

Karenina Manhães do Nascimento

**RYAN LOCHTE'S CASE IN THE OLYMPIC
GAMES RIO 2016: DEBATING HIS
UNDERSTANDINGS ABOUT THE BRAZILIAN
CULTURE**

MONOGRAFIA

DEPARTAMENTO DE LETRAS
Programa de Pós-Graduação em
Língua Inglesa

Rio de Janeiro
Setembro de 2017

Karenina Manhães do Nascimento

**RYAN LOCHTE’S CASE IN
THE OLYMPIC GAMES
RIO 2016:
DEBATING HIS
UNDERSTANDINGS
ABOUT THE BRAZILIAN
CULTURE**

MONOGRAFIA

DEPARTAMENTO DE LETRAS
Programa de Pós-Graduação em
Língua Inglesa

Orientadora: Prof.^a Dr.^a Mônica Spitalnik Nathan

Rio de Janeiro
Setembro de 2017



DEPARTAMENTO DE LETRAS

Pós-Graduação Lato Sensu em Língua Inglesa

Karenina Manhães do Nascimento

**Ryan Lochte's Case in the Olympic Games Rio 2016:
Debating his understandings about the Brazilian Culture**

Monografia apresentada ao Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras da PUC-Rio como requisito parcial para obtenção do título de Especialista em Língua Inglesa.



Orientadora: Prof.^a Dr.^a Mônica Spitalnik Nathan

Rio de Janeiro
29 de setembro de 2017

“Sometimes the individual will act in a thoroughly calculating manner, expressing himself in a given way solely in order to give the kind of impression to others that is likely to evoke from them a specific response he is concerned to obtain.”

Ervring Goffman

Acknowledgments

I would like to register my deep gratitude in special to my advisor, Professor Monica Spitalnik, for her huge patience and excellence while counseling and helping me in this hard but delightful journey – it was quite important to encourage me as a researcher. I also would like to thank Professor Maria Isabel Azevedo Cunha not only for accepting the invitation to be my examiner but also for the puzzles that helped me improve as an individual. I am thankful for all Professors that participated in this course as well as all my classmates for every enriching moment we spent together; all of them are present in this monograph somehow. I cannot forget to thank my family for all love and encouragement; I could not do it if they were not supporting me from the beginning. To everyone who helped me accomplish this work,
Thank you.

Abstract

This monograph aims at analyzing three interviews with the American swimmer Ryan Lochte about a ‘supposed robbery’ which he claimed happened to him during the period of The Olympic Games in Rio 2016. The interviews were transcribed in order to observe, discuss and criticize the interactions between the interviewers and the interviewee. This study aims at understanding how speakers signal and interpret meaning in social interaction, therefore we used the Interactional Sociolinguistics approach to carry out a micro-analysis of the data and we adopted the Critical Discourse Analysis approach to address the macro-elements of prejudice and power present in Ryan’s discourse.

INDEX

1- Introduction	8
2- Literary Review	9
2.1- Language Discourse and Power	9
2.2- Interactional Sociolinguistics	11
3- Methodology	17
3.1- The Event	17
3.2 - The videos	18
3.3 - The Study	19
4- Analysis	21
4.1- Analyzing the first interview	21
4.1.1- 1st moment: At the NBC studio in Rio	21
4.1.2- 2nd moment - interview on the beach	23
4.1.3- 3rd moment - Back at the NBC studio	28
4.2- Analyzing the second interview	29
4.3- Analyzing the third interview	38
5- Discussion	54
5.1- Body Language	54
5.2- Word and grammar choices	55
5.3- Pauses, hesitation and emphasis	57
5.4- Overlap and interruptions	57
5.5 - The position of the American Committee	58
6- Conclusion	59
7- Reference	61
8- Appendix 1 – Interview 1	64
9- Appendix 2 – Interview 2	67
10- Appendix 3 – Interview 3	69

1- Introduction

This research aims at observing, discussing and criticizing previous understandings the US swimmer Ryan Lochte had about the Brazilian culture in the 2016 Rio Olympics. Bearing in mind the issues of power in discourse as well as some prejudice speech present in our current society, this topic is important because it has not been thoroughly debated in the academia, thus creating a gap that has to be filled in.

This research paper is based on three interviews with Ryan Lochte, who participated in the 2016 Rio Olympics. The main topic discussed in the interviews is a “supposed robbery at gunpoint as the cab he and his friends were in tried to pull away from a service station” which he first claimed to be a victim of, but later it was discovered to be a lie created by him to get rid of some immature attitudes in Brazil, for instance, destroying a bathroom in a gas station. It is imperative to mention that Ryan Lochte is an important figure in the American sports (he is the second best medalist after Michael Phelps in the American swimming team) which represents the responsibility of his discourse in the case. However, different from his teammate Michael Phelps, he acted as a bad character and took advantage of the situation for his own gain. He had the information about cases of violence and thieves in the streets of Rio and then he made up his version of the facts. It is important to highlight that while Brazilian authorities deeply investigated the case, the American ones reacted to it with lots of indignation towards the swimmer. Nobody supported him and he not only faced lots of critics from the Americans, but also lost much sponsorship.

Basing my research on the works of Fairclough (Critical Discourse Analysis) to analyze discourse in a macro level and Tannen (Interactional Sociolinguistics Approach) to focus on discourse in a micro-level, I’m interested in observing, discussing and criticizing how Lochte constructed his understandings of the event and then, discuss the issue of how power constructs and is constructed through discourse.

I consider that language is socially constructed. That is why, as a critical/socio-constructivist researcher, I believe that by means of debating power and mainly how it constructs and is constructed through discourse, this research has the huge importance on empowering other future researchers to continue studying this issue. Subsequently, we may co-construct a new understanding of how our Brazilian culture is identified abroad.

2- Literature Review

Two different theoretical perspectives will be used to approach the data: the Interactional Sociolinguistics approach and Critical Discourse Analysis. The former will be used to approach the data microanalytically and the latter, to explore the macro-level domain.

2.1- Language, Discourse and Power

When we talk about language, discourse and power it is necessary to define what is understood by these concepts. According to Simpson and Mayr (2010: p.7)

“(…) discourse is what happens when language ‘gets done’. Whereas language refers to a more abstract set of patterns and rules which operate simultaneously at different levels in the system (the grammatical, semantic and phonological levels for example)”.

These authors also state that the use of these patterns in real life makes reference to discourse, as it captures what is happening when language forms are politically, socially and culturally in action.

When Simpson and Mayr (2010: p.2) talk about power, they state that “power comes from the privileged access to social resources such as education, knowledge and wealth.” They conclude that having access to these means affords status, authority and influence in society as a whole. Hence, it allows domination coercion and control over subordinate groups. Thinking about the USA as a wealthy country, we notice a certain superior tone in the American reporters’ discourse during the first interview – mainly when they refer to South American countries.

Simpson and Mayr (2010: p.3) mention that “(…) discourse constructs hegemonic attitudes and beliefs and (...) [it] does so in such way as to make these beliefs appear ‘natural’ and ‘commonsense’”. They also state that this hegemony is very important because it happens through language, that is, people in general permit certain formations of power due to a natural and commonsensical representation of a dominant language in society. These attitudes and beliefs are also present and reinforced in Ryan’s discourse, for instance, when he chooses his words in the interactions with the reporters. However, when Fairclough (1989) as well as Simpson and Mayr (2010) debate about ‘commonsense’ assumptions, he says that people are not aware of the presence of these assumptions in their daily linguistic interactions and conventions. It is quite interesting

to notice that these assumptions are present in the common belief of our society. So, the only way of breaking these pre-conceived assumptions is through the awareness of the use of language. In Fairclough (1989: p.2) “Ideologies are closely linked to language, because using language is the commonest form of social behavior, and the form of social behavior where we rely most on 'common-sense' assumptions”. This way, the author concludes that the study of ideology present in the nature of language should be considered one of the most important aspects in social studies. It reinforces the importance of this study in the process of understanding the role of language in the construction of power in our society.

According to Fairclough (1989), an effective discourse is established by social joints of conventions connected to social institutions. “(...) discourse has effects upon social structures, as well as being determined by them, and so contributes to social continuity and social change” (1989: p.17). These social relationships define social positions that are held by the use of language. So, the language in use is able to help in altering relations in society. That’s why Fairclough (1989: p.20) sees “language and discourse as a form of social practice.” Thinking about this, it is quite significant to point out the relation of power present in the interviews that were analyzed in this study. In the first one, we notice the use of discourse in behalf of contributing to the “social continuity” of the American superiority; mainly when we see the discourse of the reporters when talking about their assumptions about the South American countries. Whereas, when analyzing the third interview, we notice the Brazilian reporter’s attempt to establish a “social change” concerning these assumptions. Thus, that’s why we say that language is embedded in society and not out of it. Therefore, “language is a social process” that every time someone utters, listens, writes or reads, he/she acts in accordance to a certain social convention and, thus, faces social effects of it. When Ryan exposes his understandings of what had happened at the night of the event in Rio, we notice an attempt to impose his superiority over the Brazilian culture in his discourse. This is a language choice in the social process of power relations. Thinking about this social aspect of language, “People internalize what is socially produced and made available to them, and use [it] to engage in these social practices, including discourse” (FAIRCLOUGH, 1989, p.24).

“Discourse then, involves social conditions, which can be specified as social conditions of production, and social conditions of interpretation.” (FAIRCLOUGH, 1989, p.25).

These conditions also account for three other levels of social organization, as Fairclough (1989: p.27) calls it: “level of social situation, or immediate social environment”, where the discourse takes place; “level of social institution”, representing the discourse itself and “level of the society as a whole”. Fairclough concludes that such social conditions formalize the way people product and interpret text in interaction. In the three interviews analyzed in this study, there are three different levels of social situation: In the first interview, it takes place in Rio during the Olympic games; in the second interview, it takes place in the USA in the NBC’s (an American TV channel) studio after the police investigations and in the third interview, it is also in the USA but in GLOBO’s studio (a Brazilian TV channel) and also after the Brazilian police’s investigations. This difference in the level of social situation causes a change in the interactions and relations of power.

According to Simpson and Mayr (2010), in order to favor particular ideologies and at the same time depriving others, the linguistic structure in a certain text (word choice, grammatical levels for instance) can show its ideological orientation. So, “(...) linguistic analysis offers useful analytical tool for probing ideological stand points across different portrayals in the media for the same event or experience.” (p. 6) Fairclough also points out the importance of gestures, facial expressions, movements, postures and the like in spoken interaction as a way for the listener to perceive the speaker’s meaning/meta-message.

2.2- Interactional Sociolinguistics

"How we say what we say communicates social meaning."

(TANNEN, 1987, p.16)

The above quote is very important for this study because the way we utter words, if it is loud or low, its speed, its pitch and emphasis, carries a meaning concerning our understandings and the effect we aim at with that particular utterance in a certain interaction. All these features establish how the speaker will be judged; it determines the speaker’s linguistic style.

What is linguistic style? It “is a set of culturally learned signals by which we not only communicate what we mean but also interpret other’s meaning and evaluate one another as people” (TANNEN, 1995, p.139). Based on this, we say that every speaker is

conscious about the other's status/linguistic style; so, everybody adapts their linguistic style depending on whom they are talking to. Therefore, we project different images of ourselves, and grasp the image the other wants to send in interaction. This is clear if we observe how Ryan changes his linguistic style depending on the person by whom he is being interviewed.

“How you say what you mean is crucial, and differs from one person to the next, because using language is learned in social behavior.”

(TANNEN, 1995, p.138)

This quote is quite significant for this analysis, as we understand that the way we communicate (utter and listen) is heavily induced by our cultural background. So, it is quite important to understand “first, what is culture? Culture is everything you have ever learned about how to communicate” (TANNEN, 1983, p.3) and what we think about a certain topic. When engaging in conversation with people by paying attention to the way people interact with us, we learn how to interact with others. Language not only expresses ideas, but also (being a way of social behavior) negotiates the relationship among people. In Schieffelin's (1979/1990) studies we see that children grasp social knowledge and language structure at the same time, implying that language is part of social relations. Based on the social aspect of language, we have to consider the importance of the paralinguistic aspect of the language in discourse. “Even the smallest details of talk are functional and potentially meaningful.” (CAMERON, 2001, p.111) If we look at the context in which the detail appear in discourse, it is easier to understand why the speaker had chosen this or that feature in his/her discourse. In the interviews, it is extremely important to pay attention to the paralinguistic aspect of the language and prosody in the participants' (Ryan and the reporters) discourse in interaction, so we can better picture the ideas that are being shared.

“When we speak, we have ways of conveying to the listener some quite complex information of how we intend them to treat the message (...) prosody (intonation, pitch and stress contrasts), paralinguistic cues (hesitation, contrasts of speed and volume, simultaneous speech) (...) we want to pick out as having a particular significance.”

(CAMERON, 2001, p.109)

According to Ervin-trip, style is the co-occurring changes at various levels of linguistic structure within one language. He also says that we make linguistic choices on two

different levels: on the syntagmatic relations, and paradigmatic relations. The first follows the rule of co-occurrence, when there are two different styles together; the second, the rule of alternation, when the speaker chooses among styles. Based on the understanding of styles, we say that different speakers and different contexts with the same linguistic and paralinguistic cues may have different meanings in their message. So, having this concept in mind, we understand that “Each person’s individual style is a combination of features learned in interaction with others (hence, social), plus features developed idiosyncratic” (TANNEN, 1984, p.16). So, we conclude that “the way we speak is who we are and who we want to be.” (TANNEN, 1995, p.141), that is, the way we speak shows the conflict of our inner beliefs and the (good) image we want to have in society. In the interactions, we clearly see the conflict between Ryan’s beliefs and the image that he wants to convey about himself.

When considering the difference between the person who we are and the one who we want to be, we have to look at the concept of meta-message which is “what is communicated about relationships – attitudes towards each other, the occasion and what we are saying” (TANNEN, 1992, p.16). Then, it is important to consider not only what is said, but also the meta-message of what is said. Keeping this concept in mind, we have to debate about the importance of indirectness. “Only a small part of meaning is contained in the words spoken, the largest part is communicated by hints, assumptions and the audience filling in from context or prior experience.” (TANNEN, 1983, p.8). In the interviews, we notice that Ryan uses indirectness, so he does not commit himself to the interlocutor’s interpretation.

Another aspect that is important for this study is the analysis of the turn-taking process. In Cameron (2001: p.112) we see that “for making claims about interpretation involves ‘going to the next turn’, the point in talk where the hearer becomes a speaker and produces a response to the previous speaker’s utterance. That response provides evidence of how its producer took the previous turn”. In the interviews analyzed for this study, we see how turn-taking is applied: it is very important to understand what is happening in interaction, moreover, how the participants position themselves in front of it.

“First turns present the producer of the second turn with a choice, for instance, invitations, offers, suggestions or proposals, may be either accepted or declined. A turn with solicits the

addressee's opinion on some proposition made by the speaker, may be met with either agreement or disagreement.”

(CAMERON, 2001, p.96)

So, we understand that when the producer of the second turn agrees with the proposition of the first, his/her utterance will not demand so much elaboration as it would if he disagreed with it. The latter has to be, somehow, more elaborated as it is more face threatening. In this study, we see how Ryan has his face threatened, mainly in the third interview. Another aspect to consider in turn-taking is how “the floor is constantly negotiated and renegotiated as a conversation goes along.” (CAMERON, 2001, p.90) Based on the concepts of floor negotiation and the turn-taking process in interaction, it is necessary to debate about the concepts of interruption and overlapping, their differences and effects in interaction.

“Linguist Adrian explains that ‘overlap’ is mechanical: Anyone could listen to a conversation, on a tape recording of one and determine whether or not two voices were going at once. But interruption is inescapably a matter of interpretation regarding individuals’ rights and obligations.”

(TANNEN, 1990, p.190)

The most important aspect to identify interruption is to understand if “the other speaker is trying to change the topic of the conversation, it may be taken as an interruption that constitutes dominance, but what the speakers are trying to do when talking to each other.” (TANNEN, 1990, p. 195) It is quite significant to see how interruption happens in interactions, and how it is connected to power relations between the participants.

Based on the way we interact, it is known that “Anything we say to show we are involved with others is in itself a threat to our (and their) individuality. And anything we say to show we are keeping our distance from others is in itself a threat to our (and their) involvement.” This is what we call double bind - “whatever we do to serve one need necessarily violates the other. And we can’t ‘step out of our circle.’” (TANNEN, 1992, p. 20) When interacting, we have the need for involvement and independence happening simultaneously in everything we do in interaction. In order to continue trying to balance this need, we are constantly adjusting ourselves in our utterances. It is what we call “politeness phenomena”. As we debated before, we learn our style as part of the social process of learning language, and our personal stylistic choices are made in order

to achieve the universal human need of involvement and independence, which Lakoff would call 'logic of politeness'. Lakoff also says that we constantly and on purpose avoid saying what we mean in order to achieve the higher goal of politeness and then complete the social function of language: the interaction. In order to study this, "she devised a system that represents the universal logic underlying specific language choices (ie, indirectness; preference for particular lexical or syntactic forms) in the form of three principals originally called 'Rules of Politeness' (later called rules of Rapport)." (TANNEN, 1984, p. 17) If the speaker has a preference of one rule in front of the other, in communicative strategy, it makes up style.

Rule 1- Don't impose (distance) – which characterizes a more formal interaction, it has the preference of an indirect expression in order to not impose oneself on others.

Rule 2- Give options (deference) – this rule characterizes a discourse that seems hesitant, for example, when the speaker chooses to make use of euphemisms – which means an open interpretation; so the interlocutor may not understand the speaker.

Rule 3- Be Friendly (camaraderie) – which sets up equality as a norm in interaction.

The Rule 1 and Rule 2, which correspond to distance and deference, stand for the heading of defensive, then serving the human need for independence; while Rule 3, which corresponds to camaraderie, stands for the heading of rapport, serving the human need for involvement.

"We are always trying to balance these needs. We do it by not saying exactly what we mean in our messages, while at the same time negotiating what we mean in meta-messages" (TANNEN, 1992, p. 31) But, what is meta-message and how do we do it? "(...) meta-message (...) is cued by a combination of intonation, voice quality, facial expression, gesture plus the expectation that such usage is appropriate to the situation" (TANNEN 1984, p. 32) When we think about the meta-message, we have to account for the understanding of "the meta communicative frame of interaction", that is, the activity that the speakers are engaged in, what the participants are doing and their intentions in the interaction. In order to understand the meta-communicative frame of a certain interaction, it is important to pay attention to the paralinguistic and prosody features of

speech; the intonation, pitch, rhythm and the like. Gumperz calls these features “contextualization cues”.

Besides paralinguistic and prosody features, it is necessary to point out the analysis of the speech as a whole.

“(...) in all its phonological, lexical, syntactic, prosodic and rhythmic variety (...) [as an] element of a range of behavioral characteristics that make up personal style. It would be ideal, ultimately to link an analysis of language use with a comprehensive analysis of other elements of behavior. At the very least, a linguistic analysis should correlate verbal with (...) other non-verbal communicative channels, such as facial expression and gesture”

(TANNEN, 1984, p. 14-15)

All these features are quite significant in this study as it explains Ryan’s understandings about what happened that night in Rio.

3- Methodology

As the aim of this research is to observe how Ryan Lochte has constructed his narrative of the Brazilian culture and discuss how it was constructed through his discourse, I decided to transcribe, analyze and compare three videos containing his interviews to some American and Brazilian reporters. I decided to discuss this study in the light of the Interactional Sociolinguistics approach to focus on discourse in a micro-level, and also Critical Discourse Analysis to focus on discourse in a macro level and observe possible elements of prejudice and power in the participants' discourses.

3.1- The event

The event happened on August 14th 2016 in Rio de Janeiro after a party at the French house located in Lagoa, a very wealthy neighborhood in Rio de Janeiro. Ryan Lochte was with his three teammates. By the day of the event (August 14th), the athletes had already competed in the games. It was after Ryan had already won the golden medal for the 4 x 200 meters. In his first version of the story, he alleged that they had gotten on a taxi which later was approached by some men at gunpoint. These men had identified themselves as police officers and then, asked the athletes for their money and belongings. This event was first covered and broadcasted on the following day by NBC (an American TV channel) and then by other means of media. Lochte returned to the US on August 16th 2016.

On the same day, the British Newspaper "Daily Mail" published a story with some images which showed that the swimmers were calm and making jokes when they arrived at the Olympic Village; the images also showed that they had their belongings with them. Due to some contradictions, the police started to investigate the case and prevented the other swimmers to leave the country by arresting their passports. After some investigation, the police had images of the security cameras at a gas station on Americas Avenue in Barra da Tijuca which showed the confusion between American swimmers and security guards. According to these security guards, the athletes had depredated a bathroom and had tried to leave without paying for the damages. Gunnar Bentz and Jack Conger (other swimmers at the event) testified to the police and one of them confirmed that the story of the robbery had been invented. The Brazilian Justice authorized the devolution of Gunnar Bentz's and Jack Conger's passports. Then they were allowed to leave the country, but James Feigen's passport was still withheld by the

Justice. Feigen gave a new testimony to the police and apologized for the inconvenience and the repercussion caused by the whole controversy. After paying a fine of \$ 35,000, Feigen was allowed to return to the US. The money, which had been converted into sports materials, was donated to ‘*Instituto Reação*’, an NGO that operates in Rocinha, a slum in Rio. After this, the United States Olympic Committee published a note apologizing to the Brazilian people for the conduct of the American swimmers.

3.2- The videos

Interview #1			
Date	Location	Duration	Participants
August 15 th 2017	NBC studio in Rio - Brazil	04 minutes and 05 seconds	Ryan Lochte Al Roker Billy Bush Natalie Morales

The first video was filmed in Brazil one day after the event. In this video, we see some comments on the fact made by three American reporters in the studio of NBC in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) during the Games. Afterwards, we see an informal interview with Lochte at the beach. The video was published on August 15th 2017. It contains an American reporter, Billy Bush, saying how he had obtained his exclusive interview with Ryan Lochte in which the swimmer revealed how he and three other colleagues were held up at gunpoint in Rio the day before; as well as the interview itself and the reporters’ understandings about the event.

Interview #2			
Date	Location	Duration	Participants
August 22 nd 2016	NBC studio in the USA	05 minutes and 10 seconds	Ryan Lochte Matt Lauer

The second video was filmed in the U.S. It is a formal interview made by an American reporter from NBC. The video was published on August 22nd 2017. It contains the American swimmer Ryan Lochte in the second part of an exclusive interview with

TODAY's reporter, Matt Lauer, describing another version of the event at a gas station in Rio de Janeiro in which he claims that the event had involved him himself and three other swimmers in a confrontation with armed guards at the gas station. The video also contains the reporter's impressions about what happened.

Interview #3			
Date	Location	Duration	Participants
August 20 th 2017	GLOBO studio in the USA	09 minutes and 56 seconds	Ryan Lochte Felipe Santana

The third video was filmed in the US as well. Like the previous one, it is also a formal interview but, now, with a Brazilian reporter from GLOBO NEWS (a Brazilian TV channel). This video was published on August 20th 2017. It contains an exclusive interview to a Brazilian reporter, Felipe Santana, about the event. Ryan said he did not lie, but over-exaggerated the story he had told the police and the American TV. Lochte took full responsibility for the confusion at the gas station and, though being forced to do it, he apologized to the Brazilian people.

3.3- The study

In this study, language is understood as a social process, that is, the language that we use every day at every moment in our daily activities helps us in understanding issues of social concern as well as how emerged social institutions use the language to shape the way we interact. Studying language also helps us to understand how a particular use influences the social institutions themselves and our roles in them. That's why we see language as discourse, always in action. When we speak, we are always doing something, so, that is why we believe that through the study of Ryan's discourse, we understand his beliefs about Brazilian culture and also how he used what he understood about it for his own benefit.

Bearing this in mind, we have to understand "the significance of Language in the production, the maintenance and change of social relations of power" (FAIRCLOUGH, 1989, p. 1). It is quite important to understand this in order to raise "consciousness of how language contributes to the domination of some people by others, because consciousness is the first step towards emancipation" (FAIRCLOUGH, 1989, p. 1).

When we raise consciousness about how tight the relation between language and power is and how it contributes to the domination of a group by another, we are helping people to notice to what extent their discourse is based on pre-conceived assumptions and how much it is wrought by ideology and its relations of power. It is important to say that every discourse is embedded in ideology, so there is no discourse that is impartial or free of ideology(ies), as one's discourse (what one does in social interaction through the use of language) is a result of previous social interactions which reflects the beliefs of a certain society.

4- Analysis

4.1- Analyzing the first interview

In the first video recorded interview we see Ryan Lochte talking with an American reporter about a ‘supposed armed robbery’ which had occurred just a few hours before. As described in the previous chapter, this interview took place in two different locations: at the NBC studio, on Copacabana Beach, and outdoors on the promenade in Copacabana.

To analyze the interview, we will divide it into three moments: at a first moment, the video shows three reporters interacting in the studio; at a second moment, the interview takes place on the beach between one of the reporters and Ryan Lochte; and at a third moment, the interaction is back in the studio between the same three reporters. The reporter who interviews Ryan on the beach interacts with the other ones in the studio as well.

In order to analyze the data in this study, I will focus not only on linguistic forms such as words and sentences, but also on prosodic and paralinguistic features, so as to have a comprehensive view of what is going on in the interaction and how the participants in the interviews construct meaning. Tannen’s citation below reinforces the view of language and communication which permeate this study:

“Speech – the use of language in all its phonological, lexical, syntactic, prosodic, and rhythmic variety – is one element of a range of behavioral characteristics that make up personal style. It would be ideal, ultimately, to link an analysis of language use with a comprehensive analysis of other elements of behavior. At the very last, a linguistic analysis should correlate verbal with proxemics, kinesics, and other non-verbal communicative channels, such as facial expression and gesture.”

(TANNEN, 1984, p. 14)

4.1.1- 1st moment: At the NBC studio in Rio

In the first part of the video, the reporters are all making jokes about another colleague (his physical appearance and behavior). They were all laughing and joking. These jokes created an interactional frame of play in the studio. An important point at this moment is that this frame is suddenly broken by the utterance “it looks like Ryan Lochte was held at gunpoint”

Segments 17-20

“Male Reporter 1: He is old school! That’s how he is! -

Female Reporter: - He’s got an I-phone. He has an i-phone.

Male Reporter 1: - He’s got a blackberry and an atlas

GENERAL LAUGH

MR2: He says Lochte : it looks like Ryan Lochte was held at gunpoint and we all couldn’t believe it (...)”

Then, the result of this utterance was that, all of a sudden, all the laughter and fun gave room to serious faces and tone of voice (the atmosphere became heavier, and not as pleasant as before), so we can clearly point out a change of frame of their interaction. At this moment, they changed not only their positions in the chair (being less relaxed and brisker), but also their facial expressions and tone of voice, thus, characterizing a change of topic which led to a change in the frame of events.

Thinking about this first part as a whole and linking it to the function of the genre (TV news) in which the interaction was taking place, we can see a figurative meaning in this sudden change of frame of interaction. It seemed that they hadn’t heard about the event before and as the news of it came into the studio, it destroyed their moment of joy. It was like they were having fun at a party and, then, they ‘got held at gunpoint themselves’ so their joy was robbed from them. It may be clearly seen as a metaphor of what Ryan Lochte claimed he had suffered, as if they’ve gotten the news by surprise at that moment.

According to Tannen (1995, p.139) “Everything that’s said must be said in a way – in a certain tone of voice, at a certain rate of speed and with a certain degree of loudness”. That is, the paralinguistic and prosody aspects of discourse play an important role in the meaning-making of it. Bringing up this moment of joy which is suddenly taken away from them (as it is in a robbery) creates an effect of closeness between the spectators and the news, which is felt like they were watching the robbery happening right before their eyes, thus, making it closer and more real to the ones who are watching the video.

4.1.2- 2nd moment - interview on the beach

Segments 31-35

“ON THE BEACH

Male Reporter 2: What happened? Who were you with? What time at the night? Who pulled you over? -

RL: (er hesitation) I was with a couple of swimmers (er hesitation) we were coming back from the French house and we got pulled over our:: (.) taxi and (.) these guys came out with a badge (.) a police badge (.) no lights, no nothing (.) just a police badge (.) they pulled us over (.) (er hesitation) (.) they pulled out their guns (.) (er hesitation) they told the other (er hesitation) swimmers to take down on the ground (.) they got down on the ground (.) I refused (.) I was like (.) we didn't do anything wrong (.) so (..) I'm not getting down on the ground (..) and the guy (.) pulled out his gun (.) he cockpit it (.) put it into my forehead and said (.) “get down” and I was like (.) I put my hands up (.) like (.) whatever (hands up and grin) (.) He took our money (.) he took my wallet and then –

Male Reporter 2: He left your cellphone (.) he left your credential –

RL: He left my cellphone (.) he left my credential (.) but he took my wallet and took all the guys' cash.”

The first important aspect in this interview is that Ryan Lochte was wearing sunglasses, which makes it difficult to observe his gaze. Then, at the start of the interview, the interviewer asks Ryan four questions one after the other in a very fast pace: ‘What happened? Who were you with? What time at the night? Who pulled you over?’ Thinking about what Tannen (1983, p. 4) said concerning the role of a question in interaction: “(...) questions are regarded as too powerful to throw around, because they force a response.” However, it is the right/role of the interviewer to ask questions, making it very odd to see Ryan's reactions to these questions: he kept his arms crossed on his chest while talking. This position has the effect of asking for “distance” in the rules of Rapport. “(...) the term distance refers to the separation that exists between interactants or between speakers and their subject, which results from the application of R1 ‘Don't impose’.” (TANNEN, 1984, p.17). Analyzing body-language at this point of

their interaction through the light of Tannen words, we can say that maybe whether he was not comfortable to talk about that subject (causing a sensation that he was hiding something) or he was not comfortable with the reporter. However, after some time, he said “We got pulled over in our:: (.) (smile) taxi” he uncrosses his arms and starts to tell his story in a more casual way.

It is quite interesting to observe how Ryan Lochte pauses during his speech. An interesting pause that he makes is when he says “We got pulled over in our:: (.) taxi”. During this pause, we can notice a discreet grin on his face. This fact was the first contradictory one when the police got the video from the post office. In this video, we can see that he hadn’t been pulled over in the taxi.

Then, he goes on talking about his understandings of the event. He said: “these guys came out with a badge (,) a police badge (,) no lights, no nothing (,) just a police badge”. When he chooses to say “these guys” (a general term) he is not saying any other characteristics of these other people that got closer to them. His lexical-choice – guys - is impersonalizing the other, then, making his version more tending to the robbery version he wanted to convey. At this moment, he is manipulating language in order to make his understanding of what happened more reliable to the reporter and the audience. It’s also interesting how he emphasizes the word “badge” by saying that they had got nothing “no lights (,) no nothing (,) just a police badge”. When he says the word “badge” three times, he wants to show how he and the other swimmers were threatened: with a ‘doubtful’ police document - doubtful, because, as he said “no lights (,) no nothing”. When he chooses to say that, he was questioning if these badges were real or fake, or even if they were corrupted police officers trying to rob them. While he was saying the utterance “these guys came out with a badge (,) a police badge” and “just a police badge”, he opened his arms expressing doubt in order to reinforce the message that questions the validity or the importance of these badges. This is quite an enlightening utterance as it shows his beliefs about the Brazilian police.

Another interesting part of his discourse is when he said “they told the other (er hesitation) swimmers to take down on the ground (,) they got down on the ground (,) I refused (,) I was like (,) we didn’t do anything wrong (,) so (::) I’m not getting down on the ground”. It is interesting how he says that only the other swimmers were asked to get down on the ground: ‘they told the other (er hesitation) swimmers to take down on

the ground', as if he was not asked or as if he was not part of what was happening. This part of his speech shows that according to him, he was not asked to do the action, so he felt the right to refuse doing it. When he mentions the expression 'get down on the ground', he makes a gesture with his right hand going down. As he used verbal and non-verbal language in order to communicate the action of going down on the ground, he was emphasizing the meaning of it, thus showing how threatening "these guys" were to them. However, even being threatened, he refused to get down on the ground, only him, the others swimmers did. When he said that he refused, he opened his arms and turned his body toward the reporter; as if he was emphasizing the meaning of his refusal, that he was superior and would not obey the supposed robbers. This conveys a touch of arrogance in his discourse. It also illustrates the relation of power in his interaction with the police and how he had more power than an important governmental institution of a country. Keeping his beliefs about Brazilian police in mind, we infer that he wanted to show an image of an uncorrupted guy, that he would not submit himself to a corrupt police; and thus, building an image of a brave man, a typical image present in the American culture, as the Superman, Capitan America and the like.

Then, he stated, 'I was like (,) we didn't do anything wrong (,) so (..) I'm not getting down on the ground'. This part is also quite intriguing because he used the term 'I was like' in order to transport his discourse to the moment of the event. This is a strategy that the speaker (in this case, Ryan) makes to bring the hearer (here, the reporter and the audience) closer to the story; so, the closer the hearer is to the story, the easier it is to convince the hearer of version that is being told. His next words are fairly intriguing as well, he said 'we didn't do anything wrong'. These words show how he positioned himself in the situation: as victims. At this moment, we can see another discreet grin on his face which reinforces another aspect of arrogance in his discourse. As soon as he assumes (in his version) that he is not guilty and thus he is not going to do anything, he is putting himself superior than the others by reinforcing his superior position over the security guards and the other swimmers. Another interesting aspect of his discourse is that, while he says "so (..)", he shrugs showing that he couldn't understand what was happening. This gesture, combined with the utterance 'we didn't do anything wrong', emphasized the meta-message that he wanted to pass to the reporter – that he (and the other swimmers) were not responsible to whatever happened that night. Then, he said, 'I'm not getting down on the ground'. This utterance, linked to all the gestures and grins

suggests an arrogant and superior tone to his discourse and also to his understandings of what happened.

Another interesting part of his discourse is when he said ‘and the guy (,) pulled out his gun (,) he cockpit it (,) put it into my forehead’. While he said ‘he cockpit it’, he made the gesture of a gun with his right hand, pointed it to the reporter’s face and said ‘put it into my forehead’. At this moment, the reporter raises his hand to his chin in a gesture of despair. The combination of verbal and non-verbal communicative channels here is used by Ryan to make the reporter feel scared of the police and, consequently, make his story real, vivid, plausible; as if he was there in the event being held at gunpoint as he was claiming. Reflecting about how a speaker’s utterance is taken by the hearer and how we can analyze this interaction, I cite some words by Cameron:

“(…)strategy for making claims about interpretation involves ‘going to the next turn’, the point in talk where the hearer becomes a speaker and produces a response to the previous speaker’s utterance. That response provides evidence of how its producer took the previous turn”

(CAMERON, 20011, p.112)

Thus, we can assume that his strategy was extremely successful as we can see the reporter’s response by raising his hand to his chin as he could not believe in what had happened. It’s also very important to mention that this was the first response of the reporter to anything that Ryan had said before. Thinking about his lexical-choice in this utterance, we can see another use of the general word to refer to the supposed robber of that night which causes a distance in who this ‘guy’ is. On the other hand, we have a specification of where to the gun was pointed: it was pointed into his ‘forehead’ which there could not be any other more threatening and lethal part of his body to be chosen than where his brain is. By choosing the forehead, it makes the action in the story more dramatic and more appealing to the reporter and the audience.

His following words were ‘and I was like (,) I put my hands up (,) like (,) whatever’. Again, he used the expression ‘I was like’ as a strategy to bring the hearer closer to his story, to the day when the event happened. As soon as he said ‘I put my hands up’ he made the gesture putting his hands up saying ‘whatever’ as he had surrendered; he had had no choice but obeying the supposed robbers. At this moment, he was using body-language combined with verbal language in order to create a more emphatic scenario

around the story he was telling. As he said ‘whatever’, we can see a grin on his face which conveyed a tone of arrogance into his discourse.

After that, he continued ‘He took our money (.) he took my wallet’. In this part we can see another contradictory evidence in his speech: at the beginning, he said ‘these guys’, meaning that there were more than one; and now, by the choice of the singular pronoun ‘he’, Ryan is claiming that there was only one who had robbed them. Another aspect concerning Ryan’s choice of pronouns is when he said ‘our money’ and ‘my wallet’; he chose the first person plural pronoun to refer to money but, the singular one to refer to wallet. Considering that when we get robbed and our wallet is taken, we lose more than money, we lose everything that is in it: documents for instance. By using the first person singular pronoun to say that he was the only one who lost the wallet, he put himself in the most affected victim of that night which is an important aspect on his understandings of that night. There is a very important point in this utterance to be considered as well: when he chose to repeat that ‘He took’ something from them with a pause in between. By doing so, he is emphasizing the unknown actor (he/the guy/ the other) and the terrible action (took/robbed) in his discourse. This brings to the speaker’s discourse a strong appeal to the hearer’s sympathy to the story that is being told.

After being silent during the whole interview, the reporter interrupts Ryan saying ‘He left your cellphone (,) he left your credential’. This is an interesting interruption, as he was silent during all the time Ryan was telling the story and decided to say something when he was saying another controversy in his version: having your wallet taken from you but not an important document and your cellphone is something quite intriguing. After being questioned by the reporter about his credentials and cellphone, Ryan answers ‘He left my cellphone (,) he left my credential (,) but he took my wallet and took all the guys’ cash.’ Choosing to repeat the reporter’s utterance first and then, making use of the connector ‘but’ to link it to what he wants to point out (that he took his wallet and the other’s cash) indicates that there is an “(...) idea (...) that the first conjunct (...) implies an assumption which is contradicted by the second conjuncts (...). In other words, on the basis of the first conjunct, the hearer might be lead to expect something which is then denied.” (HUSSEIN, p. 1) For Ryan, it was necessary to hide the fact that he kept his credential and his cellphone, because he wanted to lead the hearer to pay attention to what was lost, not to what was kept.

4.1.3- 3rd moment - Back at the NBC studio

Segments 37-42

Male Reporter 1: It could have ended a lot worse -

Female Reporter: Thank Goodness they were all safe, I mean, that is (,) the number 1 thing they warn you against when you come to Latin or South America countries this whole thing (,) there is this (,) (er hesitation) (,) this band of (,) of people who do this (,) where they bump your car (,) and then (,) you're forced to get out of your car to see if there is some damage to the car and that's when they hold you up. If you run a car in any - South American country ...

Male Reporter2: - That's what they - said they said they got pulled over they said "hey show me your insurance"

Female Reporter: - yeah it's exactly (,) that's the trick -

Male Reporter 2: - He says "give me the money"

Female Reporter: - It's interesting that the cab driver from here (Brazil) (,) would stop (,) and pull over and do that - so -

When the video goes back to the studio, the interaction takes place between the reporters. A very interesting utterance by one of the reporters is 'that is (,) the number one thing they warn you against when you come to Latin or South American countries this whole thing (,) there is this (,) (er hesitation) (,) this band of (,) of people who do this (,) where they bump your car (,) and then (,) you're forced to get out of your car to see if there is some damage to the car and that's when they hold you up. If you run a car in any - South American country ...'

The segment starts when the female reporter says: '(...) the number one thing they warn you against when you come to Latin or South American countries'. The choice of saying 'the number one thing' implies that there is a list of strong recommendations to be followed once they come to any country in South America. When she chooses her words, she not only presumes there is a possible list 'to be safe and sound' in Rio, but also means that this is the most advisable one. As she continues, she utters 'there is this (,) (er hesitation) (,) this band of (,) of people who do this'. It is quite interesting how

she hesitates, makes pauses and stutters when choosing the lexicon 'band' to refer to the people who, according to them, are thieves. There is an attempt to create/ build a camaraderie frame in the interaction among the reporters and the audience. There was an attempt to hide - and at the same time - of exposing her previous understandings about Brazil. We can illustrate this with the understandings of double-bind in interactions: "Our needs for involvement and independence – to be connected and to be separate – are not sequential but simultaneous. We must serve both needs and at once in all we say." (TANNEN, 1992, p.20)

Then, the reporter continues, 'where they bump your car (,)'. She makes a gesture of a bump with her hands. The combination of verbal and non-verbal communicative channels are used by the reporter to cause in the audience the sensation of closeness as if the audience was there in the event and had their own cars bumped, and thus, making it easier for the audience to believe in the ideology present in her discourse.

Another passage from the same reporter's discourse, which is very interesting to analyze, is when she uttered 'It's interesting that the cab driver from here (Brazil) (.) would stop (,) and pull over and do that (.) so (.)'. In here, she questioned the possible cab driver's attitude in the event. By using a supposed attitude from a Brazilian cab driver, she generalizes it; as if this attitude could not be expected from any cab driver around the world, but only the ones from Brazil. Besides this, as she says 'so' and pauses, she raises her eyebrows questioning the supposed attitude of Brazilian cab drivers, thus, adding a prejudiced tone to her discourse.

4.2- Analyzing the second interview

In the second video we see Ryan Lochte being interviewed by an American reporter (NBC channel) in order to defend himself from the accusations that he had lied about the event in a gas station in Rio (Brazil). It is important mentioning the tone of the interview. If we compare the previous interview to this one, the latter is much more formal than the former. The previous interview was held at the beach in Rio and both the reporter and Ryan were casually dressed, while this one was held at a TV studio and both the reporter and Ryan were wearing formal clothes. An important aspect is, mainly, Ryan's tone: during the first interview, he could hold the floor for a longer time; whereas, during this one, he had to struggle to win the floor more frequently. Besides this, it is worth discussing Ryan's facial expressions. It's clear that he is much more

apprehensive during this interview: his eyes were wide open, he didn't smile as in the first one and he made use of less gestures as well. Another notable aspect is the color of his hair. Before the games, he had dyed his hair blond and for the second interview he dyed his hair brown. This is an attempt to distance his current image from the one that he had projected during the first interview, as if he was a new person.

Before the analysis of the second interview, it's important to keep in mind that the first and the second interviews were made by the same NBC News program.

Besides, the analysis of this interaction is based on Tannen's definition of meta-message - "The meta-message (...) is cued by a combination of intonation, voice quality, facial expression, gesture plus the expectation that such usage is appropriate to the situation" (TANNEN, 2005, p.32)

Segments 1-2

American Reporter: What was your tone? (,) The police said in their press conference (,) that you were 'angry (,) that you were belligerent (,) and perhaps (,) that the security guard was worried that you might get aggressive.' Is that fair? (,) a fair characterization? –

Ryan Lochte: Not (,) me getting aggressive (,) I mean (,) that's not really (,) my (::) that's not (,) me (,) is getting (er hesitation) mad and angry and wanted (sic) to fight or anything like that (er hesitation) but I was (er hesitation) I was upset that (,) we got pulled up in a taxi for (,) I thought that something that nothing (,) like (,) there is no reason for a gun to be (,) pulled out (,) for us (,) for (,) doing nothing –

The second interview starts with a very interesting question by the reporter: "What was your tone?", then, he continues saying that the Brazilian police used the words "angry, belligerent and aggressive" to describe him; after this, he finishes his turn offering the floor to Ryan by asking his opinion about this. It is very interesting to observe how this question was posed in the interview. First, he asks what his tone towards the police was, an institution of authority of a foreign country. Second, the reporter quotes the discourse of the same institution in order to give Ryan the opportunity to answer to it; giving Ryan the chance to respond to the police accusation that he was 'angry, belligerent and aggressive'. It is clear here that, at this moment, the reporter is giving Ryan the right of

defending himself and also, through it, the reporter is defending NBC for the first interview in Rio.

Another important aspect of this turn by the NBC reporter is when he utters ‘*Is that fair? (,) a fair characterization?*’ At this moment, the reporter opts to repeat the word ‘fair’. First he asks if it is fair the fact that the police could accuse him of being ‘angry, belligerent and aggressive’. Then, he utters ‘*a fair characterization?*’ questioning if the words by the police were fair. At this moment, the reporter offers Ryan the opportunity to question both actions: the police right to say that about him and also the words used by the police to describe him at the moment of the event.

In Ryan’s first answer to this interview, he utters “Not (,) me getting aggressive (,) I mean (,) that’s not really (,) my (::) that’s not me (,)”. It’s intriguing how he pauses after saying ‘not’ and then he says ‘me’, as he wanted to have the listener’s attention to this part of his utterance. He makes use of the same strategy on “*that’s not (,) me*” in order to reinforce the meta-message that he is not like the Brazilian police had described. Adding to the use of pauses, he has some curious facial expressions. He frowns and slightly squeezes his eyes in an expression of surprise and disbelief. The meta-message is that he is contesting the words used by the police – that he was “mad and angry and wanted (sic) to fight or anything like that”. The combination of these facial expression pauses and word choice gives his discourse the tone of contest and disagreement toward the Brazilian police’s discourse.

Right after, he chooses the word “upset” in order to describe how he had reacted to the police that night. By substituting the words ‘angry, aggressive and belligerent’ with the word ‘upset’, he is attenuating his behavior towards the Brazilian police that night, turning it into a softer one. When he tries to justify his ‘upset’ reaction, he raises his eyebrows making a facial expression of discredit while uttering “I thought that something that nothing”. It shows that he believes he did nothing wrong to be approached by the police. Then, he hesitates, gazes to his right and utters “there is no reason for a gun to be (,) pulled out (,) at us”. This hesitation shows that he wanted to paraphrase what he had said before, and, by putting “the gun” again at the center of the event, he calls the listener’s attention to the police reaction, thus distancing the listener’s attention from his behavior. When he utters “for doing nothing” he is sending the meta-message that he was innocent and the police over-reacted on the situation. By choosing

the word ‘nothing’, he shows his understanding of his behavior that night which was, according to him, irrelevant.

Segments 3-4

American Reporter: Gunnar (,) in his statement to the police said that you got into a heated discussion with that – security guard –

Ryan Lochte: I was upset (,) there was no reason for us to be seating down (::) (nod) with a gun pointed to us fo(::)r (,) nothing that we did –

When the reporter used his teammate’s (Gunnar’s) testimonial to confront Ryan’s version of the story saying that he got into a ‘heated discussion’, the reporter stresses the word ‘heated’. In response to this, Ryan raises a little his tone of voice and repeats that he ‘was upset’. At this moment, Ryan is trying to win the floor in order to justify his reaction to the police officer. It’s quite thought-provoking how Ryan doesn’t question Gunnar’s discourse as he did with the police previously; he only justifies his behavior, by, again, using a much softer word: ‘upset’. Ryan continues repeating the same words as before in order to attenuate the bad image that he had constructed for himself. However, at this moment, as he wanted to have a stronger position to defend himself, he makes use of curious facial expressions when he utters “*no reason for us to be seating down*”; he nods and frowns making a facial expression as he couldn’t understand why a gun had been pointed at him. Then, in order to reinforce the idea present on his meta-message, he continues “for doing nothing”. It’s explicit that the choice of words and the use of these facial expressions add meaning to the meta-message that he wants to convey in this interview: to reduce the importance of his attitudes and highlight the police’s behavior as an over-reaction to, as he said, ‘nothing that they did’.

Segments 5 and 6

*American Reporter: But at any time during that exchange Ryan when you were **that** upset (,) and terrified (,) like you’ve just said (,) Do-Do you think you post a **threat** (,) to that security guard (,) that would have (,) made him believe that he needed to continue (,) to have that gun out of his holster? -*

Ryan Lochte: - I think (,) when I got up (,) and I started (: :) you know being like (,) this is (: :) using some words (: :) this is (: :) being us (: :) we shouldn't be (,) like (,) treated like this (,) like (,) there is no way (,) like (,) we wanted to go back in the car we wanted go back (,) like (,) that's (,) that's why I got heated (,) and (: :) (nod) you know the-the guy could've probably drawled his gun from that (: :) and once he did you can definitely see me go like this (his hands up) (,) and (,) that's when (,) we sat down - and

The reporter continues instigating the swimmer by using words that Ryan himself had used before. In order to mark that these words were Ryan's; the reporter chose some expressions that would mean so in his discourse, such as, 'when you were **that** upset' and 'like you've just said'. The reporter chose to use these expressions in this interview to mark Ryan's authorship of the ideas he wanted to confront. In order to emphasize and reinforce his meta-message, the reporter makes use of intriguing pauses and stresses as when he stresses the word 'threat' and 'that', as well as when he pauses in 'he needed to continue (,) to have that gun out of his holster'.

At this moment, it's worth observing and comparing the tone of the interviews. In the first one, the reporter is just listening to Ryan and believing in the entire story he was telling. In this one, the reporter is confronting his versions and trying to separate NBC's ideology and discourse from Ryan's. At the time of the event and the first interview, NBC's coverage was widely spread on multiple kinds of media. When the police investigation came up, NBC's image was affected as well as Ryan's. It is evident at this moment how the reporter tries to separate Ryan's discourse from NBC's in order to clean their image.

Ryan's answer to this question is full of hesitation. First, he starts with the expression "I think" which has the meaning of not committing oneself to what one's saying. Right after this, he hesitates when he is trying to describe what he said to the police: "this is (: :) using some words (: :) this is (: :) being us (: :) we shouldn't be (,) like (,) treated like this (,) like (,) there is no way (,)" . It is interesting how he tries to choose his words carefully at this part of his discourse. It has an important meaning because it was not a good idea to say all the words he used that night. Then, he chooses the word used by Gunnar, 'heated', and as a response to this word choice, he makes a facial expression of regret. It implies that he had rehearsed before and he was not expecting this question to be posed to him, so he got lost with his words and showed more than he wanted to at

this moment. As he makes this facial expression, he gazes the floor to find his words and continues “the-the guy could’ve probably drawled his gun from that”. The choice of the word ‘guy’ again, as in the first interview, is an attempt to empty the authority’s power of that moment by choosing a much more general word in order to refer to an officer. It’s quite puzzling how he modalizes by the choice of the verb phrase ‘he could have drawled’ to make his conclusions less affirmative and more remote, so he does not commit himself to it. Ryan continues his discourse justifying his attitudes. ‘Once he did’ is an interesting part of his discourse as it’s a link between the officer drawing his gun and his victimized reaction, when he raises his hands up in a gesture of surrendering. Ryan makes use of a threatened facial expression combined with his gesture of raising his hands up. At this moment of the interview, he is trying to emphasize his reaction of surrendering and change the frame of the conversation – that he was not guilty of anything, but a victim of an overreaction of the Brazilian police.

Segments 7 -12

American Reporter: I – I – guess that what I am trying to get out of this is the first version the story you told (.) Ryan (.) was much more (.) about the mean streets or Rio –

Ryan Lochte: - Yeah-

*American Reporter: And the version that we are hearing now is much more about (,) a **negotiated** - settlement –*

Ryan Lochte: um hum –

*American Reporter: to cover up some **dumb** behavior –*

Ryan Lochte: - (.) and (:) that’s why I’m taking full responsibility for it (.) it’s because I over-exaggerated that story and if I never did-done that (,) we wouldn’t be in this mess -

This segment is one of the most important ones for the analysis of this interview. The reporter just interrupts the swimmer aiming to keep the frame of the conversation which is distancing NBC’s discourse from Ryan’s. This is clear when we observe how the reporter constructs his discourse to ask Ryan a question. First, he utters ‘what I am trying to get out of this is’. This expression precedes his intention with the interview, to state that Ryan was the one who caused a huge problem by telling two different versions of the fact to the media. When the reporter talks about his first version of the event, he

utters “about the mean streets of Rio”. The reporter gazes Ryan, nods and smiles with a facial expression of confrontation as if the reporter was trying to put on Ryan’s hands the entire responsibility of the mess that was made, as if NBC was trying to get away from the responsibility of publishing a story without checking it. It is noticeable here the reporter’s meta-message (a representative of NBC channel). He is trying to detach their image from Ryan’s and put the blame on him. When the reporter says Ryan’s second version of what had happened that night, it’s thought-provoking to observe his word choice: ‘cover up’ and ‘dumb behavior’. The verb choice points out the reporter’s intention on marking that Ryan had done something wrong that night (confronting Ryan’s discourse). As you just need to cover up something that is not right doing; the adjective choice ‘dumb’ points out the reporter’s position on the matter. What is worth observing is when Ryan tries to interrupt the reporter’s discourse as if he did not want him to continue his turn. It’s noticeable that Ryan wanted to win the floor in order to change the frame of the conversation. However, the reporter keeps holding the floor until the end of his speech. If we compare the attitude of the reporter here and the one in the first interview, we notice that here, the reporter is controlling the interview more often than in the first one.

When the reporter finishes his turn, Ryan has nothing to say but apologize, and do what the reporter was claiming: he takes “full responsibility for it”. It is quite intriguing when Ryan says “if I never did-done that (,) we wouldn’t be in this mess”. The pronoun choice ‘we’ is suggesting that NBC is in the mess as well as he is. He, somehow, includes NBC as part of the problem.

Segments 13-16

*American Reporter: What about the people of Rio you know? They dealt with **all** the headlines going into the games (,) –*

Ryan Lochte: - and (gaze down) –

*American Reporter: - **About** pollution and violence and crime and here comes the story (,) with one of the highest profile US Athlete saying “I got held up at a gun point (:) on the street of Rio” (.) What would you say to them now? –*

Ryan Lochte: I am (er hesitation) (,) and my deepest apologies (sigh) (.) (er hesitation) (,) they put on a great games (er hesitation) they did everything (:) the people (er

hesitation) (.) of Rio of Brazil (,) the authorities (,) everyone there they put on a great games (,) and (,) my (,) immature (,) intoxicated behavior (er hesitation) (::) tarnished that a little –

As the reporter goes on, he questions Ryan about the people of Rio. And, at this moment, Ryan tries to interrupt the reporter in another attempt to change the frame of the conversation. However, the reporter still holds the floor and continues his speech. It causes him a big annoyance, as Ryan gazes the floor. As well as his facial expression indicates he was not comfortable at that position. When the reporter takes the floor, we see that he uses the same strategy as before; he uses Ryan's word in order to highlight what is NBC's and what is Ryan's discourse, so they make it clear that it's not NBC's position on the event: 'highest profile US Athlete saying "I got held up at a gun point (:) on the street of Rio"'.

The reporter's strategy is face threatening for Ryan, so he tries to save his face: Ryan tries to contrast and detach his current image (the one that he wants to expose in this interview) from the "immature, intoxicated" man in the first interview. In order to achieve this objective, Ryan tries to divide his discourse in two parts: 'Ryan that night' and 'Ryan at this moment'. For the first, he chooses words like 'immature', 'intoxicated'; whereas, for the last, he chooses words like 'sorry', 'my deepest apologies' and 'great games'. When Ryan makes this separation between his previous and current behavior, he wants to send the meta-message that he is different now; maybe because he had lost lots of sponsorships due to his attitudes in Brazil.

Ryan finishes his turn uttering "behavior (er hesitation) (::) tarnished that a little". The choice of the phrase 'a little' has lots of meaning in his understandings of what had happened that night in Rio. When he chooses "a little" in this part of his speech, he wanted to minimize the effects of his attitudes as much as he could in order to put him at the least guilty position as possible which is another strategy Ryan made use of to save his face in front of the reporter's previous turn. When Ryan chooses "tarnished **that**", he is unclear about what had been tarnished. Ryan prefers to let it unsaid in order to let the listener complete with their own understandings, and thus, not committing himself to his own words. It's also important mentioning that he hesitated a lot during this last turn, we can also notice a long pause in "*(er hesitation) (::) tarnished that a*

little” – from which we can infer that he had a difficult time in choosing the words for answering this question.

Segments 17 - 22

*American Reporter: When you saw the news coverage of (.) Gunnar and Jack (.) being taken from that plane in the airport (.) and you **knew** and you you’ve just said to me “they didn’t damage anything” –*

Ryan Lochte: - Yeah –

American Reporter: - in that gas station –

Ryan Lochte: - and – and –

*American Reporter: **AND** you were seated at home (.) in the United States (.) safe and sound (.) how did it make you feel? –*

Ryan Lochte: - (.) Hurt (.) I mean (.) I (::) I let my team down (.) (er hesitation) you know (::) (sneeze) (:) I wanted to be there (.) like (.) I don’t want them to think that (.) I left (:) (er hesitation) (.) and left them dry (.) cause (.) I mean they are my teammates I wanted definitely to be there (:) (sneeze) (.) and I wanted to help out anywhere I could (.) so (.) I just wanted to make sure that they were home safe before I came out (sneeze) and talked (:) and (.) you know (.) I’m really sorry about – I’m embarrassed (:) (er hesitation) for myself (.) my family (.) specially those guys (.) the USA swimming (sneeze) (.) the whole Olympic Games (er hesitation) everyone watching (.) (er hesitation) this is just (::) I was immature and made a (.) stupid mistake – I’m human I made a mistake and (.) I definitely learned from this (sigh)

In the last part of this interview, the reporter mentions the other (American) swimmers who were with Ryan that night, and also mentions that they had suffered consequences because of Ryan’s attitudes. It’s worth observing again that the reporter uses Ryan’s words as a strategy to keep on the focus that Ryan’s discourse is the cause of all the problems: “you’ve just said to me “they didn’t damage anything”. Ryan tries again to interrupt the reporter in order to change the frame of the conversation, but he doesn’t succeed. The reporter raises his tone of voice and continues. It is relevant to point out how the reporter compares Ryan’s to his teammates’ consequences of that night: while the later had to face the embarrassment of being taken from ‘that plane in the airport’,

the former was ‘seated at home (.) in the United States (.) safe and sound’. This is another face threatening discourse for Ryan.

When the reporter asks how he feels about it, Ryan shows he was embarrassed. He sneezes – it looks like he was crying. It’s quite thought-provoking to compare his reaction to this question in relation to how he felt for the Brazilian people. In the segment that he talked about the Brazilian people, he just wanted to send the meta-message that he had changed in order to clean his image. He never apologizes to the Brazilian people. However, in relation to his American teammates, he feels ‘hurt’.

As a response to the reporter’s question he shows he is so emotionally hurt that it brought tears to his eyes. Then, he makes puzzling word choices. He combines the choice of the words ‘hurt’ and ‘embarrassed’ with the act of crying in order to send the meta-message that he regrets what he did. When he chooses the verb “I wanted” followed by “to be there”, “definitely to be there”, “to help out anywhere I could” and “to make sure that they were home safe”; he wanted to send a meta-message that he is a teammate who cares for the whole team and would never leave them alone – such an image was broken after that night in Rio. Then he ends his speech by saying that he “made a (.) stupid mistake” and that he is “human” but he “definitely learned from this”. He’s sending the meta-message that like any human being, he has made a mistake and he has learnt from this; he chooses the word ‘definitely’ in order to emphasize how much he has learnt from his faults. To this extent, he should be forgiven by his “family (.) specially those guys (.) the USA swimming (sneeze) (.) the whole Olympic Games (er hesitation) everyone watching”. He has probably wanted to send this image because he had lost much sponsorship due to his ‘immature’ behavior in Rio, so he wanted to get them back.

4.3- Analyzing the third interview

In the third video recorded interview we see Ryan Lochte being interviewed by a Brazilian reporter about the event that took place in Rio. As described in the previous chapter, this interview took place in New York at the Globo News studio.

It is important to mention the tone of the interview: we clearly see both Ryan’s and the reporter’s relations of power in this interview, which is barely seen in the previous ones. If we compare the interaction in the previous interviews to this one, in the third

interview there are more overlaps, interruptions and raise of tone of voice than in the others. Another important aspect is Ryan's tone: During the first interview, he had the power to choose the frame of the conversation, as Ryan had the power of exposing the event the way it was more convenient for him without being confronted by anyone. During the third interview, he struggled to keep the frame of the conversation that was more convenient to him.

Moreover, it is worth discussing Ryan's facial expressions and word choice. It is significant mentioning Ryan's smiles and choice for positive words when talking about Brazil in an attempt to build some kind of rapport with the other interlocutors, in this case, the Brazilian people, as this interview would be broadcasted in a Brazilian National TV News program. These topics are going to be more deeply discussed throughout this chapter.

Segments 1-5

BR: I wanna talk to you about Rio (,) because er... the government of Brazil spent millions (,) to assure nothing bad would happen in that area –

RL: - yeah –

BR: during the Olympic Games (,) and your case was the only one that got (,) highly publicized-

RL: -yeah-

BR: er Do you feel the weight of that responsibility?

In the beginning of the exchange the reporter starts the interview by setting the frame of the conversation 'I wanna talk to you about Rio', so, the reporter is empowering himself as a Brazilian reporter by imposing on Ryan the topic to be discussed in that exchange – Rio; not anything else but the fact that 'the government spent millions (,) to assure nothing bad would happen'. Having said this, he focuses on Ryan's case in order to confront him about his responsibility in the case. By asking 'Do you feel the weight of that responsibility?' it is clear that the reporter wants to focus on Ryan's fault and responsibility for all the trouble that had happened during and after that night. It is significant to observe the reporter's body position at this moment: he has his body slightly bent toward Ryan and he is also constantly gazing the swimmer. The choice of

having such a behavior in the interaction implies that the reporter is standing up to Ryan in order to make him tell the truth about that night.

When analyzing the reporter segment more thoroughly, we see that he calls Ryan's attention about the Brazilian Government's effort on making everything work out. The reporter mentions a certain quantity of money that had been invested which caused an appealing effect in his discourse. Right after that, he mentions how his event was highly publicized during that time. It's fairly interesting to observe that the reporter is trying to confront Ryan's attitudes and call his attention to the effect of them on the image of Brazil. The reporter's turn was quite threatening for Ryan's face.

Segment 6

*Ryan Lochte: (er hesitation) I do (er hesitation) I mean (,) If I (::) If I didn't **over-exaggerated** the story (,) and (,) if I told the entire story (,) none of this would've happened (er hesitation) you know (er hesitation) I was coming from the France House (,) I was highly intoxicated (,) annnd I made (,) immature (,) calls (,) and if that didn't happen, none of this would've happened (,) and people would not be (,) all over the world (::) tuned in this story (,) They would be watching the games what they came there to do (,) I ripped the poster off the wall in the gas station (,) and coming out (,) the security guards (er hesitation) had a gun (,) we stepped out of the taxi cab (er hesitation) the guns were pointed at us (,) and (...) one of the guys (,) the translator guy or someone came from the gas station to help out saying that "you have to pay money" (,) so (,) we (,) had to give them money so (,) a gun was pointed at us (,) we had to give them money (,) so you can call it a robbery (,) you can call it extortion or you can (,) say that we (,) had to (,) pay money for the damage of that poster (,) I can't say what it was (er hesitation) all I know is that we were frightened because a gun was involved and was pointed at us (er hesitation) but we are (er hesitation) we then after that was sold and done (,) we went back to the village and we were (erm) safe-*

When Ryan answers to this question, he repeats the same discourse that he had in the previous interview. However, even being questioned about the same topics, he is in a much more threatening position as he is being interviewed by a Brazilian reporter. This reporter is speaking in the name of the Brazilian people and it seems Ryan is able to understand that, because he gazes shamefully at the floor and makes long pauses. This reaction is caused by an extreme threatened reaction towards the reporter's position

during the interview. The constant choice for the same discourse (mainly the choice of the same words) suggests that he had rehearsed for the questions he would have for this interview. It's also very important to mention that he constantly repeats the word's choice like "over-exaggerated", "intoxicated", "gun", "human mistake" - these are important words in his discourse. The first word choice, "over-exaggerated", because he needs to emphasize that it was not a lie, as in the previous interview's analysis, he chose a softer word that would relieve him from admitting he had lied to the police – which would be an admit of a crime. The second word choice, "intoxicated", would be his excuse for his attitudes that night and also an alibi that he uses when he utters that "I can't say what it was", so this word is always chosen when he is confronted by the Brazilian reporter in order to get out of an answer that he had no way out. The choice of the word "gun" is again made in order to focus on the police reaction as an over-exaggerated reaction toward him and his team mates; as well as to justify his attitudes in order to relieve him from the responsibility (even uttering that he would take all) of that night. The choice of the words "intoxicated" and "gun" in the same turn creates an effect that he desired in this interview – even being 'humble' enough to 'admit' being responsible for his actions, he wanted to diminish his blame by uttering that he was "intoxicated" and got confused because "there was a gun pointed at" him. It's thought-provoking how he has always been insisting on the existence of a gun since the first interview, and how he chooses to use this word in different ways. In the first interview, he uses the word "gun" as a threat to his life in the construction of his understandings of what happened that night. In the second, he uses it as an over exaggerating reaction from the police in order to justify his attitudes. In the third one, he chooses this word together with "intoxicated" in order to justify his confusion of what had really happened that night. Thus, not only relieving him from the responsibility of the event, but also supporting his beliefs that it could have been indeed a robbery and he did not lie (or even over-exaggerated) completely.

There is a very important part in this segment in which he utters "if that didn't happen, none of this would've happened (,) and people would not be (,) all over the world (::) tuned in this story (,) They would be watching the games what they came there to do". It suggests his worries on how his image was constantly associated to this event. In this part, he externs how he would like people to react to his story; he wishes that they were not "tuned in this story" but in "the games what they came there to do".

When Ryan mentions that he “ripped the poster off the wall in the gas station”, he makes it as an attempt to diminish his attitudes that night. His meta-message is that he had just ripped a poster off a wall and it is not a reason to be judged like he has been. It’s clearly an attempt to diminish his attitude and focus on the reaction of the police and the press as an “over-exaggerated” one. It’s also very important to point out that he only mentions the action of ripping the poster off the wall because there was a camera in the gas station that recorded it. Afterwards he repeats the existence of a “gun” and it is evident that by using repetition, he wanted to call the attention to the police ‘reaction’ making it sound like an over-reaction to what had happened, according to him. He is evidently trying to use the fact that ‘there was a gun’ in his favor, again, to relieve his responsibility in the event, and, consequently, highlighting the police’s reaction which, according to his understandings, would have led him to call it a “robbery”, “extortion” or “him having to pay for the damages of that poster”. It is interesting how he chooses words that are related to the police’s reaction and his attitudes that night. When he chooses strong words like ‘robbery’ and ‘extortion’ to relate to the police’s reaction, he is precisely implying that the police were the ones responsible for all the trouble, and thus, the consequences of that night. By implying that there was extortion, he is also suggesting that he was a victim of the Brazilian police. In the meantime, when he chooses soft words to refer to his responsibilities, he is sending the meta-message that he was just responsible for what happened to a poster on a wall.

There is another interesting part in this segment that is worth discussing. When he mentions the translator, he calls him “one of the guys (,) the translator guy or someone came from the gas station to help out”. The choice of the word ‘guy’ creates an informal atmosphere that discredits the translator and the words used by him, as if Ryan wanted to send a message that the problem could have been caused by the misunderstanding of the translation. According to Ryan, the translator uttered “you have to pay money”. The choice of words “have to” sends meta-message that he was forced to give money, thus, suggesting that he was not lying and, then, not responsible. It’s quite apparent in this segment that, he wants (repeatedly) to relieve his responsibility of that night, and then, put the blame on any other person but not on himself. In this case, the blame is put on the translator.

Right after, it is interesting to notice how he repeats the supposed translator’s words three times in a sequence. When he repeats these words for the third time, he also

repeats the existence of a gun. When combining the sentence “you have to give them money” with the existence of a gun, he is explicitly sending the message that he was not lying – or even over exaggerating the truth. At this moment, it’s quite intriguing to observe how he chooses repetition of word choices in constructing his discourse and his understandings of the events that night. That is, he makes use of this language style in order to build the truth that is more convenient for him at the interacting moment.

When Ryan utters “I can’t say what it was”, it is coherent to say that he is trying to be distant and let the audience conclude the events themselves. This is an attempt to not commit himself for the event that night, however he insists on the discourse of a “gun being pointed at” them as an attempt to relieve himself of the lie he has been accused of. This is a perfect example of the double bind by Tannen (1996: p. 20).

“Anything we say to show we’re involved with the others is in itself a threat to our (and their) individuality. And anything we say to show we are keeping our distance from others is in itself a threat to our (and their) need for involvement.”

Segments 7-8

*BR: What the (erm) the translator that was there said was that you agreed in paying them money because you **knew** the trouble you were making there and you wanted to leave – just wanted to leave*

RL: - yeah we wanted to get out of there

It is quite thought-provoking to observe how the reporter responds to Ryan’s previous turn. The reporter mentions the translator’s testimonial about the event in the gas station, but it is interesting to observe the reporter’s word choice and body language at the moment. He chooses the word ‘translator’ instead of the ‘guy that was there to help out’ – Ryan’s words. While the reporter utters “the translator that was there”, he gestures in an attempt to correct Ryan for the use of the correct word; that he was a translator, and not a “guy who was there to help”. This is very important for understanding what the reporter says right after: “you **knew** the trouble you were making there and you wanted to leave – just wanted to leave”. In this part of the reporter’s speech, he is confronting Ryan about the truth he had built in his last turn: that he did not understand what had happened due to a possible language misunderstanding. At this moment, the reporter makes use of a facial expression

confronting Ryan's truth. The reporter's facial expression is quite important in his meta-message; it implies that Ryan was constructing the truth according to what is convenient to him at that moment. There is an over-lapping when Ryan utters "we wanted to get out of there" with the reporter "wanted to leave". There is a difference between choosing "get out of there" instead of "leave"; there is an important meaning addressed in the meta-message that Ryan is sending. The expression "get out of there" has the meaning of 'escaping', while the verb "leave" does not. Ryan's verb choice in this segment has a significant extra meaning in his meta-message.

Segments 9-10

BR: There wasn't extortion - you agreed to pay

RL: - Yeah I can't say what it was, all I know is that all that happened there was a gun in our direction (,) and we had to give them money (,) whether it was to pay them the damage or anything (,) like (,) we had to do that and we were (er) let go.

The following segment by the reporter is quite interesting because now the Brazilian reporter is evident in his words; he chooses a more direct conversational style to better confront Ryan's truth. Ryan feels face-threatened and interrupts the reporter: "- Yeah I can't say what it was"

"(...) interruption is inescapably a matter of interpretation regarding individuals' rights and obligations. To determine whether a speaker is violating another speaker's rights, you have to know a lot about both speakers and the situation. (...) what is the second speaker trying to do?"

(TANNEN, 1990, p. 94)

This quote by Tannen (1990:94) illustrates how Ryan interrupts the reporter. What is Ryan trying to do with this interruption? It is clear that he is trying to stop the reporter from confronting him and his truth. When Ryan chooses to say "I can't say what it was" he is, again, trying to extricate himself from the responsibility of that night in Rio to be distant from the facts. However, at the same time, he positions himself saying "All I know is what happened" as an attempt to defend his truth. This distancing/approaching movement by Ryan is a characteristic of the double-bind in communication – he is keeping the distance to respect the rule of imposing and he is also approaching in order to save his face in the interaction.

Ryan's insistence in mentioning the existence of a gun and, as well as, the supposed translator's words choice (that they had 'to give money') make it evident that he wants to sell to the audience the idea of a robbery in order to suggest that he was not lying after all.

Segments 11-12

*BR: You **knew** they were security guards and it was because of the confusion you guys had just made before –*

RL: I mean (,) any person that gets a gun pulled over (,) you are frightened (,) you are scared (,) and (,) we had (: :) we were scared (,) we gave them money and they let us go (,) end of story (,) that was it (,) I take all the responsibility (,) this was (er hesitation) my fault (,) It was something that (er hesitation) I did (,) (er hesitation) I ripped this (erm) poster off the wall (erm) It was my fault (,) so I take full responsibility for this –

The Brazilian reporter continues confronting Ryan's position in relation to what happened at that night. He starts his utterance with an assentation "you knew". This choice is very important to analyze what the reporter was trying to do in the interview. The use of a simple tense makes his utterance more assertive and accusatory. We understand that the Brazilian reporter is trying to indict Ryan of what had happened. He is also very assertive when saying that they were security guards, and that he knew they were there "*because of the confusion (they) had just made before*". In this part, the reporter positions himself and confronts Ryan one more time. He has also a facial expression that emphasizes the meta-message of standing up to Ryan's discourse that he "could not say what it was".

In Ryan's answer to this last turn, we see that he ignores the reporter's confrontation. Ryan is constantly trying to change the frame of conversation to a more convenient version of the facts. He starts his utterance with the expression 'I mean', which is a fairly significant choice for his attempt to change the frame of conversation as it is an expression that indicates a shift of topic.

It's quite remarkable for Ryan to keep the version that it was a robbery, so he would not be lying and then, he would not have committed a crime. Because of this, it is crucial for Ryan to keep up with the story of a gun being pointed on his face, and that he had misunderstood the facts due a problem in communication caused by the translator that

night – both could have led to his understandings of being a robbery. The role of the Brazilian reporter is quite relevant in this segment; he is trying to deconstruct Ryan's discourse by confronting his understandings of the facts.

Ryan's choice of words in this segment is quite remarkable to understand what he is trying to do with his discourse. He chooses to say the words "frightened" and "scared" as the result of the existence of a gun. In this part, he is trying to send the meta-message that everybody in his position would feel the same way: "scared", "frightened"; thus, causing a generalization that brings his discourse closer to the listener which builds camaraderie through arousing sympathy on the other.

When Ryan chooses to utter "that was it, end of story", he is evidently not comfortable with the confrontation made by the Brazilian reporter so he had to make it stop. He is trying to take control over the interaction by imposing an end to a topic that is face threatening for him. There is a pause in the video, suggesting that it was edited. Then, the swimmer utters "I take all the responsibility (,) this was (er hesitation) my fault (,) It was something that (er hesitation) I did (,) (er hesitation) I ripped this (erm) poster off the wall (erm) It was my fault (,) so I take full responsibility for this". As we observe his utterance right after the edition in the video and a heated confrontation by the Brazilian reporter; it suggests that Ryan was coached on what to say during the interview – which makes a huge difference in the validity of his real intentions during the interview.

Segments 13-16

BR: Why on the next day you went on TV to say it was a robbery? Why didn't – you just keep it down? –

RL: - I (erm) I over-exaggerated the story you know that -

*BR: - **WHY?**-*

RL: It was my fault – I don't know! (er hesitation) I still (er hesitation) I still wonder that to my (,) like to myself everyday now (,) since then like (,) I (,) Brazil doesn't deserve that (er hesitation) you guys put on an amazing Olympics (,) Everyone in Brazil (,) the people (,) (er hesitation) (,) the fans (er hesitation) everyone that put on (er hesitation) the Brazil Olympics like (,) it was amazing (,) and (er hesitation) you guys didn't deserve that kind of publicity (er hesitation) and (,) it was my (,) immaturity (,) that (,) caused and that's why I'm saying (,) that's why I'm really sorry about that and it

*was my fault and I take full responsibility (,) you guys don't deserve it (,) you guys did a wonderful job (,) everyone in Rio (,) in Brazil (,) all over the world that helped to put this game together (er hesitation) did an amazing job (,) And (,) I take full responsibility and want the people in Brazil to know how truly sorry I am (,) it's an embarrassment for myself (,) for my family and for my country (er hesitation) I was (er hesitation) I was (er hesitation) I was highly intoxicated (er hesitation) and it was (,) I'm a **human** (,) I made a mistake (,) and (,) one thing I did learned (um) I learned a lot from this I know this will never happen again –*

The reporter continues the interview and keeps the frame of confronting Ryan's truths of the facts, and his intentions in going to the TV the next day to talk about something that, according to what he says, he could not tell about. It is worth pointing out that when Ryan has just answered "I over-exaggerated the story", there is a very symbolic interruption by the Brazilian reporter "Why?" - he raises his tone of voice, leans his body towards Ryan and gestures in an attempt to maintain the frame of the conversation despite Ryan's attempt to change to a more convenient one. Ryan is constantly escaping from the reporter's question and repeating the same words choice, and so, trying to control the path of the interview. However, through interruptions, the reporter is trying to keep the frame of conversation.

Ryan's answer "I don't know!" is another example of escaping from the reporter's question. He pauses and gazes his left side as he was looking at someone and continues "I still wonder that to myself since then". This utterance functions as a bridge to what he's saying after (as he was sorry for doing something he could not tell why) - whether there is no reason why, or it is unspeakable.

After this, he changes the frame of conversation to build camaraderie in the interaction as he continues his speech. If we pay close attention to Ryan's choice of words in this segment, we see the difference of words related to him and the ones related to Brazil, and this difference shapes his intentions with this interview. The word choice related to him has both a negative meaning, like: "immaturity"; "embarrassment"; "highly intoxicated"; "I made a mistake", as well as words choice that calls the responsibility to him, like: "I'm really sorry"; "It was my fault"; "full responsibility"; "truly sorry". However, he also chooses words that try to relieve him from possible consequences of that night, like: "I'm human"; "I did learn a lot from it"; "it will never happen again".

Ryan also tries to build closeness (camaraderie) to the listener in order to be forgiven by the IOC (International Olympic Committee). For this, his word choice related to Brazil and the Olympic Games in Rio are like “Brazil doesn’t deserve that”; “amazing Olympics”; “it was amazing”; “wonderful job”. Ryan also uses generalizations when referring to people from Brazil and when choosing words like “everybody”; “everyone”; “the Brazilian people” in order to send the meta-message that he is sorry to every single person in Brazil, and then, maybe convince the audience that he is not the ‘bad guy’ that he seemed to be – as this image could affect possible future sponsors for his career.

Segments 17-19

BR: What do you think your mistake was?-

RL: My mistake was (.) over-exaggerating what really happened – and not telling –

BR: - you were not lying?

“What do you think your mistake was?”. It is reasonably important analyzing what the Brazilian reporter’s intention is with this question. He was not interested in asking about the mistake, but he was interested in asking about Ryan’s understandings of what the mistake was. Through the verb choice ‘do you think’, we see that the reporter’s intention is to focus on Ryan’s understandings of the facts; he is trying to make Ryan say what his beliefs are, in order to confront him. As we see in the next turn, when Ryan keeps on insisting that he had over-exaggerated, he did not choose the verb “lie”, but the reporter immediately interrupts him and questions “you weren’t lying?”. We see that the reporter is trying to make Ryan confess his lies about that night.

Segment 20-21

RL: (::) I wasn’t lying to a certain extent (er hesitation) I over-exaggerated what (er hesitation) was happened and (::) like I said I can’t say if it was a robbery or anything like that (,) I’m not the person (,) to say (,) all I know is that what happened and I over-exaggerated some parts and I didn’t say everything that I needed to say(.) (er hesitation) (,) and you know (,) I take full (er) like I said I take full responsibility and it was my fault (,) those swimmers (,) they came out with statements of their own (,) and I (,) like I said (,) I over-exaggerated some parts and (,) – it was my fault...

BR: - But you didn't tell them that's - the story that we'll have to keep – up the story

However, when Ryan takes the floor and answers, he says that he was “not lying to a certain extent”. The choice of the expression ‘to a certain extent’ is rather thought-provoking. He is clearly trying not to commit himself again with any declaration that could be refuted in the future; as we see when Ryan chooses to utter “I can’t say if it was a robbery or anything like that (,) I’m not the person (,) to say”. He firmly repeats the same discourse. It is important to mention that he had lost much sponsorship due to this event in Rio, so it is noticeable that he is trying to stay away from more trouble by being more neutral and that may be the reason why he only repeats the words that he was probably told to say during interviews – “I over-exaggerated”; “I take full responsibility” and “That’s my fault” are some examples.

When he utters “those swimmers (,) they came out with statements of their own” he tries not to be responsible for what the other swimmers have said, as well as to protect his teammates from future consequences of what he says. It is crucial to mention that he was blamed for leaving his teammates suffer some consequences in Brazil alone – the other swimmers were taken out of the airplane and to be taken to the police station to testify about the facts. Because of this, he had to redeem himself so that he would not lose any other sponsorship.

There is overlap in this part of the interview (Ryan and the reporter speak together) when Ryan utters “*I over-exaggerated some parts and (,) – it was my fault*” in the segment 20, the reporter utters “*But you didn't tell them that's*”. The reporter shows a certain annoyance for Ryan’s insistence in repeating the same words choice. He interrupts Ryan and asks if he “didn’t tell them that’s the story that we’ll have to keep – up the story”. This overlapping of utterances shows another attempt from the reporter to make Ryan stop repeating the same discourse over again. This constant repetition suggests that he had been advised on what to say during interviews.

Segments 24 - 26

RL: - So (: :) No. All I did was (er hesitation) I (: :) over-exaggerated the story (,) and (:) I shouldn't've (,) That's all I can say (,) and I take full responsibility (,) I just want the people of Bra-Brazil to really know how truly sorry I'm and (,) you guys have been great (,) to me (,) to my country (,) to everyone around the world (,) I just know (,) like

going out (:) walking out to my finals in my swimming (smile) I had fans from Brazil cheering up – (:) –

BR: - A LOT -

RL: - and I don't want this incident (,) this (:) immature (:) intoxication (:) to (,) be (,) judged (,) (,) from (,) the people of Brazil (,) or across the world because (,) that's not who I am (,) and I want them to know that (,) I care and (,) I just made (,) a human mistake (.)

When Ryan utters “that’s all I can say”, he is sending the meta-message that he will not say anything different from what he had already said; it is an important remark by Ryan, as it is an example of Ryan’s imposition of power upon the Brazilian reporter.

Ryan changes the frame of the conversation when he utters “I just want the people of Brazil to really know how truly sorry I’m and (,) you guys have been great (,) to me (,) to my country (,) to everyone around the world (,) I just know (,) like going out (:) walking out to my finals in my swimming (smile) I had fans from Brazil”. He is trying to bring the listener (the Brazilian people represented by the Brazilian reporter) closer to his discourse by apologizing/ being grateful and praising Brazil and the Brazilian people to build rapport and erase any failure he had committed before, so he could bring sponsors back. Ryan has an awkward smile on his facial expression when he utters “I had fans from Brazil” which reinforces his attempt to build rapport in the interaction, the rule of camaraderie by Lackoff (1990). However, the reporter chooses to keep the distance when he chooses to interrupt Ryan with a loud utterance “a lot”. This lexical choice made by the reporter causes a break in Ryan’s attempt to build rapport. We see that Ryan immediately gazes the floor and his smile fades away. It is also evident the relation of power in the interview and how the reporter sets the rule of rapport in the interaction.

Ryan continues uttering “- and I don’t want this incident”. Right after this utterance, there is a long pause that is quite important for the analysis of his understandings. Ryan pauses right after the word choice “incident” and had an interesting facial expression. It seemed that he was gazing someone to his left side and then, he changes his word choice to “immature intoxication”. Analyzing the definition of ‘incident’ in law, it means an event that was neither planned and nor desired, but able to be prevented. The

choice of this word had to be avoided if Ryan wanted to be acquitted from any sanction that would be imposed on him, that is why he had to pause and change to “immature intoxication” – a less troublesome choice for him. It is very significant to observe his prosody in this utterance: he pauses between each word choice. This suggests that he was looking for the words carefully to not make a wrong choice again, which indicates that he was being coached on how to behave and on what to say.

Segments 29-36

“BR: Um Hum (.) what do you think of Brazil?”

RL: - It’s a very beautiful (.) Brazil is a very beautiful-beautiful place (.) The people there are amazing (.) they are kind and sweet (er hesitation) it’s a place (er hesitation) where I (.) would consider going (.) back (smile) if they (.) would ever let me (.)

BR: Um hum (erm) before going to Brazil (.) did you have a prejudice?-

RL: (.) No (erm)

BR: Did it (.) when you were there (.) did it change (.) did it change what you (.) think of Brazil?

RL: I mean (.) (er hesitation) of course you hear stories about going to different countries (.) I mean that’s a given and you have to take all the precautions (.) if you are from another culture going to a different country (.) so (.) we took precautions (.) but when we were there (.) I was telling people back home (.) I’m like (.) it’s beautiful (.) this place is amazing (.) people were beautiful (.) nice (.) the venues were perfect (.) the accommodates (.) the athletes and spectators awesomely (.)-

BR: - Did you like the games? – Do you do you – think they were successful?

RL: - I did (.) I think - I – I really do (.) I really think the Olympic Games were successful (.) and (.) Brazil did an amazing job (.) and (.) my hat goes off to you - (gaze away)”

At this part of the interview, the reporter changes the frame of interaction. He focuses on grasping Ryan’s understandings about Brazil; its culture, its people and the Olympic Games in Rio. The reporter is very direct with his questions; nonetheless, Ryan continues adopting the same strategy as before. He makes interesting choices of words

to relate to him and to Brazil. First, he lists the people/institutions he wants to apologize and then he chooses intensifiers like “very” and “110%” to emphasize his apologies and make it more believable for the audience. When he talks about Brazil, the Brazilian people and the Olympics in Rio, he chooses positive words to relate to them; like – “amazing”; “perfect”; “awesome”; “successful”; “nice”; “beautiful”; “kind” and “sweet”. These words are chosen combined with a smile. At this moment, Ryan is trying to bring the audience close to him through the rule “be friendly” (TANNEN, 1984, p. 17). He is clearly interested in relieving possible consequences that would fall on him due to his attitudes that night. He is worried about the sponsorships that he had lost as well.

Segments 37-44

“BR: why did you change the version of the story so many times?”

RL: I just (er hesitation) I over-exaggerated (er hesitation) a part of it (,) the very first part I was intoxicated (er hesitation) (,) (er hesitation) I was a little frightened (,) I mean (,) having a gun pointed to you (,) (a face that he doesn't care) in no matter what kind of way it was (,) (er hesitation) it's frightening and I was scared but you know I definitely take full responsibility for my actions-

BR: - But when we see you getting back to the Olympic Village, we see you taking pictures with the Olympic Rings (,) we see you playing with your friends (,) like (,) when you get in (,) you didn't seem to get scared (,) at all –

RL: - I mean (,) I – I at the point that happened (,) we were shocked (,) and we were like (,) I think we were kind of still in shock but we were like trying (,) to forget about it (,) and we were like (:) (Shoulders up) and we were still intoxicated (,) I mean (,) I'm not saying (gaze down) alcohol is an excuse (,) it's not (er hesitation) (,) specially for my actions (,)(er hesitation) but (,) we were heavily intoxicated – because

BR: - next day you went on a – TV program

RL: It was hours – It was hours later so I was still intoxicated –

BR: - OK, so you didn't go to sleep and-

RL: No.”

At the end of the interview, the reporter changes the frame of the conversation one more time. However, Ryan is keeping to the same speech as before – the same word choices; for instance “over-exaggerated”; “intoxicated”; “gun”; “frightened”; “I take full responsibility”.

The repetition of Ryan’s word choice is quite present in the whole interview. It is very important for Ryan that people believe in his discourse, so he is always repeating it. Another reason why Ryan uses repetition in his discourse is that he had been coached on what to say and how to react in this interview; so he could not say more than he was told to. Keeping this in mind, we see a reporter that is trying to represent a whole nation and confront Ryan on his truths and understanding about Brazil and its culture/people; while Ryan is always trying to escape from the reporter’s questions, always using the same rehearsed discourse with its repeated justifications for every single question the reporter had for him.

5- Discussion

“More important than a person’s ‘language’ and ‘culture’ might be the socioeconomic, historical or ideological subject positions that people take and that get expressed through the multiple symbolic systems they choose to use, be they verbal, visual, musical or virtual, to represent and act upon the world and others in multiple ecological dimensions.”

(KRAMSCH, 2011, p. 311)

The purpose in this chapter is to discuss each element and compare how they appear in each interview/video. In order to write this chapter, I decided to divide it into parts of discussion about:

5.1- Body Language;

5.2- Word and grammar choices;

5.3- Pauses, hesitation and emphasis;

5.4- Overlap and interruptions.

5.5 - The position of the American Committee

5.1 - Body Language

In the first video, though Ryan starts the interview with his arms crossed on the chest, appearing to be uncomfortable with the topic, as soon as he gets the floor, he changes his body language completely. He uncrosses his arms, grins and his gestures are more confident and assertive as he controls the interaction. He combines abrupt gestures, such as, opening up his arms in a gesture of doubt, discredit and refusal, making use of the gesture of a gun at the reporter’s forehead, putting his hands up in a gesture of surrendering (with arrogant grins and smiles) in order to send the message of superiority and power. The Reporter here is passive to Ryan’s body language, only reacting to it; as when Ryan had a gesture of a gun pointed to the reporter’s forehead and the reporter put his hands on his chin in a gesture of surprise and threat.

On the other hand, if we compare his body language to the second and third interviews, we see a very different Ryan Lochte. In the second video, as it had been discovered that his first version was not true, he had to change his body language to a more

apprehensive one. He gestures less, does not smile or grins but, he has his eyes more attentive to the interaction. In this interview, he had to keep a lower profile, so he appears to be more of a victim of the situation. He constantly frowns, squeezes his eyes, raises his eyebrows and nods to send a message of surprise, disbelief and discredit. He is more passive toward the facts, so he sends a message that he is not responsible for its consequences. Ryan also gazes at the floor in a regretful reaction towards unexpected and uncomfortable questions. The reporter here is more active than in the first interview – he confronts Ryan by gazing him, causing Ryan to react to his confrontations. In the second interview, Ryan reacts more regretful towards the American population, whereas, in the third one, he appears to be more regretful as well as friendlier. He smiles when talking about Brazil, its population and culture which is not present in the other interviews. Ryan is much more passive in this interview than in the previous ones. He is constantly reacting towards the reporter's body language that is much more assertive than the other reporters, which shows that the reporter is constantly standing up to Ryan. The reporter makes use of body language to hold the frame of interaction. He is always gazing Ryan and constantly making use of gestures that confront the swimmer, for instance, a correcting gesture that he makes use when he confronts Ryan about the translator. On the other hand, Ryan appears to have his face much more threatened in this interview, as he is constantly gazing the floor in a gesture of shame or being lost in his rehearsed speech.

5.2 - Word and grammar choice

During the first interview, we see a much more aggressive Ryan Lochte than in the other interviews. His lexical and grammatical choices were constantly belligerent concerning his understandings of the event. Concerning the security guards (at that point he did not recognize them as officers) he had generalizing words to refer to them. He also had discredited lexical choices when referring to the police's official documents. When he was reporting the guards' discourse, he had a much more aggressive tone than in the other interviews: he chose "get down on the ground", whereas in the second interview he chose "sit down on the ground". When referring to himself at the night of the event, he built a brave and uncorrupted picture of himself, as he had chosen "I refused" followed by "not guilty" and "nothing that we did". When he uses "I was like", he is transporting the audience to the moment of the event, making

the discourse more vivid and believable. The reporter in this interview is completely passive to Ryan's discourse.

By analyzing the second interview, we see a less aggressive Ryan Lochte. As he wants to attenuate his attitudes, and thus, the consequences of them; he chose softer words, such as when he had the opportunity to comment on the police discourse about his attitudes at that night. He substituted the words "angry" "belligerent" and "aggressive" to "upset", in order to soften his responsibilities. Another example of attenuation that is quite interesting is when he chose "sit down" rather than "get down". It creates a much more friendly speech, weakening his previous attitudes and then, saving some sponsorships from loss. He was also quite less assertive than in the previous interview. He had grammar choices that implied that he was not sure about the events, having words like "intoxicated" as a justification of his acts and uncertainty. However, he never uses the word "lie". He had an interesting choice for "over-exaggerate", and this is quite important mentioning here. If he had said "lie", he could have had juridical issues to solve with the Brazilian police – as it is a crime to lie to the police. The reporter here has an important role. He is saving the NBC's face, as it was quite much exposed to critics due to the first interview (when NBC broadcasted Ryan's supposed robbery without checking if they were true). The reporter is quite interested in detaching his image from Ryan's. He was constantly making use of expressions like "as you said". Moreover, the reporter had much more interest in confronting Ryan's beliefs and attitudes at that night, which did not happen in the previous interview.

In the third interview, we could see Ryan's repeated word and grammar choice. He would constantly and insistently use words such as "*over-exaggerated*", "*intoxicated*", "*gun*", "*human mistake*". The repetition implies that he had a rehearsed discourse and that he could not change any word of it. His discourse is so repetitive that annoys the reporter and we could see it through his facial expressions and word choices. The reporter in the third interview is much more aggressive than the others in the previous ones; he has much more assertive word choices as well. His intention is to confront Ryan and make him confess that it was a lie. The reporter questions his intentions and corrects the swimmer when he is trying to justify or attenuate his attitudes at that night. Ryan, as well as in the other video, has word choices that carry a tone of uncertainty to his discourse, for instance, "I can't say what it was". The purpose is to mitigate possible consequences for him, as well as not to confront the Brazilian reporter who was there representing the whole country. The word choices in this interview marked the power

relations in this interaction; the reporter and Ryan were constantly confronting each other.

5.3 - Pauses, hesitation and emphasis

“What do prosodic contextualization cues signal in discourse? Viewed from the perspective of interaction, prosodic phenomena can be thought of as furnishing a format or design for turns at talk. (...) In other words, prosodic contextualization cues help interactants make inferences about turn-taking and floor management, on the one hand, and about what actions or activities are being carried out, how they are being carried out, and how this might impinge upon participants’ social image or face, on the other”

(COUPER-KUHLEN, 2015, p. 85,86)

In the first interview we notice Ryan making use of pauses in order to give emphasis in the story that he wanted people to believe in. He also makes use of repetition in between pauses in order to have a strong appeal to the hearer’s sympathy. He barely hesitates as he was assertive in his speech. During the second interview, we see that Ryan has more frequent hesitations, due to the fact that he was being confronted by the reporter. He also made use of pauses to give emphasis on his speech. However, pauses were used to emphasize his innocence, as in “*that’s not (.) me*”. He wanted to reinforce the meta-message that he is not like the Brazilian police had described: “*angry, belligerent and aggressive*”. The reporter also used pauses and stress in order to give emphasis on the meta-message that he wanted to send: that NBC does not agree with his attitudes. For the third interview, we notice that Ryan makes long pauses because the reporter is Brazilian and the swimmer is facing a much more aggressive and assertive interviewer. His hesitations are much more present as he is constantly looking for the correct words to use, and is having his face threatened throughout the interaction as he is questioned and confronted by the reporter all the time. Ryan also uses pauses in order to escape from the reporter’s questions, for example, when they were too compromising for him. In the third interview, the reporter constantly paused and stressed the words in order to give emphasis to the meta-message that he wanted to sell: that Ryan had lied.

5.4 - Overlaps and interruptions

During the first interview we barely see any significant interruption or overlapping as Ryan is controlling the interaction. In the second interview, we see more frequent interruptions and overlapping. The reporter interrupts Ryan to keep the frame of the

conversation: distancing NBC's discourse from Ryan's. The swimmer tries to interrupt the reporter always trying to change the frame of the conversation, but he doesn't succeed. The reporter raises his tone of voice and continues holding the floor.

In the third interview there are more over-lappings, interruptions and raise of tone of voice than in the others. The reporter interrupts Ryan not only to control the interview, but also to set the words in the interaction. There are some moments in which the reporter chooses to interrupt Ryan in order to correct his word choice. There is an overlapping when Ryan utters "we wanted to get out of there" while the reporter utters "wanted to leave". There is a significant difference in the choice of these words. The first has the meaning of escaping, while the second does not. The reporter interrupts Ryan to prevent him from repeating the same words, whereas Ryan interrupts the reporter to make him stop confronting his truth. Interruption is another important strategy of power that the reporter makes use. When Ryan tries to change the frame of the conversation to a more convenient one, the reporter raises his tone of voice and interrupts him in an attempt to keep the frame of the conversation.

5.5 - The position of the American Committee

Another important fact that is necessary mentioning concerns the decision of the American Olympic Committee on suspending Lochte for 10 months due to the incident that became an embarrassment for the American people. He would also be banned from a competition that would be held in July 2017 in Budapest. It is quite relevant mentioning this to highlight that the American people neither accepted his behavior nor subscribed to his discourse.

6- Conclusion

In this paper I analyzed how Ryan Lochte verbalized his understandings about the Brazilian Culture and debated how he positioned himself in three interactions. The analysis of these three different interviews with three different interviewers but the same interviewee showed us that each situational and cultural context demanded from Lochte the usage of different linguistic features such as body language, word and grammar choices, pauses, hesitation and emphasis patterns, overlap and interruptions usage. And each choice of these features plays a significant role in each interaction, reflecting distinct power relations among participants, and therefore, reverberating in a different tone for Ryan's discourse.

“He may wish them to think highly of him, or to think that he thinks highly of them, or to perceive how in fact he feels toward them, or to obtain no clear-cut impression; he may wish to ensure sufficient harmony so that the interaction can be sustained, or to defraud, get rid of, confuse, mislead, antagonize, or insult them.”

(GOFFMAN, 1956, p. 2)

According to Goffman, we can say that despite the personal objective that Ryan had in mind as well as his reasons for meeting his objectives, he will be interested to regulate the audience's attitudes as well as their analysis of him by determining the interpretation that they will elaborate of the event. This way, he can manipulate this interpretation by exposing himself somehow to convey the idea that influences the audience to behave in line with his intentions. “Thus, when an individual appears in the presence of others, there will usually be some reason for him to mobilize his activity so that it will convey an impression to others which it is in his interests to convey.” Goffman (1956:3)

“(...) it is important to remember that in many ways culture and discourse are inseparable. Without talk and interaction, we would not have cultures, and our cultures inform and are created through our everyday conversations.”

(KIESLING, 2015, p. 635)

This study also shows a significant relation with these differences in his discourses and his intentions with them (meta-message). The data shows that Ryan made use of various linguistic strategies in order to adapt himself to different power relations each interview demanded from him. This is quite important to say, as he was interested in defending

his version of the story and getting rid of strict consequences for him and his career. So, understanding his choices as strategies, we can better understand his intentions with his discourse as well as his ideology concerning the Brazilian culture.

Considering the dialogic aspect of language and culture, this study starts a reflexive understanding about the importance of power relations in language – how culture can be mirrored in language and vice-versa. As a final point, we hope that this study throws some light on the matter of prejudice in discourse as well as that it continues debating about the issue, so, we can better understand how language in interaction portrays one's ideology about a specific culture. Thinking about a follow-up on this study, we can analyze the reporters' understandings about the Brazilian culture as a whole. It is quite important to proceed with this debate because it may empower future researchers to continue investigating about the issue, and then, we can de-construct to co-construct a new understanding for pre-conceived discourses and prejudiced ideology in our society.

7- REFERENCES

- A. VAN DIJK, TEUN . Critical Discourse Analysis. *In*: E. HAMILTON, HEIDI & TANNEN, DEBORAH & SCHIFFRIN, DEBORAH (Org.). The Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Oxford: JohnWiley & Sons, Inc, 2015
- CAMERON, D. Sequence and Structure: Conversation Analysis. *In*: CAMERON, DEBORAH (Org.). Working with spoken discourse. London: SAGE Publications, 2001.
- CAMERON, D. Small differences, big differences: interactional sociolinguistic. *In*: CAMERON, DEBORAH (Org.). Working with spoken discourse. London: SAGE Publications, 2001.
- COUPER-KUHLEN, ELIZABETH . Intonation and Discourse. *In*: E. HAMILTON, HEIDI & TANNEN, DEBORAH & SCHIFFRIN, DEBORAH (Org.). The Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Oxford: JohnWiley & Sons, Inc, 2015
- Entrevista completa do nadador americano Ryan Lochte. URL: <http://g1.globo.com/globo-news/jornal-globo-news/videos/v/veja-a-entrevista-completa-do-nadador-americano-ryan-lochte/5250644/>
- F. KIESLING, SCOTT. Cross-cultural and Intercultural Communication and Discourse Analysis. *In*: E. HAMILTON, HEIDI & TANNEN, DEBORAH & SCHIFFRIN, DEBORAH (Org.). The Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Oxford: JohnWiley & Sons, Inc, 2015
- FAIRCLOUGH, NORMAN. Language and power. New York: Longman, 1989.
- GOFFMAN, E. Introduction. *In*: The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Edinburg: University of Edinburg, 1956.
- HALL, KIRA & NILEP, CHAD. Code-Switching, Identity, and Globalization. *In*: E. HAMILTON, HEIDI & TANNEN, DEBORAH & SCHIFFRIN, DEBORAH (Org.). The Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Oxford: JohnWiley & Sons, Inc, 2015

J. GUMPERZ, JOHN. Interactional Sociolinguistics: A Personal Perspective. *In*: E. HAMILTON, HEIDI & TANNEN, DEBORAH & SCHIFFRIN, DEBORAH (Org.). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: JohnWiley & Sons, Inc, 2015

KRAMSCH, C. (2011). Language and Culture. *In*: J. Simpson, ed., *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. pp.305-317.

MARTIN, J. R. Cohesion and Texture. *In*: E. HAMILTON, HEIDI & TANNEN, DEBORAH & SCHIFFRIN, DEBORAH (Org.). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: JohnWiley & Sons, Inc, 2015

MASCHLER, Y & SCHIFFRIN, D. Discourse Markers: Language, Meaning, and Context. *In*: E. HAMILTON, HEIDI & TANNEN, DEBORAH & SCHIFFRIN, DEBORAH (Org.). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: JohnWiley & Sons, Inc, 2015

MITHUN, MARIANNE. Discourse and Grammar. *In*: E. HAMILTON, HEIDI & TANNEN, DEBORAH & SCHIFFRIN, DEBORAH (Org.). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: JohnWiley & Sons, Inc, 2015

Ryan Lochte Talks To Billy Bush About Being Held Up At Gunpoint | TODAY. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IxrYj0yCyLE>

Ryan Lochte: 'My Immature, Intoxicated Behavior Tarnished' A 'Great' Games (Full Interview) | TODAY. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-1CIJ-r5dGA>

SIMPSON, P. & MAYR, A. (Org.). Introduction: Key topics in the study of Language and Power. *In*: *Language and Power*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

TANNEN, DEBORAH. Conversational Style: Theoretical Background. *In*: *Conversational Style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

TANNEN, DEBORAH. Cross-cultural communication. *CATESOL Occasional Papers*, v. 10, p. 1-16, 1984.

TANNEN, DEBORAH. The power of talk: who gets heard and why. *Harvard Business Review*, p. 138-148, 1995.

TANNEN, DEBORAH. The workings of conversational style. *In*: TANNEN, DEBORAH (Org.). That's not what I meant! How Conversational Styles makes or breaks relationships. New York: Happer, 2011.

TANNEN, DEBORAH. Who is interrupting? Issues of Dominance and Control. *In*: You just don't understand: Woman and men in conversation. [s.l.]: Quill, 2001.

U. PHILIPS, SUSAN. Language Ideologies. *In*: E. HAMILTON, HEIDI & TANNEN, DEBORAH & SCHIFFRIN, DEBORAH (Org.). The Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Oxford: JohnWiley & Sons, Inc, 2015

8- APPENDIX 1 - Interview 1

One day after the event

MR1= male reporter 1

MR2= male reporter 2

FR= female

reporter

RL = Ryan Lochte

IN THE STUDIO

1. MR1: you had a big **big** exclusive yesterday-
2. MR2: Yeah you heard about this, so, when out, I went to the Christ the Redeemer-
3. MR1: right -
4. MR2: as we all do but I hiked up the mountain with my old executive producer Silverstein and Kid Hoover-
5. MR1: - How old is he?-
6. MR2: He is fifty-seven -
7. MR1: No! He is older than that; He looks it.-
8. FR: (laugh)
9. MR2: He looks terrible –
10. MR1: He really looks **bad** -
11. MR2/FR: (laugh)
12. MR2: - we hiked up the side –
13. FR: He looks awesome; he is my new boss, he looks great –
14. MR1: He doesn't! Oh WAIT! Of course you are going to say he is awesome. He's a wizened little leprechaun who just... he is horrible.-
15. FR: (laugh)
16. MR2: It's true that. He was checking his (er – hesitation) as he does, like checking his blackberry the whole time I've got –
17. MR1: He is old school! That's how he is! -
18. FR: - He's got an I-phone. He has an i-phone.
19. MR1: He's got a blackberry and an atlas!

GENERAL LAUGH

20. MR2: He says Lochte : it looks like Ryan Lochte was held at gunpoint and we all couldn't believe it and then, little while later he says, well, the IOC's now denying

that so, maybe it didn't happen and then we got down and we were heading over to the US house to do a little shopping and he says, wait a minute (.) it seems like a distraction again, it looks it **might** have happened (,) and just as I'm leaving (,) we all have our stuff with us (.) kid says (,) is that Lochte? (.) and I looked through the the (::) the (::) he's walking into us and it's Lochte with his green hair(.) I walked over and said "hey Lochte" and we got "did it happen?" and he goes "yeah, happened" co (::) co (::) come out here, come with me (,) he came out (,) we were talking on the street (,) I made a call to Silverstein (,) and I said "Rob, can you sand a crew?" and as soon as I said "can you send a crew here" I realized this is not gonna last that long

21. FR: right –

22. MR2: I crossed the street with new school with the i-phone it told the story –

23. FR: Kept taping the whole thing –

24. MR2: get tapping the whole thing -

25. FR: Yeah -

26. MR2: And, by the way, Kid's tapping the whole thing is the cover of the New York post this morning when Lochte told us this horrifying story coming back from a party with Brazilian swimmers and Thiago Pereira, the great Bra (::) Brazilian swimmer down here took them all pulled over by an unmarked car (,) no sirens on top (,) guys get out with guns and badges (,) and they go up to Lochte (,) and all the swimmers get down on the ground (.) Lochte, he tells me he goes no (,) "I'm not getting down on the ground (,) you got a gun you can use it" (,) which is **not** -

27. MR1: - Actually that's is not how you do -

28. MR2: That's what he told me and anyway (,) they took his wallet, they took his money -

29. MR1: - you got the video right? -

30. MR2: Right on the cellphone (,) here is Lochte talking about it right here.

ON THE BEACH

31. MR2: What happened? Who were you with? What time at the night? Who pulled you over? -

32. RL: - (er hesitation) I was with a couple of swimmers (er hesitation) we were coming back from the French house and we got pulled over our:: (.) taxi and (.) these guys came out with a badge (,) a police badge (,) no lights, no nothing (,) just a police badge (,) they pulled us over (,) (er hesitation) (,) they pulled out their guns (,) (er

hesitation) they told the other (er hesitation) swimmers to take down on the ground (,) they got down on the ground (,) I refused (,) I was like (,) we didn't do anything wrong (,) so (..) I'm not getting down on the ground (..) and the guy (,) pulled out his gun (,) he cockpit it (,) put it into my forehead and said (,) "get down" and I was like (,) I put my hands up (,) like (,) whatever (hands up and grin) (,) He took our money (,) he took my wallet and then –

33. MR2: He left your cellphone (,) he left your credential –

34. RL: He left my cellphone (,) he left my credential (,) but he took my wallet and took all the guys' cash.

IN THE STUDIO

35. MR1: It could have ended a lot worse -

36. FR: Thank Goodness they were all safe, I mean, that is (,) the number 1 thing they warn you against when you come to Latin or South America countries this whole thing (,) there is this (,) (er hesitation) (,) this band of (,) of people who do this (,) where they bump your car (,) and then (,) you're forced to get out of your car to see if there is some damage to the car and that's when they hold you up. If you run a car in any - South American country ...

37. MR2: - That's what they - said they said they got pulled over they said "hey show me your insurance"

38. FR: - yeah it's exactly (,)that's the trick –

39. MR2: - He says "give me the money"

40. FR: - It's interesting that the cab driver from here (Brazil) (,) would stop (,) and pull over and do that – so -

41. MR2: And listen! Don't be a hero (,) - I mean (,) anywhere in your life somebody says –

42. MR1/FR: NO!

43. MR2: - "get down on the ground" (,) they got a – gun -

44. FR: - Yeah! -

45. MR1: -We get another wallet, you get another - phone -

46. FR: - Right, exactly.

9- Appendix 2 - Interview 2

After the police had discovered it was not a robbery

AR= American Reporter

RL= Ryan Lochte

1. AR: What was your tone? (,) The police said in their press conference (,) that you were **angry** (,) that you were belligerent (,) and perhaps (,) that the security guard was worried that you might get aggressive. Is that fair? (,) a fair characterization? –
2. RL: Not (,) me getting aggressive (,) I mean (,) that's not really (,) my (::) that's not me (,) is getting (er hesitation) mad and angry and wanted to fight or anything like that (er hesitation) but I was (er hesitation) I was upset that (,) we got pulled up in a taxi for (,) I thought something that nothing (,) like (,) there is no reason for a gun to be (,) pulled out (,) for us (,) for (,) doing nothing –
3. AR: Gunnar (,) in his statement to the police said that you got into a heated discussion with that – security guard –
4. RL: was upset (,) there was no reason for us to be seating down (::) (nod) with a gun pointed to us fooor (,) nothing that we did –
5. AR: But at any time during that exchange Ryan when you were **that** upset (,) and terrified (,) like you've just said (,) Do-Do you think you post a threat (,) to that security guard (,) that would have (,) made him believe that he needed to continue (,) to have that gun out of his holster? -
6. RL: - I think (,) when I got up (,) and I started (::) you know being like (,) this is (:) using some words (:) this is (::) being us (:) we shouldn't be (,) like (,) treated like this (,) like (,) there is no way (,) like (,) we wanted to go back in the car we wanted go back (,) like (,) that's (,) that's why I got heated (,) and (:) (nod) you know the-the guy could've probably drawled (?) his gun from that (:) and once he did you can definetly see me go like this (his hands up) (,) and (,) that's when (,) we sat down - and
7. AR: - I – I – guess that what I am trying to get out of this is the first version the story you told (,) Ryan (,) was much more (,) about the mean streets or Rio –
8. RL: - Yeah-
9. AR: And the version that we are hearing now is much more about (,) a **negotiated** - settlement –
10. RL: um hum –
11. AR: to cover up some **dumb** behavior –

12. RL: - (.) and (:) that's why I'm taking full responsibility for it (.) it's because I over-exaggerated that story and if I never did-done that (,) we wouldn't be in this mess -
13. AR: What about the people of Rio you know? They dealt with **all** the headlines going into the games (,) –
14. RL: - and (gaze down) –
15. AR: - **About** pollution and violence and crime and here comes the story (,) with one of the highest profile US Athlete saying “I got held up at a gun point (:) on the street of Rio” (.) What would you say to them now? –
16. RL: I am (er hesitation) (,) and my deepest apologies (sigh) (.) (er hesitation) (,) they put on a great games (er hesitation) they did everything (::) the people (er hesitation) (.) of Rio of Brazil (,) the authorities (,) everyone there they put on a great games (,) and (,) my (,) immature (,) intoxicated behavior (er hesitation) (::) tarnished that a little –
17. AR: - When you saw the news coverage of (,) Gunnar and Jack (,) being taken from that plane in the airport (,) and you **knew** and you you've just said to me “they didn't damage anything –
18. RL: Yeah –
19. AR: in that gas station –
20. RL: - and – and –
21. AR: **AND** you were seated at home (,) in the United States (,) safe and sound (,) how did it make you feel? –
22. RL: - (,) Hurt (,) I mean (,) I (::) I let my team down (,) (er hesitation) you know (::) (sneeze) (:) I wanted to be there (,) like (,) I don't want them to think that (,) I left (:) (er hesitation) (,) and left them dry (,) cause (,) I mean they are my teammates I wanted definitely to be there (:) (sneeze) (,) and I wanted to help out anywhere I could (,) so (,) I just wanted to make sure that they were home safe before I came out (sneeze) and talked (:) and (,) you know (,) I'm really sorry about – I'm embarrassed (:) (er hesitation) for myself (,) my family (,) specially those guys (,) the USA swimming (sneeze) (,) the whole Olympic Games (er hesitation) everyone watching (,) (er hesitation) this is just (::) I was immature and made a (,) stupid mistake – I'm human I made a mistake and (,) I definitely learned from this (sigh)

10- Appendix 3 - Interview 3 – Jornal Nacional

BR = Brazilian reporter RL = Ryan Lochte

1. BR: I wanna talk to you about Rio (,) because er... the government of Brazil spent millions (,) to assure nothing bad would happen in that area –
2. RL: - yeah -
3. BR: during the Olympic Games (,) and your case was the only one that got (,) highly publicized-
4. RL: yeah-
5. BR: er Do you feel the weight of that responsibility? -
6. RL: (er hesitation) I do (er hesitation) I mean (,) If I (::) If I didn't **over-exaggerated** the story (,) and (,) if I told the entire story (,) none of this would've happened (er hesitation) you know (er hesitation) I was coming from the France House (,) I was highly intoxicated (,) annnd I made (,) immature (,) calls (,) and if that didn't happen, none of this would've happened (,) and people would not be (,) all over the world (::) tuned in this story (,) They would be watching the games what they came there to do (,) I ripped the poster off the wall in the gas station (,) and coming out (,) the security guards (er hesitation) had a gun (,) we stepped out of the taxi cab (er hesitation) the guns were pointed at us (,) and (...) one of the guys (,) the translator guy or someone came from the gas station to help out saying that "you have to pay money" (,) so (,) we (,) had to give them money so (,) a gun was pointed at us (,) we had to give them money (,) so you can call it a robbery (,) you can call it extortion or you can (,) say that we (,) had to (,) pay money for the damage of that poster (,) I can't say what it was (er hesitation) all I know is that we were frightened because a gun was involved and was pointed at us (er hesitation) but we are (er hesitation) we then after that was sold and done (,) we went back to the village and we were (erm) safe-
7. BR: What the (erm) the translator that was there said was that you agreed in paying them money because you **knew** the trouble you were making there and you wanted to leave – just wanted to leave
8. RL: - yeah we wanted to get out of there
9. BR: There wasn't extortion - you agreed to pay
10. RL: - Yeah I can't say what it was, all I know is that all that happened there was a gun in our direction (,) and we had to give them money (,) whether it was to pay them the damage or anything (,) like (,) we had to do that and we were (er) let go.

11. BR: You **knew** they were security guards and it was because of the confusion you guys had just made before –
12. RL: I mean (,) any person that gets a gun pulled over (,) you are frightened (,) you are scared (,) and (,) we had (::) we were scared (,) we gave them money and they let us go (,) end of story (,) that was it (,) I take all the responsibility (,) this was (er hesitation) my fault (,) It was something that (er hesitation) I did (,) (er hesitation) I ripped this (erm) poster off the wall (erm) It was my fault (,) so I take full responsibility for this –
13. BR: Why on the next day you went on TV to say it was a robbery? Why didn't – you just keep it down? –
14. RL: - **I** (erm) I over-exaggerated the story you know that -
15. BR: - **WHY?**-
16. RL: It was my fault – I don't know! (er hesitation) I still (er hesitation) I still wonder that to my (,) like to myself everyday now (,) since then like (,) I (,) Brazil doesn't deserve that (er hesitation) you guys put on an amazing Olympics (,) Everyone in Brazil (,) the people (,) (er hesitation) (,) the fans (er hesitation) everyone that put on (er hesitation) the Brazil Olympics like (,) it was amazing (,) and (er hesitation) you guys didn't deserve that kind of publicity (er hesitation) and (,) it was my (,) immaturity (,) that (,) caused and that's why I'm saying (,) that's why I'm really sorry about that and it was my fault and I take full responsibility (,) you guys don't deserve it (,) you guys did a wonderful job (,) everyone in Rio (,) in Brazil (,) all over the world that helped to put this game together (er hesitation) did an amazing job (,) And (,) I take full responsibility and want the people in Brazil to know how truly sorry I am (,) it's an embarrassment for myself (,) for my family and for my country (er hesitation) I was (er hesitation) I was (er hesitation) I was highly intoxicated (er hesitation) and it was (,) I'm a **human** (,) I made a mistake (,) and (,) one thing I did learned (um) I learned a lot from this I know this will never happen again –
17. BR: What do you think your mistake was?-
18. RL: My mistake was (,) over-exaggerating what really happened – and not telling –
19. BR: - you were not lying?
20. RL: (::) I wasn't lying to a certain extent (er hesitation) I over-exaggerated what (er hesitation) was happened and (::) like I said I can't say if it was a robbery or anything like that (,) I'm not the person (,) to say (,) all I know is that what happened

and I over-exaggerated some parts and I didn't say everything that I needed to say(.) (er hesitation) (.) and you know (,) I take full (er) like I said I take full responsibility and it was my fault (.) those swimmers (,) they came out with statements of their own (,) and I (,) like I said (,) I over-exaggerated some parts and (,) – it was my fault...

21. BR: - But you didn't tell them that's the story that we'll have to keep – up the story

22. RL: - NO! We didn't – have communication.

23. BR: - So you didn't come to - the police?

24. RL: - So (::) No. All I did was (er hesitation) I (::) over-exaggerated the story (,) and (:) I shouldn't've (.) That's all I can say (,) and I take full responsibility (,) I just want the people of Bra-Brazil to really know how truly sorry I'm and (,) you guys have been great (.) to me (,) to my country (,) to everyone around the world (.) I just know (,) like going out (:) walking out to my finals in my swimming (smile) I had fans from Brazil cheering up – (::) –

25. BR: - **A LOT** -

26. RL: - and I don't want this incident (,) this (::) immature (:) intoxication (:) to (,) be (,) judged (,) (.) from (,) the people of Brazil (,) or across the world because (,) that's not who I am (,) and I want them to know that (,) I care and (,) I just made (,) a human mistake (.)

27. BR: Do you apologize? Wha-wha-what do you say to the people of Brazil? I just give you (smile) a chance of saying.

28. RL: To (,) the gas station owner (,) to (.) the Brazilian police (:) to the people of Rio (,) and to the people of Brazil that everyone that came together to put what a wonderful games on (,) I just want to say (,) I'm truly (,) 110% (,) I'm sorry (,) and it (,) it won't happen again (,) and I learned from and (,) I just want you guys to know that (,) I love you guys (,) you guys treated me with (.) so much respect (,) and I'm sorry (,) that (,) my (er hesitation) immaturity (:)(er hesitation) was cased all this (,) all this hash(??) (::)

29. BR: Um Hum (,) what do you think of Brazil?

30. RL: - It's a very beautiful (,) Brazil is a very beautiful-beautiful place (.) The people there are amazing (,) they are kind and sweet (er hesitation) it's a place (er hesitation) where I (,) would consider going (,) back (smile) if they (,) would ever let me (.)

31. BR: Um hum (erm) before going to Brazil (,) did you have a prejudice?-

32. RL: (.) No (erm)
33. BR: Did it (,) when you were there (,) did it change (,) did it change what you (,) think of Brazil?
34. RL: I mean (,) (er hesitation) of course you hear stories about going to different countries (,) I mean that's a given and you have to take all the precautions (,) if you are from another culture going to a different country (,) so (,) we took precautions (,) but when we were there (,) I was telling people back home (,) I'm like (,) it's beautiful (,) this place is amazing (,) people were beautiful (,) nice (,) the venues were perfect (,) the accommodates (,) the athletes and spectators awesomely (.)-
35. BR: - Did you like the games? – Do you do you – think they were successful?
36. RL: - I did (,) I think - I – I really do (,) I really think the Olympic Games were successful (,) and (,) Brazil did an amazing job (,) and (,) my hat goes off to you - (gaze away)
37. BR: why did you change the version of the story so many times?
38. RL: I just (er hesitation) I over-exaggerated (er hesitation)a part of it (,) the very first part I was intoxicated (er hesitation) (,) (er hesitation) I was a little frightened (,) I mean (,) having a gun pointed to you (,) (a face that he doesn't care) in no matter what kind of way it was (,) (er hesitation) it's frightening and I was scared but you know I definitely take full responsibility for my actions-
39. BR: - But when we see you getting back to the Olympic Village, we see you taking pictures with the Olympic Rings (,) we see you playing with your friends (,) like (,) when you get in (,) you didn't seem to get scared (,) at all –
40. RL: - I mean (,) I –I at the point that happened (,) we were shocked (,) and we were like (,) I think we were kind of still in shock but we were like trying (,) to forget about it (,) and we were like (:) (Shoulders up) and we were still intoxicated (,) I mean (,) I'm not saying (gaze down) alcohol is an excuse (,) it's not (er hesitation) (,) specially for my actions (,)(er hesitation) but (,) we were heavily intoxicated – because
41. BR: - next day you went on a – TV program
42. RL: It was hours – It was hours later so I was still intoxicated –
43. BR: OK, so you didn't go to sleep and-
44. RL: No.