Delicate Questioning Practices in Broadcast Talk*

Jieun Lee
(University of Hawai'i at Manoa)

From a conversation analytic perspective, this study aims to explore
how the talk show host accomplishes delicate questioning practices
through the employment of the directly or hypothetically quoted reported
speech as well as syntactic and multimodal resources. For the analysis,
the third-party quotation, the anonymous party quotation and the non-
co-present TV audience quotation are examined. In quoting the third-
party or the anonymous party, the host claims less knowledgeable epis-
temic stance and solicits the stories from the guest speakers (or more
knowledgeable speakers). In quoting the non-co-present TV audience,
the host establishes the tellability on the story-to-be-told and questions
possible inquiries that the audience may have for the guest speakers.
Through such practices, the host strategically approaches the guests' ru-
mors or personal questions while detaching himself from the produced
report.

Keywords: Questioning, Reported speech, Broadcast talk, TV talk
show, Conversation Analysis

1. Introduction

In everyday interaction, reported speech is one of the most fre-
quently observed conversational practices (Vološinov 1973, p. 115). As
Bakhtin (1981) pointed out in his analysis of discourse:

> In real life we hear speech about speakers and their discourse at ev-
> ery step. We can go so far as to say that in real life people talk
> most of all about what others talk about – they transmit, recall,
> weigh and pass judgement on other people's words, opinions, asser-
> tions, information; people are upset by others' words, or agree with
> them, context them, refer to them and so forth (p. 338).

Work on reported speech has been widely examined for its pervasive-
ness in a variety of research disciplines.[1] Though extensive, the study
on reported speech, within a domain of linguistics, can be con-
ceptualized in terms of three centural concerns: (a) the forms of re-
ported speech, (b) the authenticity or representation and (c) the inter-
actional functions or *what it does* (Clift and Holt 2007).

Focusing on the third concern, this study examines in detail how
the talk show host accomplishes delicate questioning practices through
the employment of the third party quotation, the anonymous party
quotation and the television audience quotation. How is reported
speech incorporated into the questioning sequence? How does the
host mark distance from the produced reports? What kinds of syntac-
tic as well as multimodal resources are employed in pursuing the ac-
tion of *delicate* questioning? These questions guide the present study.

2. Background

2.1. Television Talk Show

Among various types of media talk, the genre of news interviews
and conferences have received extensive focus (Clayman 1988, Clayman
& Heritage 2002, Greatbatch 1988, Heritage 1985, Heritage & Roth
1985, Haddington 2004, Weizman 2006), political interviews (Lauerbach
2006), television debates/discussion (Georgakopoulou & Patrona 2000).
The emergence of research on television talk show (or tabloid talk
show, celebrity talk show) discourse which lies on the interface be-
tween institutionality and reality began relatively recent (Eriksson
2010, Gregori-Signes 2000, Ilie 2001, Martínez 2003, Tanaka 2006,
Thornborrow 2001, 2007, Tolson 2001).

TV talk show, in particular, is one of most complex and dynamic
genres that exhibits a wide range of discourse: ordinary conversation,
questioning, storytelling, teasing, therapeutic discourse, etc (Ilie 2001).
Although both news interviews and TV talk shows fall along the con-
tinuum of broadcast discourse, TV talk shows should be examined
from another perspective. TV talk show is viewed as a particular in-

---

1) See Güldemann and Roncador (2002) for a comprehensive bibliography work on re-
   ported speech, particularly, with regards to linguistic domains.

stance of speech event – as labeled "semi-institutional discourse" (ibid.) –which is expected to be entertaining and, at the same time, informative.

2.2. Questioning in TV Talk Shows

The communicative function of questioning appears to be grounded on the basis of a particular syntactic form, namely, the interrogative sentence type. However, as Ehrlich and Freed (2010) pointed out, "no single linguistic factor determines whether a particular utterance is understood as 'doing questioning," and therefore "a definition of questions that includes both functional and sequential considerations" is required (p. 6). Indeed, many researchers (e.g., Ehrlich & Freed 2010, Heritage & Roth 1995, Labov & Fanshel 1977, Raymond 2000, Sidnell 2012, Stivers 2010, Yoon 2006) have suggested that a number of ways exist to accomplish the act of questioning; it is not necessary to rely only on interrogative syntax. The declarative utterances, sometimes accompanied with a tag question and/or a rising intonation, sequential features and context are the examples. Freed and Ehrlich (2010, p. 6) suggested a broad definition of questions as utterances based on functional and sequential dimensions that (a) solicit and/or are treated by the recipient as soliciting information, confirmation, or action and (b) are delivered as a way to create a slot for the recipients to produce a responsive turn. Sidnell (2010) also suggested that "sequential positioning provides resources for understanding what a particular turn is doing" (p. 39).

The interview is "a question-driven form of interaction" (Heritage and Roth 1995, p. 2) that moves the interviewing sequence forward by implementing various types of social actions such as eliciting narratives, requesting information, asking for opinion, challenging, complaining and displaying a certain stance. The host's questioning practices are varied depending on the type and the formality of broadcast talk. In news interview setting, for example, the interviewers are expected to play almost exclusively their institutional roles as professionals, to provide questions in straightforward manner and to maintain their neutrality throughout the interview (Clayman 1988). In TV talk show setting, on the otherhand, the host plays multi-participant roles (e.g., "story elicitor", "primary recipient", "problematizer", "dramatizer") (Ochs and Taylor 1992, Thornborrow 2001) and generates a

number of different types of question forms, from "conversationally framed questions" to "institutionally framed questions" (Ilie 2001, p. 221).

3. Data and Method

The data of the current study is a semi-structured, video-recorded television talk show interview *Muluphphak Tosa* 'Knee-drop Guru', which was aired from 2007 to 2011. Every week, one or a couple prominent public figures (e.g., celebrities, athletes, Olympic medalists, authors, etc.) are interviewed. The talk show deals with the guest speakers' exposés about intimate personal details such as rumors, scandals and life story which had not been exposed in public. The data of the present study consists of 360 minutes (7 sets of talk show programs, 8 male and 2 female speakers).

It is important to note that there is a hypothetical role-play relationship performed within the talk show setting. The host (indicated in extracts as Kang) plays a *tosa* 'spiritual guide, guru' and the guest speakers become a person who is seeking for his/her anxiety to be solved. This unique hypothetical *tosa* - guest relationship influences the format of the show-in-progress. In the studio setting, total four participants are involved: a host 'Kang', a guest speaker, and two peripheral participants who mostly provide active backchannels, brief assessments and laugh tokens. Unlike typical American talk shows, an on-site studio audience is absent.

The recorded talk show interviews are transcribed following the Jefferson transcriptions (Atkinson and Heritage 1984, Jefferson 2004).

4. Analysis

4.1. Presenting the Hearsay Reports

In this section, I will consider three examples of quoted speech produced by a less knowledgeable [K-] speaker, and examine how the embedded reported speech is locally organized. Specifically, I examine the ways in which the host detaches from the hearsay and the sensi-

tive rumors while inviting the guest's confirmation and soliciting relevant stories.

In Extract (1), the host claims [K-] epistemic status (lines 3-4, 6-7, and 10-12) and presents something newsworthy that is relevant to the topic being discussed through the voice of a non-present third party, Choo, who previously appeared as a guest on this talk show.

Extract (1) (Host: Kang, Guest: DH)

```
01 Kang:        이대호 선수의 학창 시절로>저희들이 한 번
02              들어가 보도록 하겠습니다<¿
03              추 선수: 그 방송을: 저 모니터를:
04              >했을 겁니다::<
05 DH:          °예°=
06 Kang:        =이대호 선수를 발굴한 건 본인이었다,
07              [(       .      )] 이제 [그렇게] 말씀을 하셨거든요¿=
08 DH:          [((slight nodding))]  [((nodding))]
09              네
10 Kang: →      전학을 갔는데¿ 3학년 때¿
11       →      교실에 갔더니 웬 고등학생이
12       →      앉아있더라::
13              그게 모든 이야기가 다 사실입니까?
```

```
01 Kang:        'Lee Daeho' senswu-uy hakchang sicel-lo >cehuy-tul-i han pen
                NAME athlete-of school:life period-to we(hum.)-PL -NM one time

02              tuleka-po-tolok ha-keyss-sup-ni-ta<¿
                enter -try-INDUC do-will-AH-IN-DC
                We will try to explore Lee Daeho's school life period.

03              Choo senswu: ku pangsong-ul: ce monitor-lul:
                Choo athlete  that broadcast-AC  that monitor-AC

04              >hay-ss-ul-ke-p-ni-ta::<
                do-PST-ATTR-thing-AH-IN-DC
                {You} must have seen Mr.Choo's broadcast.

05 DH:          °yey°=
                Yes.

06 Kang:        ='Lee Daeho' senswu-lul palkwul-ha-n ke-n ponin-i-ess-ta,
                NAME athlete-AC discover-do-ATTR thing-TC self-NM-PST-DC
                "It was I who first excavated DH",

07              [(    .    )][icey] kulehkey malssum-ul ha-sy-ess-ketun-yo¿=
                now that:way word:HON-AC say-SH-PST-CORREL-POL
                That was what he said

08 DH:          [((slight nod))] [((nod))]

09              ney
```

```
                        Yes

  10 Kang:  →    cenhak  -ul ka-ss -nuntey¿ sam   haknyen ttay¿
                 transfer-AC go-PST-CIRCUM  three grade   period
```
"Being transferred to a new school in 3ʳᵈgrade"

```
  11      →      kyosil   -ey ka-ss -teni weyn kotunghaksayng   -i
                 classroom-to go-PST-DET  what:one:earth high: school:
                 student-NM

  12      →      anc-a-iss-te-la::
                 sit-CONN-exist-RT-INTROS
```

"{I found} a high school kid sitting in the elementary classroom"

```
  13             kukey motun iyaki-ka ta sasil-ip-ni-kka?
                 that all   story-NM all fact—AH-IN-Q
```
Is this story all true?

Having established a new topic 'DH's school life' (line 1), Kang makes [K-] claims in a multi-TCU turn accompanied by both directly and indirectly quoted speech (line 6 and 10-12). The host's [K-] epistemic stance is followed by a yes-no question, asking for authenticity. Because Kang is in a less knowledgeable position than DH, Kang consistently specifies that he is not a firsthand experiencer, thereby displaying a lack of certitude about the produced report. First, and most explicitly, the hearsay quoted speech plays a significant role. The sentence ender –*tela*[2] in the directly quoted report (lines 10-12) is used to "report a particular experience s/he had related to the matter being discussed" (M.-S. Kim 2006, p. 67). Second, Kang detaches the report from himself by making it clear that the source of information comes from the third party – that is, the authority source of information, 'Choo's episode' (line 3). Third, Kang produces a confirmation-seeking question to DH upon each hearsay report. The declaratively-formatted question ('That was what he said¿': line 7) seeks DH's confirmation of the first reported speech. The second reported speech is followed by a more straightforward confirmation-seeking question, 'Is this all true?' (line 13).

The deployment of the [K-] claims and the embedded reported speech suggest the extent of knowledge to which Kang is oriented to the current topic and the contextually relevant background information. In

_____

2) See M.-S. Kim (2006) for an analysis of -*tela.*

building a relevant context, Kang furnishes DH with the basic compo-
nents, such as story character (i.e., Choo), temporal (i.e., third grade),
spatial (i.e., classroom) setting, and the action being performed (i.e., 'I
found a high school kid sitting in the elementary school classroom'),
to develop a possible response by weaving them together.

There are cases where the third-party being quoted is unspecified
and left anonymous. Extract (2) is taken from the interview with
Choo, a Korean professional baseball player in major league baseball
(MLB). The host presents a rumor about Choo in quotative forms
(lines 6-7) and verifies its authenticity (line 10).

Extract (2) (Host: Kang, Guest: Choo)

```
01 Kang:        아니 그-- >이제< 들리는 얘기가:-- 뭐 >사실이면 사실이다
02              아니면 아니다< 하면 되는 겁니다 >왜냐하면<
03              여러 가지-- 추신수 선수 >같은 경우에는
04              이 정도 선수 급이 되면,< 구단에서 움직이거든요¿
05              (0.7)>그래서< 만약에 (.) 아시안 게임 금메달을 따지 못 했을 경우에↑
06      →       <구단에서> 시민권::::: (.)을 뭐 제안 했다더라
07      →       아니면 뭐 .hh (.) >어떻게< 귀화설이 >있다더라<
08              뭐? 설::너무나도 많았거든요
09 Choo::       °네°=
10 Kang:        =예 (.) >사실입니까?<
```

```
01 Kang:        ani ku-- tulli-nun yayki-ka:-- mwe >sasil-i-myen
                sasil-i-ta
                DM that hear-ATTR story-NM what truth-COP-then truth-COP-DC
                Well, regarding the story which {I} heard
```

```
02              ani-myen ani-ta< ha-myen toy-nun ke-p-ni-ta >waynyahamyen<
                No-then no-DC say-then become-ATTR thing-AH-IN-DC
                because
                {You} can just say it's true if it's true or it's not true if
                it's not true because
```

```
03              yelekaci— 'Choo Sinsoo' senswu kathun kyengwu-ey-nun
                Various NAME athlete like case-at-TC
                various- In your case for example
```

```
04              i cengto senswu kup-i toy-myen kwutan-eyse wumciki-ketun-yo¿
                This degree athlete level-NM become-then team-from
                move-CORREL-POL
                When a player reaches about your level, the team takes
                an action (=takes out the paper of naturalization)¿
```

```
05              kulayse manyak-ey(.)AsianGamekummeytal-ulttaci
                mos hay-ss-ul kyengwu-ey↑
                so if-at Asian Game gold:medal-AC earn not do-PST-ATTR case-at
                So if {you} failed to win the Asian Game gold medal_
```

```
06      →       <kwutan-eyse> siminkwen::::: (.)ul mwe ceyan hay-ss-ta-te-la
                Team-at citizenship-AC DM offer do-PST-DC-RT-INTROS
                "{I heard} the team has offered {Choo} a citizenship"


07      →       animyen mwe .hh kwihwa-sel-i iss-ta-te-la
                Or DM naturalization-rumor-NM exist-DC-RT-INTROS
                Or .hh "{I heard} there is a rumor of naturalization"


08              mwe?sel::nemwunatomanh-ass-ketun-yo
                What rumor too many-PST-CORREL-POL
                There were too many rumors


09 Choo:        °ney°=
                 Yes


10 Kang:        =yey (.) >sasil-ip-ni-kka<?
                Yes truth-AH-IN-Q
                Yes, is it true?
```

First, the social and cultural context around Choo's situation needs to
be clarified. Choo has not yet fulfilled his mandatory military service
in Korea; thus, his carrying out the military service has been a big is-
sue inside and outside of Korea. The fulfillment of military service in
Korea has always been an initial measure around public figures re-
garding their public responsibilities and moralities. Therefore, bringing
up such sensitive issue takes great deliberation.

The rumors quoted anonymously are embedded within the claims of
[K-] epistemic status (lines 6-7). A topical sensitivity is marked in vari-
ous levels through the host's explicit hesitancy toward the ongoing
topic and distancing attitude from the presented rumor. First, employ-
ment of a hearsay report marked with *–tela* is the most noticeable. As
mentioned earlier, the hearsay quotations (i.e., 'I heard the team has
offered you citizenship: line 6' and 'I heard there is a rumor on natu-
ralization: line 7'), are enacted in the voice of the anonymous. Kang
makes it clear that the quoted speech is beyond the boundary of his
firsthand experience by leaving the original reference unspecified, as in
'the story which I heard' (line 1) and 'There were too many rumors'
(line 8).

Second, some overt disfluency is recurrently observed. In line 1, the
hearsay report is expected to follow, as indicated by 'the story which
I heard,' but Kang abruptly abandons his telling mid-course. Kang
then intends to reduce the pressure on Choo by suggesting that Choo
can simply choose between true or false on the following question

without giving the details, as shown in 'if it is true, just say it's true, if not, say it's not' (lines 1-2). The talk resumes in line 3, but the ongoing TCU-in-the-making is again abandoned, as in 'Numerous-.' It is contextually inferrable that Kang may say 'Numerous rumors,' as it is the central concern here. Kang's repetitive act of abandoning the ongoing TCU not only effectively displays his cautious attitude toward the current topic, but it also indicates the degree of sensitivity of the forthcoming question to Choo.

Third, Kang displays his cautious orientation through marked elongation around words such as *siminkwen::::* ,'citizenship' (line 6) and *se::l,* 'rumor' (line 9),' marked pause (line 5), and recurrent use of discourse markers such as *mwe* (lines 1, 6, 7, and 8) and *icey* (lines 1, 3).

Extract (3) also takes a similar structure in which the host presents three –*tela* post-faced hearsay rumors (lines 2-3, 6-7, and 10-11 consecutively) about Kwak, a renowned male film director. This time, the host additionally deploys gaze redirection as a resource to clearly distinguish the third-party reported speech from his own speech.

Extract (3) (Host: Kang, Guest: Kwak)

```
01 Kang:          .hhh <친구> 흥행 이후에, 참 >별의별 이야기들이
02       →        다 있었습니다.< ((gazing down left)) 뭐 곽경택: 감독이↑
03       →        (0.5) <실제> ((gazing Kwak)) >조폭이라더라!<
04 Kwak:          hehehe
06 Kang:  →       어 뭐 ((gazing down left)) >이를테면< 조폭과 아주 그
07       →        ((gazing Kwak)) 깊은 관계에 [ 연 ]루가 돼있다더라.
08 Kwak:                                      [°네°]
09                네:
10 Kang: →        어 ((gazing down left)) 뭐 일본 야쿠자에서↑
11       →        곽경택을 ((gazing Kwak)) 영입하려 한다더라.
12 ALL:           hahahaha
                  (irrelevant lines deleted)
13 Kang:          직접 곽경택 감독님은 조폭이 맞습니까?


01 Kang:          .hhh <chinkwu³⁾> hunghayngihwu-ey, cham>pyel-uy-pyeliyaki-tul-i
                  TITLE success after-at really all:sorts:of story-PL-NM

02       →        ta iss-ess-supni-ta.< ((gazing down left)) mwe 'Kwak
                  Kyung Taek': kamtok-i↑
                  all exist-PST-AH-IN-DC. Like NAME-producer-NM

                  After the big success of the movie <Friends>, there were all
                  sorts of stories.
```

---

3) A genre of Korean action-drama movie, released in 2001, where a conflict between two transnational organized crimes turns two old friends into enemies.

Figure 1. (Line 2)

```
03        →        (0.5) <silcey> ((gazing Kwak)) >cophok-i-la-te-la!<
                   Actually member:of:transnational:organized:crime-RT-INTROS
```
Like "The director 'Kwak' is actually a member of
transnational organized crime!"

Figure 2. (Line 3)

```
04 Kwak:                   hehehe
```
hehehe

```
06 Kang: →       e mwe ((gazing down left)) >ilultheymyen< cophok-kwa acwu ku
                 DM like so:to:speak member: of: transnational:
                 organized: crime-with really that
```


Figure 3. (Line 6)

```
07        →       ((gazing Kwak)) kiph-unkwankyey-ey[yen]lwu-katway-iss-
                  ta-te-la.
                  Deep-ATTR relationship-at involve-NM become-exist-DC-RT-INTROS
```

Uh like so to speak "{He} is deeply involved in
transnational organized crime."

Figure 4. (Line 7)

```
08 Kwak:                    [°ney°]
                            Yes
09             ((smiling)) ney:
               Yes

10 Kang: →     e ((gazing down left)) mwe ilpon yakuza⁴⁾-eyse↑
               DM like Japanese Yakuza-from
```


Figure 5. (Line 10)

```
11       →     'Kwak Kyung Taek'-ul ((gazing Kwak)) yengip-ha-lye ha-n-ta-
               te-la.
               NAME-AC scout-do-in:order:to do-IN-DC-RT-INTROS

               Uh like "Japanese Yakuza is interested in scouting 'Kwak'."
```


Figure 6. (Line 11)

```
12 ALL:        hahahaha
               hahahaha

               (irrelevant lines deleted)
13 Kang:       cikcep 'Kwak Kyung Taek' kamtok-nim-un cophok-i
```

---

4) *Yakuza* is a Japanese term for members of transnational organized crime syndicates in Japan.

```
mac-sup-ni-kka?
Directly NAME producer-HT-TC member:of:transnational:
organized:crime-NM correct-AH-IN-Q
```
Directly {speaking}, are you a member of transnational organized crime?

Kang mentions Kwak's past non-fictional film titled *Chinkwu,* 'Friend,' which involves two conflicting criminal alliances that turn two old friends into enemies and relates the movie in relation to reality (i.e., a rumor that Kwak is deeply involved with *cophok,* 'transnational organized crime'). Kang then brings up three instances of rumors among 'all sorts of stories' (line 1), even though they are not taken seriously (e.g., Kwak laughing at lines 4 and 12 and smiling at line 9). Each – *tela* post-faced reported speech is enacted in the voice of the anonymous. The source of information on the hearsay rumors is unspecified, and Kang makes it explicit that he is a mere 'animator' or delivery man with regard to the presented rumors (Goffman 1981).

Gaze redirection is one example. Sidnell (2006), in considering the multimodal and interactive character of reenacts, noted that the speakers not only present the linguistic features of the original utterance to their recipients, but also body orientation, positioning, gaze, and gesture. In the above example, Kang's gaze redirection occurs in the left-side boundary of the reenactment – that is, he gazes away from the guest speaker prior to each initiation of the reenactment. The direction of gaze withdrawal (i.e., down-leftward) is also consistent (see Figures 1, 3, and 5). Such gaze redirection is returned to the guest in mid-reenactment and the mutual gaze is maintained until completion of the reenacted segment (see Figures 2, 4, and 6). In so doing, Kang makes the third-party quotation even more distant.

Also, the framing discourse marker *mwe* (lines 2 and 10), which is employed as a left-side boundary of the reenactment, displays Kang's lack of certitude toward and distancing attitude from the conveyed hearsay reports. The discourse marker *mwe* can be roughly interpreted as 'something like, things like.' Therefore, the employment of *mwe* degrades the certainty toward the delivered report. K.-H. Suh (2007) claimed that *mwe* foregrounds the speaker's "non-commitment to specificity" and thereby serves as a hedging device (p. 84). In a similar vein, the adverb *ilultheymyen* 'so to speak, for example' (line 6), preceded by the second report, also exhibits Kang's non-committal and non-imposing attitude.

I have thus far examined the interactional functions of the third-party and the anonymous reported speech embedded within the claims of less epistemic status. The use of reported speech –particularly marked with the *–tela* post-faced speech – explicitly detaches the host from the story event at hand, thereby marking that the host is not a firsthand experience holder. In sum, the ways in which the questioner constructs, emphasizes, and delivers the reported speech embedded within the claims of [K-] epistemic status is significant in prompting the guest's confirmation and further elaboration.

4.2. Questioning on Behalf of the Invisible TV Audience

Unlike the other institutional discourses (e.g., counselor-counselee, teacher-student, doctor-patient), the host in the television talk show discourse is always aware of recording the ongoing conversation with the guest speaker and broadcasting it to the public in a prospective time frame. Particularly, this talk shows do not have an overhearing audience in a studio setting and, therefore, an immediate reaction (e.g., sympathetic applause, laughter, hooting, booing) from the studio audience is not observed. Nevertheless, the host consistently activates his institutional role as the talk show host and mentions the invisible and prospective *sichengca pwun.tul,* 'television audience (HON.).' The following example is a point in case.

Extract (4)　(Host: Kang)

```
01 Kang:        시청자 분들에게 이제 최종 꿈을
02              말씀 해 주시기 바랍니다=
03              =먼저 >이원희 선수에게 기회를 드리겠습니다↑<

01 Kang:        sichengca pwun-tul-eykey icey choycong kkwum-ul
02              malssum hay cwu-si-ki pala-pni-ta=

                Please tell your final dream to the TV audience

03              =mence >iwenhuy senswu-eykey kihoy-lul tuli-keyss-supni-ta↑<
                {I} will first start with Mr. Won-Hee Lee
```

Likewise, the host explicitly mentions the talk show audience *out there* as if they are concurrently present. The host treats the (overhearing or non-co-present) audience as the primary addressee instead of the guest speaker (Heritage 1985, Schegloff 1992). Such institutionally construc-

ted questions are much more powerful than questions in ordinary con-
versation in soliciting responses (e.g., stories, information, opinions).
Extract (5) illustrates the host raising questions on behalf of the TV
audience.

Extract (5) (Host: Kang)

```
01 Kang:        >근데 이제< ((lip smacking)) 제일 궁금한 건
02              아마 "시청자 분들"도 (.) 뭐 그런 생각이 들지 모르겠지만↑
03              우리랑 다르다는 게 제일 신기한 거 잖아요,
                (3 irrelevant lines deleted)
08              느꼈을 때 얼마나 충격적이었을까요?


01 Kang:        >kuntey icey< ((lip smacking)) ceyil kwungkumha-n ke-n
                But the most curious thing is that

02              ama "sichengca-pwun-tul"-to (.) mwe kulen sayngkak-i tul-ci
                molu-keyss-ciman↑
                maybe the tv audience might think the same

03              wuli-lang taluta-nun key ceyil sinkiha-n ke canh-ayo,
                {They (=people in Amazon)} are different from us in many ways
                which is amazing

                ((3 irrelevant lines in which Kang mentions polygamy as an ex-
                ample))

08              nukky-ess-ul ttay elmana chwungkyekcek-i-ess-ul-kka-yo?
                How shocked were {you} when you felt {the difference}?
```

The questioning still makes sense if the inserted clause 'maybe the tv
audience might think the same' (line 2) is omitted. Kang brings up
'the most curious' (line 1) question on the grounds that the TV audi-
ence may feel the same way about the present issue. In so doing, Kang,
as a representative of the public, aligns himself with the TV audience
and suggests that the question is worth asking since many television
viewers want to know about the difference between 'us' and 'the peo-
ple in Amazon.'

The host not only becomes a spokesperson for the TV audience, but
also performs as a delivery man or an "animator" (Goffman 1981) by
conveying what the TV audience *might* think or say about the current
topic. In such cases, the host hypothetically quotes the TV audience's
speech by employing reported speech. Extracts (6) and (7) are cases in
point.

Extract (6) is excerted from the interview with Hana, a female re-

nowned cellist. As an initiating remark, Kang quotes what 'a large group of TV audience' (line 1) expects to learn about Hana.

Extract (6) (Host: Kang, Guest: Hana)

```
01 Kang:        오늘은 그 많은 "시청자 분들"은
02      →       ((animating voice)) 우리 아들 우리 딸 어떻게 하면
03      →       장한나처럼 저렇게 키울 수가 있지?
04 Hana:        ((looking down)) hhh
05 Kang: →      도대체 부모님은 어떤 교육을 시켰길래
06      →       또 어떻게 그 음악인인데 하버드 대학교:::를 가고
07      →       또 >공부는 또< >어떻게 시켰다는 거야!<
08 Hana:        ((smiling)) hhh
09 Kang:        ((back to the normal voice)) 있는 그대로 진정성을 가지고
10              현실적인 대화를 나눠 보기를 저희들이 희망해 보겠습니다
11 Hana:        ((nodding)) 네
12 Kang:        수많은 악기들 중에 6살 때 첼로랑
13              운명적인 만남을 가지게 된 계기가 뭡니까?
```

```
01 Kang:        onul-un ku manh-n "sichengca pwun-tul"-un
```
Today, a lot of the TV audience {may think}

```
02      →       ((animating voice)) wuli atul wuli ttal ettehkey ha-myen
03      →       canghanna-chelem celehkey khiwu-l swu-ka iss-ci?
```
"How can I raise my sons and daughters like Hana Jang?"

```
04 Hana:        ((looking down)) hhh
```
hhh

```
05 Kang:→       totaychey pwumo-nim-un etten kyoyuk-ul sikhy-ess-killay
```
"What kind of education did her parents offer {to Hana}"

```
06      →       tto ettehkey ku umakin-intey Harvard tayhakkyo:::lul ka-ko
07      →       tto >kongpwu-nun tto< >ettehkey sikhy-ess-tanun ke-ya!<
```

"Also, how did she as a musician study and get accepted to Harvard {as non-music major}!"

```
08 Hana:        ((smiling)) hhh
```
hhh

```
09 Kang:        ((back to normal voice)) iss-nun kutaylo cincengseng-ul kaci-ko
10              hyensilcek-in tayhwa-lul nanwe po-ki-lul cehuy-tul-i huymang-
                hay po-keyss-supni-ta
```
We are now hoping to have a realistic and sincere conversation

```
11 Hana:        ((nodding)) ney
```
Yes

```
12 Kang:        swumanh-un akki-tul cwung-ey 6 sal ttay cello-lang
13              wunmyengceki-n mannam-ul kaci-key toy-n kyeyki-ka mwe-pni-kka?
```

```
How were you destined to learn cello among so many
instruments when you were 6?
```

Kang produces two consecutive sets of direct reported speech (lines 2-3 and lines 5-7). The subject, 'TV audience,' is overtly marked, but the framing quotative marker and speech verb are contextually omitted. Nevertheless, they are recognized as quoted speech through voice demarcation. For instance, Kang enacts the TV audience with a dramatically animated voice (e.g., high pitch, loud tone, rapid speech fluency) but shifts back to his interviewer-like voice quality (e.g., low pitch, normal tone, normal speech fluency) as he announces an official start of the interview at lines 9-10.

Although the reported utterances are interrogatively structured (e.g., wh-question, rising intonation), Hana does not seem to respond to the questions. As evidenced by Hana's second position responses, Hana displays quite a humble attitude by dropping her head and looking down while shyly laughing (line 4) and by laughing with a smile on her face and not competing for the conversational floor (line 8). Hana understands that the interrogatively formatted reported speech is not meant to be taken as response-seeking questions. Kang returns to the host's position and marks his initiating remark, 'We are now hoping to have a realistic and sincere conversation,' (lines 9-10). In response, Hana finally confirms with 'Yes' at line 11.

In sum, the TV audience's interest in Hana's personal story is instantiated through employment of hypothetically quoted reported speech. Kang *becomes* one among the TV audience and presents possible inquiries that the audience may have for the guest: How did Hana's parents educate their daughter? How did she get into Harvard University? In what kind of environment did Hana grow up?

Extract (7) reveals a similar feature. The excerpt is fragmented from the interview with 'Hong', a male climber in his 50s. Prior to the extract, Hong talks about his experience of climbing a tough mountain called Lhotse Shar. Kang asks, on behalf of the TV audience, the items that Hong brought in his hiking backpack when he climbed Lhotse Shar (lines 5-6 and 9).

Extract (7) (Host: Kang, Guest: Hong)
```
01 Kang:        >근데 그- 이제 저-< 사실은 그 등산화 [ 뭐 ] 등산복-
02 Hong:                                           [º예º]
```

```
03 Kang:          >″시청자 분들″이 인제< 젤 궁금하게 생각하는게:
04 Hong:          예
05 Kang:    →     .hh 그러면 과연 >엄홍길 대장이< 그 로체샤르를,
06          →     [    이    ]렇게 올라갔을때::
07 Hong:          [((nodding))]
08                예
09 Kang:    →     그 배- 배낭 안에 과연 뭐- 어떤 게 들어있을까
10                이런 게 궁금: .hh 하게 생각 할 거 같아서요,
```

```
01 Kang:          >kuntey ku- icey ce-< sasil-un ku tungsanhwa [mwe] tungsanpok-
                  But that-now uh- actually those hiking books and hiking wear
```

```
02 Hong:                                                       [ºYeyº]
                                                                Yes
```

```
03 Kang:          >″sichengca pwun-tul″-i incey< ceyl kwungkumha-key sayngkakha-
                  nun-key:>
                  What the TV audience is most curious about is that
```

```
04 Hong:          Yey
                  Yes
```

```
05 Kang:    →     .hh kulemyen kwayen >emhongkil taycang-i< ku Lhotse Shar-lul,
```

```
06          →     [    i   ]lehkey ollaka-ss-ul ttay::
                  .hh Then when 'Mr. Hong-Gil Um' climbed Mt. Lhotse Shar
```

```
07 Hong:          [((nodding))]
```

```
08                Yey
                  Yes
```

```
09 Kang:    →     ku pay- paynang an-ey kwayen mwe- etten key tuleiss-ul-kka
                  What- what kind of stuff {does he carry} in that back-backpack'
```

```
10                ile-n key kwungkum: .hh ha-key sayngkak ha-l ke kath-ase-yo,
                  {It seems that the audience} is curious about such thing
```

Kang's first turn is marked as an incomplete utterance with some critical disfluency (e.g., 'but uh-,' 'now uh-,' absence of verb) and thus fails to deliver the message clearly. He mentions 'hiking boots' and 'hiking wear' (line 1), but suddenly abandons the TCU-in-the-making. Then, in line 3, Kang reformulates what he was attempting to achieve in the previous turn. He mentions in advance that the forthcoming question is primarily on behalf of the TV audience in the format of 'What makes the TV audience most curious about is that~' (line 3). The curiosity is enacted in directly quoted speech at lines 5-6 and 9, which is an interrogatively formatted utterance marked with a wh-question word and an interrogative sentence ending *–kka*. Then Kang's

mitigated assumption is followed, 'It seems that the audience is curi-
ous about such thing' (line 10), rather than an overt question.

The topic being discussed (i.e., What kind of items do you carry in
your backpack?) is not normally considered taboo. Nevertheless, Kang
approaches the subject in a delicate and inarticulate manner (e.g., dis-
fluency, hypothetical quoting, speaking on behalf of the third party,
mitigating strategy *–ul kes kath-* 'seems'). This may be derived from
the fact that the embedded question performs the action of request –
that is, Kang makes a request for 'taking Hong's personal belongings
out from the backpack.' The action of the request is strategically ac-
complished by hypothetically quoting what the TV audience is asking
about Hong.

5. Conclusion

In this study, I have demonstrated how the talk show host activates
his institutional role as a deliberate questioner or a story elicitor, uses
direct or hypothetical reported speech creatively in questioning se-
quence and accomplishes the action of delicate questioning. I have ex-
amined the instances in which the host quotes the third-party or the
anonymous party, and asks relevant questions on the hearsay and the
rumors to the firsthand experience holder (Section 4.1). The host
makes explicit that he is a less knowledgeable speaker and confirms
what he had heard from the third-party (Extract 1) and also brings up
the sensitive rumors about the guest speakers by leaving the original
sources unspecified (Extracts 2 and 3).

I also showed that the host hypothetically quotes the invisble TV
audience and questions the possible inquires that the TV audience
likely to have for the guest speaker (Section 4.2). Analysis showed
that the use of reported speech enabled the host to perform as an
"animator" (Goffman 1981) and to become one of among the TV au-
dience. In so doing, the host asks the guest's personal opinion (Extract
5), displays intellectual snobbery towards the Harvard University (Ex-
tract 6), requests to exhibit the guest's personal belongings (Extract 7).

I hope that the findings of this study will help understand the deli-
cate and creative functions of reported speech embedded within the
speaker's patterned questioning practices. I suggest that more research

is needed to better understand how the questioner approaches sensitive issues in a variety of settings, including the classroom, the therapy sessions and everyday interactions.

References

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bamberg, M. & Geograkopoulou, A. (2008). Small stories as a new perspective in narrative and identity analysis. *Text & Talk* 28.3, 377-396.

Barbieri, F. (2009). Quotative be like in American English: Ephemeral or here to stay? *English World-Wide* 30.1, 68-90.

Bavelas, J. B., Coates, L., & Johnson, T. (2000). Listeners as Co-Narrators. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 79.6, 941-952.

Baynham, M. (1996). Direct speech: What's it doing in non-narrative discourse? *Journal of Pragmatics* 25, 61-81.

Benwell, B. & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and Identity*: Edinburgh University Press.

Bolden, G. (2004). The quote and beyond: defining boundaries of reported speech in conversational Russian. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36, 1071-1118.

Buttny, R. (1998). Putting Prior Talk Into Context: Reported Speech and the Reporting Context. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 31.1, 45-58.

Cacchione, A. (2006). Reported Speech: Towards a Definition as a Communicative and Linguistic Universal *Journal of Universal Langauge* 7, 1-28.

Clayman, S. (1988). Displaying neutrality in television news interviews. *Social Problems* 35, 474-492.

Clayman, S. & Heritage, J. (2002). *The news interview: Journalists and public figures on the air.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clift, R. & Holt, E. (Eds.). (2007). *Reporting Talk: Reported speech in interaction*: Cambridge University Press.

Duranti, A. (1986). The audience as co-author: An introduction. *Text* 6.3, 239-247.

Eriksson, G. (2010). Politicians in celebrity talk show interviews: the narrativization of personal experiences. *Text & Talk* 30.5, 529-551.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse*. London: Arnold.

Fetzer, A. & Weizman, E. (2006). Political discourse as mediated and public discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38, 143-153.

Freed, A. F. & Ehrlich, S. (Eds.). (2010). *"Why do you ask?": The function of questions in institutional discourse*: Oxford University Press.

Georgakopoulou, A. & Patrona, M. (2000). Disagreements in Television Dis-

cussions: How Small Can Small Screen Arguments Be? *Pragmatics* 10.3, 323-338.

Greatbatch, D. (1988). A turn-taking system for British news interviews. *Language in society* 17, 401-430.

Gregori-Signes, C. (2000). The Tabloid Talkshow as a Quasi-Conversational Type of Face-To-Face Interaction. *Pragmatics* 10.2, 195-213.

Haddington, P. (2004). Stance Taking in News Interviews. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 17, 101-142.

Heritage, J. (1985). Analyzing news interviews: aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience. In T. A. v. Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (Vol. 3, pp. 95-117): New York: Academic Press.

Heritage, J. (2002). The limits of questioning: negative interrogatives and hostile question content. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34.10-11, 1427-1446.

Heritage, J. & Atkinson, J. M. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. & Roth, A. (1995). Grammar and institution: Questions and questioning in the broadcast news interviews. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28.1, 1-60.

Hutchby, I. (1995). Aspects of recipient design in expert advice-giving on call-in radio. *Discourse Processes* 19, 219-238.

Hutchby, I. (1996). Power in discourse: The case of arguments on a British talk radio show. *Discourse & Society* 7, 481-498.

Ilie, C. (2001). Semi-institutional discourse: The case of talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 209-254.

Jefferson, G. (Ed.). (2004). *Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction*: John Benjamins.

Labov, W. & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation*. New York: Academic Press.

Lauerbach, G. (2006). Discourse representation in political interviews: The construction of identities and relations through voicing and ventriloquizing. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38, 196-215.

Martínez, E. R. (2003). Accomplishing closings in talk show interviews: a comparison with news interviews. *Discourse Studies* 5.3, 283-302.

Myers, G. (2001). "I'm out of it; you guys argue": making an issue of it on *The Jerry Springer Show*. In A. Tolson (Ed.), *Television talk shows* (pp. 173-191). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Raymond, G. (2000). *The Structure of Responding: Type-conforming and nonconforming responses to yes/no type interrogatives.* (Doctor of Philosophy), University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles.

Scannell, P. (1991). *Broadcast Talk*. London: Sage.

Schegloff, E. (1992). On talk and its institutional occassions. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings* (pp. 101-

134). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequential Organization in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sidnell, J. (2012). Declaratives, Questioning, Defeasibility. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45.1, 53-60.

Sohn, H. (1999). *The Korean Language*: Cambridge University Press.

Stivers, T. (2010). An overview of the question-response system in American English Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 2772-2781.

Tanaka, L. (2006). Turn-taking in Japanese Television Interviews: A Study on Interviewers' Strategies *Pragmatics* 16.2, 361-398.

Thornborrow, J. (2001). Authenticating talk: building public identities in audience participation broadcasting. *Discourse Studies* 3.4, 459-479.

Thornborrow, J. (2007). Narrative, opinion and situated argument in talk show discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39, 1436-1453.

Tolson, A. (2001). *Television Talk Shows: Discourse, Performance, Spectacle*: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Volosinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*: The Harvard University Press.

Weizman, E. (2006). Roles and identities in news interviews: The Israeli context. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38, 154-179.

Yoon, K.-E. (2006). *Complaint Talk in Korean Conversation.* (Doctor of Philosophy in Education), University of Illinois at Urbana-Cahmpaign, Urbana-Champaign.

Jieun Lee
Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures
University of Hawai'i at Manoa
2500 Campus Road, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA
E-mail: jieunlee625@hotmail.com