline to answer; 7) to make political point; 8) to give incomplete reply; 9) to repeat answer to previous questions; 10) to state or imply that the question has already been answered; 11) to apologize. In a further study that was carried out by Bull in 2003, "literalism" was added as the 12th evasion type to the list mentioned above.

In his semantic-structural approach, Galasinski (2000) grouped evasion strategies into two main categories: overt evasion and covert evasion. He further grouped these categories into subcategories. According to him, overt evasion strategies are 1) to state openly; 2) to imply and 3) to present oneself as the one who should not be asked the question. He determined the following subgroups for the covert evasion strategies: 1) changing the textual context of the question, 2) changing the focus of the question, and 3) changing both the focus and the textual context of the question. According to him, overt evasion strategies are easier to detect compared to the covert evasion strategies. He states that the speaker trying to evade the question covertly gives an answer that manipulates the semantic content of the question. The addressee, although pretending to answer the question, virtually answers a different one, and it is usually more difficult to detect that the speaker is using an evasion strategy (p. 61).

Clayman (2001) is another linguist who categorized the evasion strategies as overt and covert evasion strategies. According to him, the overt evasion strategies are: 1) deference to the interviewer, 2) token request for permission, and 3) overtly refusing to answer; and the covert evasion strategies are: 1) positive resistance (word repeats, anaphoric repeats), 2) talk that departs from the agenda of the question, and 3) repeating the question by modifying it (changing the problem while repeating).

Gambino (2011) is another linguist who carries out studies on evasion strategies. He states that "euphemisms" and "palliative phrases" are favorite forms of evasive language. According to him, "to select out" someone means to fire him from a job. People "misspeak" themselves. They never say foolish or deceptive things, or-heaven forbid!-lie (p. 24).

### **Statement of the Problem**

The phenomenon of evasion represents one of the most analyzed aspects in the social-psychological literature on political interviews (Gnisci and Bonaiuto, 2003: 387). However, there have not been any studies that focus on the evasion strategies used in the Turkish political context. In other words, there is not any research that aims to find out the evasion strategies that are used by Turkish politicians in TV interviews, press conferences or public speeches. In order to determine universal evasion strategies that are used by politicians, there should be more studies that focus on different political platforms in different countries. As Bull (2009) also states, the scope for cross-cultural comparisons of political interview analysis is simply enormous. Turkish political context is one of such platforms that need to be investigated to reach at universal claims on evasion strategies used by politicians.

### **Purpose of the Study**

Turkish politicians are frequently seen in TV interviews to express their policies to public. While they are presenting or defending their policies, they are expected to use some evasion strategies to prevent possible negative consequences of the questions that are asked to them. The purpose of the present study is to investigate the evasion strategies that are used by Turkish politicians in TV interviews. While investigating such strategies, the study relies on the categories that were developed by Bull and Mayer (1993) which was further developed by Bull (2003), Galasinski (2000) and Clayman (2001) to determine if similar strategies are used in Turkish political context or not. Another aim of this study is to find out if there are any other evasion strategies except for the ones mentioned by the scholars stated above. Hence, the study intends to contribute to the studies that aim to find out the universal evasion strategies used by the politician worldwide.

### **Research Questions**

1- As far as the models developed by Bull and Mayer (1993), Galasinski (2000) and Clayman (2001) are taken into account, which evasion strategies are used by the Turkish politicians in TV interviews?

2- What other evasion strategies are used by the Turkish politicians except for the ones mentioned by Bull and Mayer (1993), Galasinski (2000) and Clayman (2001)?

3- What are the frequencies of the evasion strategies used by the Turkish politicians?

4- Does the frequency of the evasive answers of the politicians change according to the position of their political parties in the Turkish Parliament?

### **Methodology**

The methodology of the research is based on a triadic amalgamation proposed in turn by the functional approach of Bull & Mayer (1993) which was further developed by Bull (2003), the semantic-structural approach by Galasinski (2000) and finally, Clayman (2001). Of the three, the functional approach was developed considering the functions of replies with 12 distinct forms of evasion, and this approach forms the basis of our final typology. 11 of the evasion strategies in this model were developed by Bull and Mayer (1993), and one other category, *literalism*, was added to it by Bull (2003). These categories constitute the first twelve items of the model used in the data analysis.

One item from Galasinski (2000) and another item from Clayman (2001) have been added to the model. The strategy of *changing the textual context of the question* is the one taken from Galasinski (2000) and *positive resistance, word repeats, anaphoric repeats* is the evasion strategy that has been adapted from Clayman (2001). For our purposes, during the analysis of the data, we have adapted three more categories: *refusing to answer by employing humor, answering by shifting the agent from "I" to "we", and circumlocution*, to come up with a typology which consists of 17 types of evasive replies. The resulting typology can be seen below:

#### ***The Model of Evasion Strategies Used in the Study***

1. **Ignores the question:** The politician simply ignores the question without making any attempt to answer it or even to acknowledge that the interviewer has asked a question
2. **Acknowledges the question without answering it:** The politician acknowledges that the interviewer has asked a question but then fails to give an answer
3. **Questions the question:**
  - a. Request for clarification. The politician asks for further information about the question
  - b. Reflects the question back to the interviewer
4. **Attacks the question:**
  - a. The question fails to tackle the important issue
  - b. The question is hypothetical or speculative
  - c. The question is based on a false premise
  - d. The question is factually inaccurate
  - e. The question includes a misquotation
  - f. The question includes a quotation taken out of context
  - g. The question is objectionable
  - h. The question is based on a false alternative
5. **Attacks the interviewer**
6. **Declines to answer:**
  - a. Refusal on grounds of inability
  - b. Unwillingness to answer
  - c. to present oneself as the one who should not be asked the question
7. **Makes political point:**
  - a. External attack-attacks opposition or other rival groups
  - b. Presents policy
  - c. Justifies policy
  - d. Gives reassurance
  - e. Appeals to nationalism
  - f. Offers political analysis
  - g. Self-justification
  - h. Talks up one's own side.
8. **Incomplete answer:**
  - a. Partial answer (answers part of a single-barrelled question)
  - b. Half answer (answers one half of a double-barrelled question)
  - c. Starts to answer but doesn't finish
  - d. Negative answer. The politician states what will not happen instead of what will happen
9. **Repeats answer to previous question**
10. **States or implies that the question has already been answered**
11. **Apologizes**

12. Literalism
13. Changing the textual context of the question
14. Positive resistance, word repeats, anaphoric repeats
15. Evasion by employing humor
16. Widening the scope or responsibility
17. Circumlocution

#### Data Collection

The corpus was obtained from <http://www.siyasetmeydani.net/arsiv.asp> between April 21 and May 22, 2011, which consists of 8 political interviews delivered by leading Turkish politicians as interviewed by Ali Kırca in his TV show 'Siyaset Meydanı' just before the general elections of June 12. The program is presented in two different formats. In the first one, the interviewees are questioned by the interviewers, Ali Kırca and Tuba Atav. The leaders of the four political parties are interviewed in this format. In the second format of the program 24 audiences from several professions are employed to ask as many detailed questions as possible and to make comments on the replies of the politicians. Ali Kırca and Tuba Atav serve as the moderators to direct the distribution of questions, and interrupt where necessary. The members of the four political parties are interviewed in this format.

The questions posed pertain to such diverse issues as the current political debates on the Kurdish conflict, terrorism, state policies on economic development, new projects, general elections and the political parties' promises for the Turkish electorate.

This study analyzes the video recordings of only 8 leading Turkish political leaders with varying degrees of length. The transcription of the oral interviews contains approximately 136.934 words and the total recording of the eight videos amounts up to 1182 minutes. Each interview lasts for approximately two hours. Two representative figures from each political movement (Justice and Development Party, Republican People's Party, Nationalist Movement Party and Peace and Democracy Party) were chosen to be analyzed. The aforementioned 8 Turkish political figures are Recep Tayyip Erdoğan (the leader of Justice and Development Party), Prof. Dr. Burhan Kuzu (a member of Justice and Development Party), Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu (the leader of Republican People's Party), Gürsel Tekin (a member of Republican People's Party), Devlet Bahçeli (the leader of Nationalist Movement Party), Prof. Dr. Ümit Özdağ (a member of Nationalist Movement Party), Selahattin Demirtaş (co-chairman of Peace and Democracy Party), and Sırrı Süreyya Önder ( a member of Peace and Democracy Party and an independent deputy candidate from Istanbul). The current study is based on the application of evasive strategies in non-replies and half-replies in the speech of these political figures. The researchers decided together the type of each non-reply strategy on consensus. In some cases, one response to a question was coded in terms of several forms of evasion.

#### Limitations

This study is a small scaled study. It investigates the evasion strategies used by only eight Turkish political figures. The data was collected from only one TV program, Siyaset Meydanı. The interviews which consist of the data of the study were taken from eight programs broadcasted between the dates of April 21 and May 22, 2011. Two representative figures from each political movement were chosen to be analyzed. The gender of the politicians was not taken into consideration, and all of them were male. A final limitation is that the video recordings may vary in length due to the nature of the discussion in each interview, the length of advertisements in-between, and the speech style of the political leaders.

#### Data Analysis & Findings

19 hours and 42 minutes of data were analyzed and 13 evasion strategies out of 17 have been found in the data. The strategies of *repeating answer to previous question*, *stating or implying that the question has already been answered*, *apologizing* and *literalism* were not used by the politicians analyzed in the study.

In total, 68 evasive responses were detected in the data. It was observed that Recep Tayyip Erdoğan was the political figure who displayed the most frequent use of evasive strategies. 22 responses of him were regarded to be evasive. The distribution of evasive responses of the other political figures is as follows: Kılıçdaroğlu (10), Bahçeli (7), Demirtaş (7), Önder (7), Kuzu (5), Tekin (5) and Özdağ (5). The distribution of the evasion strategies used by the politicians is given in Table 1:

Table 1: Evasion Strategies Used by the Turkish Politicians

STRATEGIES OF EVASION	POLITICIANS								Total
	Tayyip Erdoğan	Kemal K.oğlu	Devlet Bahçeli	Selahtin Demirtaş	Burhan Kuzu	Gürsel Tekin	Ümit Özdağ	Sırrı S. Önder	
Ignoring the question	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	2
Acknowledging the question/ N.A.	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	2

Questioning the question	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
Attacking the question	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2
Attacking the interviewer	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	3
Declining to answer	5	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	8
Making political point	2	1	1	-	-	1	2	-	7
Using incomplete answer	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	-	13
Repeating answer to previous question	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stating/implying 'already answered'	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Apologizing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Literalism	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Changing the textual context	6	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	16
Positive resistance and repeating	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2
Refusing by using humour	5	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
Shifting the agent from "I" to "we"	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	3
Circumlocution	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>68</b>

The analysis of each evasion strategy used by Turkish Politicians is presented below:

### **Ignoring the question**

This strategy of evasion requires that the politician simply ignores the question without making any attempt to answer it or even to acknowledge that the interviewer has asked a question. It was observed to be used twice by different politicians: Gürsel Tekin and Selahattin Demirtaş. One example from the interview of Gürsel Tekin is presented below:

**INTERVIEWER:** *Peki o %10 barajı onun içine girseydi siz evet oyu mu verecektiniz? (Then, if the 10% election threshold had been included in it, were you planning to vote in favor of it?)*

**GÜRSEL TEKİN:** *Kanun teklifi verdik kanun teklifi. Şimdi aile sigortasıyla ilgili. Parayı nereden bulacaksınız diyorsunuz. (We have made a legal proposal. As for family insurance, you are asking me how we will provide the financial support.)*

### **Questioning the Question**

The strategy of *questioning the question*, as its name indicates, is evading answering by asking further questions to the interviewer. One of the ways of it is to ask for a clarification of the question; the politician makes a request for further information about the question. This kind of a questioning was not encountered in the data.

Another way of questioning the question is reflecting the question to the interviewer by a new question. In their interviews, Özdağ and Önder used this strategy to evade answering. One of them is:

**INTERVIEWER:** *Peki neden adayınız yok. Engin Alan'ı koyana kadar niye başörtülü bir aday koymadınız? (Then, why don't you have such a candidate? Instead of putting forward Engin Alan as a candidate, why did not you put forward a woman in veil as a candidate?)*

**ÜMİT ÖZDAĞ:** *Efendim AKP'nin adayı var mı? (Sir, does Justice and Development Party have such a candidate?)*

### **Attacking the Interviewer**

*Attacking the interviewer* is another strategy of evasion used by the politicians. It was observed to be used three times in the data; Kuzu and Önder (twice) attacked to the interviewer. One of them is:

**INTERVIEWER:** *Hayır hocam o kadar basit değil. Bu ülkenin tüm halkları eğitim sisteminde öğretilmelidir. Ya Merinos koyunu biliyoruz nerede yetiştiriyor. Ama Kürdün nereden gelip nereye gittiğini bilmiyoruz hocam. Bu yanlış değil mi hocam? (No sir, it is not that easy. All folks of this country should be taught in our educational system. We all know where the Merinos sheep are reared, but we do not know anything about the history of Kurdish people. This is wrong, sir, is not it?)*

BURHAN KUZU: *Efendim bilenler biliyor belki sen bilmiyorsun. (Sir, you may not know anything about it, but everybody knows it.)*

### **Declining to Answer**

One of the most preferred strategies of evasion in the data was *declining to answer*. This strategy is performed by expressing grounds of inability, exhibiting unwillingness to answer, presenting oneself as the one who should not be asked the question and refusing to answer overtly.

Demirtaş and Önder refused to answer by grounding their inability to give an answer. For instance;

INTERVIEWER: *Sizin deyiminizle gerilla adlandırılıyor ama neticede hükümetin söylediği şu ben tekraren söylüyorum. Sayın Başbakan diyor ki bir terörist grubu sınırdan içeri gelmeye çalışıyor. Niyeti Türkiye'ye girmek. Orada da bir karakol var siz de söylüyorsunuz. Müdahale etmeyecek mi asker buna? (You call them as 'guerillas', but I will repeat what the government says. As the Prime Minister also asks, when a terrorist group tries to enter our country secretly, should not our military powers take action?)*

SELAHATTİN DEMİRTAŞ: *Yani Ali bey biz askeri açıdan hakikaten ne oluyor bitiyor askeri konulara hakim değiliz. (Mr. Kırca, in military issues, we really do not know what is happening there. We are not fully informed.)*

### **Refusing to Answer by Using Humor**

Another evasion strategy observed in the data is *refusing to answer by using humor*. The politicians answered the questions by making jokes to the interviewers. Erdoğan used this strategy twice. Kılıçdaroğlu refused to answer by using humor, too. The example taken from the interview of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan is given below:

INTERVIEWER: *Ama o bölge neresi? Biz medyada tartıştığımız haritalar çıktı, insanlar koşa koşa arsa almaya gitti. (What regions are you talking about? A few maps have been published in the media and many people wanted to buy the lands shown in that maps.)*

R: TAYYİP ERDOĞAN: *Sen kendin aldın mı onu söyle? (Did you buy a land yourself?)*

INTERVIEWER 1: *Ben almadım, alamadım, söylerseniz gidip alalım. (I did not buy anything, I could not. If you give some clues about it, I will go and buy one.)*

R: TAYYİP ERDOĞAN: *Ali bey aldın galiba? (Mr. Kırca, I guess, you have bought one?)*

INTERVIEWER 2: *Hayır almadım. (No, I did not.)*

### **Circumlocution**

By using the evasion strategy of *circumlocution*, the interviewee evades answering by using many words to express an idea that might be expressed by few; yet, his indirect or roundabout language does not constitute a precise answer for the question:

INTERVIEWER: *Sizin için siyasi liderliğinizin bir ömrü var mıdır koyduğunuz, bir vadesi var mı? (Is there a lifespan for your leadership? What I mean is: Are you planning to retire at some point?)*

DEVLET BAHÇELİ: *Ömürsüz siyaset olmaz. Ancak teşkilatımızın temel tercihleri doğrultusunda bir karar süreci yaşanabilir. O ayrı bir konudur. Onun için de tüzükte öngörülen süreler ve öngörülen kurumlar var. Tabi bir mücadeleyi yürüten bir siyasi lider hedefe varırken olmaz düşünerek olmaz üzerine yorum getirip kendisinin geleceğini tayin ederse zaten işi başından terketmiş bırakmış demektir. O sebepten dolayı bunun varsayımı olmaz. Benim şimdiki görevim Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi'ni başarıya ulaştırmaktır. (All policies have a lifespan, but some decisions can be made in accordance with the basic preferences of our party. It is another issue. There are some certain dates and procedures in our regulations. While the party leader is carrying out the policies, s/he cannot take action by considering the negative consequences. If he does so and make some comments on his political future, it means that he gives up just at the onset. For that reason, there can be no supposition about it. At the moment, my duty is to make Nationalist Movement Party successful.)*

### **Discussion**

In the study, it was found out that the majority of the evasion strategies proposed by Bull (2003), Galasinski (2000) and Clayman (2001) are used by Turkish politicians as well. 10 of the 14 strategies were found in the responses of the Turkish politicians. Only four of the strategies were not encountered in the analysis of the data. However, it should be taken into account that the data of the study is limited to 19 hours and 42 minutes of oral interviews. It is expected that the missing strategies may also be encountered if the amount of the data and the number of the participants are increased. The study illustrates that the categories of evasion strategies proposed by these scholars are applicable in Turkish political context as well.

In addition to the ones proposed by Bull (2003), Galasinski (2000) and Clayman (2001), three more evasion strategies were determined during the analysis of the data. They are: *refusing to answer by employing humor*, *answering by shifting the agent from "I" to "we"*, and *circumlocution*. These added categories are expected to contribute to the studies that seek for universal evasion strategies used by politicians worldwide. The applicability of these categories can be checked in other researches that investigate the evasion strategies used in different political discourses.

The most frequently used strategies of evasion found in the data are *changing the textual context of the question* and *giving an incomplete answer*. The politicians were observed to change the textual context of the question 16 times. This evasion strategy was encountered in the discourses of all political figures. The other strategy, *giving an incomplete answer*, was used by the politicians 13 times. Except for Önder, this strategy was also observed in the responses of all politicians. Since these strategies are not as strict as *refusing to answer overtly*, and they are relatively mild in nature, the politicians seem to be in a tendency to refuse answering the questions covertly and in a smooth manner.

In the analysis of the data, it was observed that it was Erdoğan who employed the most frequent use of evasion. He used 6 different evasion strategies with 22 examples. The reason for his frequent use of evasion may just be attributed to his style. However, as he was the Prime Minister of Turkey when the study was conducted, he evaded giving detailed information about the policies of the government. Unlike other party leaders, he was not only a politician who declared promises, but also the one who had the responsibility to defend the policies that had already been executed and the continuity of the government. This can provide an alternative explanation for his frequent use of evasion strategies. Thus, being the leader of the party in power seems to influence the frequency of using evasion strategies.

### Conclusion

This study has been conducted to investigate the tendencies of Turkish politicians to give evasive responses in TV interviews. It was found out that 14 different evasion strategies with 68 examples were used by the political figures in Turkey as far as the data of the study is concerned. The Prime Minister, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, used remarkably more evasion strategies compared to the other politicians. Hence, one of the conclusions that can be drawn from the study is that there is a direct correspondence between the use of evasion strategies and being the leader of the party in power. With reference to the typologies developed by Bull (2003), Galasinski (2000), and Clayman (2001), it was observed that the majority of the strategies suggested by such scholars were also applicable for the Turkish political context. In addition to the categories proposed by them, three other categories of evasion have been determined in the analysis of the data, which can be viewed as a contribution to the studies that aim to find out universal evasion strategies used by politicians.

### REFERENCES

- BAVELAS, Janet, B., BLACK, Alex, BRYSON, Lisa, & MULLETT, Jennifer. (1988). "Political equivocation: A situational explanation". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. Vol. 7, No.2, pp. 137-145.
- BAVELAS, Janet, B., BLACK, Alex, CHOVIL, Nicole, & MULLETT, Jennifer. (1990). *Equivocal communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- BAVELAS, Janet, B. (2009). "Equivocation". In H.T. Reis & S. Sprecher (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of Human Relationships* (pp. 537-539). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- BULL, Peter, & MAYER, K. (1993). "How not to answer questions in political interviews". *Political Psychology*, Vol. 14, pp. 651-666.
- BULL, Peter. (2003). *The Microanalysis of political communication*. London: Routledge Publications, Inc.
- BULL, Peter. (2008). "Slipperiness, evasion and ambiguity: equivocation and facework in non-committal political discourse". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 324-332.
- BULL, Peter. (2009). "Techniques of political interview analysis". In Álvarez-Benito, G., Fernández-Díaz, G. & Íñigo-Mora, I. (Eds.). *Discourse and politics* (pp. 215-228). Newcastle-upon-Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- CLAYMAN, Steven. E. (2001). "Answers and evasions". *Language in Society*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 403-442.
- FRASER, Bruce. (2009). "Hedging in political discourse: The 2007 Bush Press Conference". In P. Cap (Ed.). In the proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Political Discourse (pp. 201-213). Warsaw, Poland.
- GALASINSKI, Dariusz. (2000). *The Language of deception: a discourse analytical study*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- GAMBINO, Richard. (2011). "A glossary of evasive language in government". *The English Journal*, Vol. 63, No. 8, pp. 24-25.
- GNISCI, Augusto, & BONAIUTO, Marino (2003). "Grilling politicians: Politicians' answers to questions in television interviews and courtroom examinations". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, Vol. 22, pp. 385-413.
- NG, S. Hung, & BRADAC, J. James. (1993) *Power in language*. California: Sage Publications Inc.
- LI, Songqing. (2008). "A performative perspective of flouting and politeness in political interview". *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 32-47.
- WEILIN, Dou, & XIAOYING, Zhang. (2008). "Cross-cultural pragmatic analysis of evasion strategy at Chinese and American regular press conferences with special reference to the North Korean nuclear issue". *Intercultural Forum*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 1-20.