

JIHOČESKÁ UNIVERZITA V ČESKÝCH BUDĚJOVICÍCH
FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA
ÚSTAV ANGLISTIKY

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

QUESTIONING TECHNIQUES IN SPOKEN MEDIA
DISCOURSE: ANALYSIS OF AUTHENTIC DATA IN TWO
DIFFERENT TELEVISION GENRES

Vedoucí práce: Lohrová Helena, Mgr. Ph.D.

Autor práce: Soňa Hluší

Studijní obor: Anglický jazyk a literatura – Německý jazyk a literatura

Ročník: 4.

2015

Prohlašuji, že svoji bakalářskou práci jsem vypracovala samostatně pouze s použitím pramenů a literatury uvedených v seznamu citované literatury.

Prohlašuji, že v souladu s § 47b zákona č. 111/1998 Sb. v platném znění souhlasím se zveřejněním své bakalářské práce, a to v nezkrácené podobě elektronickou cestou ve veřejně přístupné části databáze STAG provozované Jihočeskou univerzitou v Českých Budějovicích na jejích internetových stránkách, a to se zachováním mého autorského práva k odevzdanému textu této kvalifikační práce. Souhlasím dále s tím, aby toutéž elektronickou cestou byly v souladu s uvedeným ustanovením zákona č. 111/1998 Sb. zveřejněny posudky ředitele a oponentů práce i záznam o průběhu a výsledku obhajoby kvalifikační práce. Rovněž souhlasím s porovnáním textu mé kvalifikační práce s databází kvalifikačních prací Theses.cz provozovanou Národním registrem vysokoškolských kvalifikačních prací a systémem na odhalování plagiátů.

České Budějovice, 28.července 2015

Soňa Hluší

PODĚKOVÁNÍ

Ráda bych poděkovala vedoucí své bakalářské práce, paní Mgr. Heleně Lohrové, Ph.D., za její vedení a trpělivost.

ANOTACE

Tato bakalářská práce analyzuje a porovnává otázky u dvou rozdílných televizních žánrů. Práce využívá metody konverzační analýzy ke zmapování otázek a jejich užívání v mediálním diskurzu. Otázky v mediálním žánru hrají důležitou roli, právě proto se tato práce zabývá jejich používáním v mediálním rozhovoru. Otázky jsou zkoumány prostřednictvím moderátora jehož úkolem je řídit interakci, určovat směr rozhovoru, snažit se získat faktické odpovědi, popř. udržet si svoji pozici. Za účelem porovnání charakteru otázek a jejich účinku budou pro rozbor vybrána data ze dvou odlišných televizních žánrů - populární talk show a politického interview. Analýza otázek bude provedena na základě videozáznamů a transkripčních přepisů.

ABSTRACT

This paper analyses and compares questioning techniques in two different television genres. It employs the method of Conversation Analysis to identify the use and purpose of questions in media talk. Questions play a very important role in broadcast talk, and the paper looks at how they are used in interviews. It does this by examining the role of the interviewer, whose task is to create the structure of an interaction, determine the direction of conversation and obtain information, and their effect on the interviewee. The data of the two different television genres; the political interview and the talk show interview are analysed in order to compare questioning techniques and their effect on interviewees. The analysis is based on two different video recordings (one from each genre) and their transcripts.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Introducing TV genres.....	2
2.1. The political interview.....	3
2.2. The talk show interview	4
2.3. The role of the interviewer in the news interview	5
2.3.1. Formal tasks of the interviewer	5
2.3.2. Neutralism and adversarialness	6
2.3.3. The role of the entertainer	7
2.3.4. Providing the information and representing the audience	7
2.4. The role of the interviewee.....	8
3. Data and transcription process	9
4. Methodology	12
4.1. Conversation analysis: history.....	12
4.2. Applying CA to the study of media talk.....	13
4.3. Institutional talk.....	14
4.3.1. Turn taking	15
4.3.2. Rules of turn-taking.....	16
4.3.3. Whose turn is it?.....	17
4.4. Media talk.....	17
4.4.1. Characteristics of media talk	17
4.4.2. Analysing media talk.....	18
4.4.3. Questions in media talk	19
4.4.4. What is a question?.....	19
5. Data analysis.....	20
5.1. Roles of participants in media talk and asymmetry.....	20
5.2. Flexibility and constraint of question design.....	22
5.3. Questioning sequences	24
5.3.1. Political interview.....	24
5.3.2. Talk show interview	26
5.4. Function of questions	27
5.5. Question design and journalistic norms	28
5.5.1. Dimensions of adversarialness	28
5.5.2. Defensible questioning	31

5.5.2.1. Justification and footing shift	32
6. Discussion and conclusion	33
Works Cited.....	38
Appendices	

1. Introduction

This study examines questioning techniques in two different popular British television genres, the political interview and the talk show interview. The thesis focuses on the respective hosts of the talk show and political interview, their use and design of questions. Questioning is a basic journalistic tool, and questions have an important role in media discourse which has changed over time. The purpose of interviewing has long been to gather information, but with the advance of electronic media, (television, internet, radio and websites), it has taken on added significance as a way of presenting information to the public (Heritage and Clayman 215). While, at the start of journalism, questions were primarily asked to elicit new information, at the present time of live and unedited broadcasting, often accompanied by printed transcripts, questions are created together with their presenter's message which is shown to the public in the form of an interview.

The political interview is characterised by its form of question-answer sequences. This thesis seeks to determine if the journalist only asks questions and how the questions influence an interviewee's response. To find answers to this, the paper analyses and compares the use of questions by Jeremy Paxman, one of Britain's most respected journalists, famous for his tough and rigorous interviewing of public figures, and that of Jonathan Ross, a talk show interview host, renowned for his fast-witted and irreverent American style talk show, which was a departure from the conventions of other British talk shows. The aim is to reveal in the two interviews patterns representative of the respective genres and to analyse the distinctive features of these. Question analysis is undertaken on the basis of two video extracts and their transcripts.

In order to approach the task of analysing questioning techniques in both interviews, the analysis is divided into three parts. The first part provides the terminological background and introduces the methodology of Conversation Analysis. The second part describes the data and sets out the analysis. The final section of the paper summarises the principal findings and presents conclusions arrived at by the research.

2. Introducing TV genres

This thesis introduces the concept of genre in order to analyse conventions of the political interview and the talk show interview, each representing a different type of genre talk. These genres are recognisable both by type of convention and socio-cultural needs.

Genre is an instrument crucial to the understanding and description of both the political interview and talk show interview. The core definition of genre was introduced to the study of Linguistics by Professor John Swales in the book *Genre Analysis*, one of the aims of which is to use genre analysis for applied linguistic purposes.

According to Swales, genre can be described as:

....a recognizable communicative event characterized by a set of communicative purpose(s) identified and mutually understood by the members of the professional and academic community in which it regularly occurs. Most often it is highly structured and conventionalized with constraints on allowable contributions in terms of their intent, positioning, form and functional value.
(13)

This definition may be unpacked through discussion of the data under review; political and talk show interviews. First, each genre is a communicative event, which is identified not only by its language and participants but also by the context of the conversation. That is to say, the television genre of political interview or talk show interview is a communicative event identified by the interaction of the interviewer and the interviewee who speak for the benefit of the public. The whole interaction of political and talk show interview discourse ordinarily occurs in a broadcasting studio with or without the presence of an audience. In other words, a genre occurs within a functional setting. Secondly, communicative events of the same genre are recognised by the set of similar communicative purposes that the participants aim to fulfil. Members of a certain genre typically aim at specific communicative goals. For example, the interviewer aims to elicit information through questioning the guest; the interviewees, in

contrast, pursue their own agenda, aiming to maintain an image that will not be discrediting. The entire interview is held for the benefit of the audience and both participants act in accordance with this. Thirdly, these goals build the basic internal structure of genre and constrain the choice of content and style. For example, the internal structure of the news interview is a question-answer sequence and this fact creates constraints for participants. Although participants are restricted to following a question-answer sequence, far more is usually going on within the interview, as will be explained in the analysis part of this paper. Participants of different genres therefore have to conform to the restrictions imposed by the genre as to the structure and choice of the content and style. That is to say, the interviewer conforms to the task of questioning and the interviewee conforms to the task of answering questions. In addition, genre is highly structured and conventionalised. Communicative events of the same genre not only share the same communicative purpose, but characteristically also the same structure, style, content and type of intended audience.

Swales considers genre mainly within the field of text analysis and his concept was further elaborated by Professor Bhatia. According to Bhatia,

...the analysis of genre has developed and steadily progressed over the last thirty years from pure surface description to a more detailed description of various aspects of genres, and it has become a powerful and useful tool for arriving at significant form-function correlations which can be used for a number of applied linguistic purposes. (11)

In other words, genre is a valuable source helping us to define two different television genres for the purposes of this paper.

2.1. The political interview

Political and talk show interviews can both be considered as sub-genres of the broad type of broadcast interview. Both genres are part of an institutional context; in this case television. This form of conversation occurs between at least one interviewer and one interviewee, but nowadays there are many programmes broadcast with more than one journalist or multiple interviewees. The main differences between political and

talk show interviews are found in the goals of the interaction, the relationship between participants, audience inclusion, and the scope of formality. All of these differences will be discussed below to illustrate the contrast between both genres.

The political interview is typically a type of formal interview represented by important political figures, usually government ministers and others involved in politics. The broadcast occurs in an official room or in a television studio with no audience present (e.g., *Newsnight Jeremy Paxman*). Every minute of the interview is predefined by broadcasters, but questions and answers may depart from a traditional script. The roles of participants in an interview are also predefined. The whole interview is held for the benefit of the general public, who are usually not present and can be referred to as a mass audience. The final addressee of the interview is not the interviewee, as it seems, but the audience.

Politicians and other public figures in a political interview are asked to explain their actions to the public. Russell Brand, featured in the political interview data example used in this analysis, represents a public figure who is being questioned upon the publication of his political magazine.

The interviewer, Jeremy Paxman, strives to bring out the facts of Russell Brand's political opinions. In their interchange, Russell Brand systematically defends his statements, denying any charges that could potentially result in the loss of his public fame and favour. Due to the fact that the participants aim to achieve different tasks, the interview often results in conflict. For the achievement of the interviewer's purpose he/she often designs the questions in order to reveal interesting facts.

2.2. The talk show interview

There is a wide range of factors determining the talk show interview genre, but it can be classified as a short interview with celebrities or experts about topics of their choice. Characteristics of the talk show interview are loosely based on those of the political interview. However, as Tolston describes, the talk show exhibits "a certain ambivalence between forms of talk which are designed both to inform and to entertain" (178). Whereas the political interview has a primarily informative function, the function of the talk show is largely that of entertainment. The host of the talk show approaches

the informative purpose through friendly conversation, focusing on the personal and private life of personalities and their career, while adopting a mostly humorous tone.

A typical setting for a broadcast is a studio with the presence of an audience. The audience provides reactions like applause and laughter and can also occasionally be addressed by the host of the show or guest. The script of the talk show is usually looser than the script for a political interview. There is a script for how to welcome a guest and how to introduce them, but the rest depends on the host's abilities. An experienced host is able to come up with something to say in any situation, following on from what the producer has initiated.

There is interplay of formal and informal characteristics in the talk show. It is noticeable that a talk show interview shares similarities with mundane conversation, which creates the informal character. However, there are also obvious formal properties in terms of who starts, directs and closes the interview. For instance, the host always starts the conversation, welcoming and introducing his guest.

Focusing on the role of talk show participants, the host is someone aiming to reveal the personality of the guest to the mass audience. This task is achieved through the content and design of the interviewer's questions. The host determines topics to talk about through the content of the questions, but a situation can arise where a guest changes the topic through the content of the answer. The host of the talk show interview also uses questions as tools to entertain and inform the audience. The role of the interviewee is very similar to that of the political interviewee, being there to present themselves to the public and very often in order to promote the work they are currently engaged in, such as a book, album, television series or film.

2.3. The role of the interviewer in the news interview

This section focuses on interviewers and describes their main tasks. They play a very important role in an interview because they lead the whole conversation and influence the interviewee's answers through the design and content of their questions.

2.3.1. Formal tasks of the interviewer

The interviewer is the one who begins and ends the interview. The interview usually starts with introducing the public figure or explaining the issues that will be discussed. This form of opening is performed for the audience who need the information in order to understand the interview as a whole. The opening scene is found in spoken or written form - spoken at the beginning of the interview and written in the form of a short article (for example next to the video posted on the internet).

After the opening scene, the interviewer begins the interview with a question or statement. This gives an opportunity for the interviewee to respond and present their answers. The interviewer also determines the subjects to be discussed and controls the whole course of the interview so that they fulfil the intended task and do not change the interaction into a "personal soapbox" (Clayman 265).

At the end of the interaction, the journalist often notifies the public figure that they are running out of time and at the end, thanks the guest and ends the conversation.

2.3.2. Neutralism and adversarialness

It is the role of the interviewer to stay "objective" and "unbiased", avoiding taking up positions or any other actions that could suggest agreement, disagreement or support of the public figure. As Clayman suggests, absolute neutrality is impossible to achieve, but journalists strive to gain a 'neutralistic' posture through a set of specialised discourse practises (262). Some of the practises are; speaking on behalf of the public and asking questions for their benefit rather than not for his/her own sake, avoiding subjective statements or expressing their own opinions, avoiding expressions that could imply agreement or disagreement.

While journalists are supposed to remain neutral, they should also be adversarial in their treatment of public figures (Clayman 265). Clayman suggests that journalists achieve adversarialness mainly through the "content" and "form" of their questions, which may be used so as to put pressure on public figures in order to address issues they might prefer not to talk about. In order to attract as many viewers as possible, the journalist strives to make the show interesting and appealing. People tend to enjoy confrontation, so an interview lacking in any conflict would not be very

exciting. The interviewer achieves adversarialness mainly through sharp questioning (the content and form of the questions) (Clayman 265).

Objectivity and adversarialness are two basic journalistic norms (not prescribed, but mutually accepted). These two norms, as Clayman and Heritage suggest, work in cooperation with one another (228). Skilled journalists, such as Mike Wallace, Dan Rather and Sam Donaldson in the US and John Humphreys, Andrew Marr and Jeremy Paxman in the UK are able to maximise their adversarialness within the boundaries of neutrality (Clayman and Heritage 228).

Clayman and Heritage also claim that use of these two norms is based on "the interview contract" (228). This means that the interviewer needs to interview public figures as part of their job and public figures need interviewers to present their ideas and careers to the public. To make this work, the interviewers should not cross the boundary from "adversarial to aggressive" (228) because that could mean an end to their career and the public figure should be interesting to viewers in order to increase the number of viewers and supporters.

2.3.3. The role of the entertainer

At this point, it is necessary to mention that the interviewer also fulfils the role of entertainer. In the case of the talk show interview, the interviewer brings out points of interest and curiosity for their guests, often using a witty and relaxed tone to evoke a friendly environment.

The role of the entertainer can also be seen as relating to the theory of "the interview contract" (Clayman, Heritage 228). The interviewer needs the public figure to attract interest and the interviewee needs to be interviewed so that they can present themselves to the public. In order to successfully achieve both, topics need to be chosen according to the interests of the public and the whole interview needs to appeal to the audience.

2.3.4. Providing the information and representing the audience

In the role of the interviewer, it should be noted that media talk and the interview as a whole is held for the benefit of the audience. The journalist can be understood as a mediator between the public figure and the audience and as a person who guides the audience through the whole interview. The journalist's orientation towards the audience can be seen in the opening scene, when they welcome the audience and speak directly to camera, making eye contact with the public. The function of this greeting is to attract the viewer's attention, make them listen, watch, perceive and understand the information. The journalist speaks directly to the audience, not only at the beginning of the interview but sometimes also during the interaction, and can address them when introducing a new topic, explaining important facts or, in the case of the talk show interview, making statements in order to get the audience to laugh. Journalists also use reformulations of what was previously said so as to simplify a statement, making it more understandable for the audience.

2.4. The role of the interviewee

The role of the interviewee is influenced by the interview host's questions. Provided that the basic task of the journalist is to ask questions, the interviewee's duty is to give answers. One of the obligations is not to deviate from the question-answer sequence and to speak to the point, which means always answering the question clearly and not turning away from the topic being discussed. Such a deviation can result in a different form of sanctions such as a verbal warning from the host.

The interviewee is expected to wait to be asked to speak as, if he or she chooses to speak without being asked, the interviewer is obliged to give warning and to try to maintain a question-answer sequence form. There is the possibility for the interviewee to request to speak, but the interviewer is not obliged to comply with this.

The choice of discussed topic is up to the interviewer, unless conditions have been imposed beforehand by the interviewee as part of their agreement to be interviewed. It can happen that the interviewee tries to deviate from the discussed topic onto his own area of interest or competency. In this case, the journalist usually responds by returning to the question and attempting once more to persuade the interviewee to answer it.

As well as the choice of questions and issues to be discussed, depending on the interest of the audience, the answers are also dependent on the presence of the public. The main aim of the interviewee is to present themselves or those they represent in a good light. The answers are therefore created in order to manipulate the minds of the audience and to obtain benefit for the public figure. For example, if there is a yes/no answer question, the interviewee can choose to answer with a long, explanatory statement in order to manoeuvre away from a clear answer. As the interview becomes more adversarial, the questions asked are often very controversial and interviewees may try to avoid answering them. A good journalist is aware of such techniques and knows how to obtain the answer.

3. Data and transcription process

The first data is an example of a talk show interview in the form of a video from The Jonathan Ross Show. The video extract was recorded on 2nd February 2013. Talk show presenter Jonathan Ross interviews public figure Russell Brand on various topics, focusing mainly on the guest's spiritual life, drug addiction past, lifestyle and scandals. The interview lasts over eight minutes, but the transcript itself starts one and a half minutes after welcoming the guest. Jonathan Ross is one of the best known British broadcasters of his generation, famous for his sharp wit.

The second data, representing the political interview genre, comes from a Newsnight programme. It was broadcast in October 2013 on BBC Two and soon after the interview became widely seen by the public. Journalist Jeremy Paxman talks to Russell Brand about voting and revolution, following him taking on the role of guest editor for the political magazine New Statesman.

The selection of data was dictated by reason of personal interest and popularity. Both of the videos can be described as representative of their respective genre. Journalist Jeremy Paxman and TV presenter Jonathan Ross are well known British broadcasters and both genre examples share a common guest, Russell Brand, who is a popular English comedian, actor, author and activist engaging in politics.

The present work analyses data from video recordings of two different television genres; a political interview and a talk show interview recorded off air. The examples of media talk are in the form of transcriptions; a key tool for question technique analysis. Therefore the reader should understand the transcripts as a central part of each section.

Both video recordings were transformed into audio versions to allow the analyst to focus primarily on the speech of both participants; the interviewer and the interviewee. As there was no written version of the data, both recordings were first of all converted into a text version with the help of a native English language speaker. The audio recordings were transferred into a subtitle program, *VisualSubSync*, using audio waveform representation. This program allowed the analyst to mark each 20 second speech flow and also to capture the length of pauses.

1 **RB:** well, I don't eh get my authority from this pre-existing paradigm which is quite
2 narrow and
3 only serves a few people, I look elsewhere for alternatives that might be of service to
4 humanity (1.3). (00:40) alternate means alternate political systems.

The above example illustrates a pause in length of 1.3 seconds and speech flow after the first 40 seconds (00:40) in line 4.

The field of Conversation Analysis, which provides the method for analysis in this work, includes, the Jefferson Notation System as an approach to transcription. The same system is used in this thesis, but conventions are simplified according to the need of question techniques analysis. The symbols used indicate intonation, pauses, speech flow, overlapping, latching and also increased volume, emphasis and unfinished or uncertain words.

Besides speech flow transcription, conventions include symbols describing intonation. There are three types of intonation marked; indicating respectively, falling intonation at the end of turn, slightly rising intonation at the end of turn which shows continuation or unfinished turn and most importantly highly rising intonation at the end of the turn, which invites the second participant to provide a response. The following example illustrates JR's turn with highly rising intonation at the end which strongly invites RB to provide some sort of response:

- 1 **JR:** how - how many tattoos you now have, Russell?
2 **RB:** alright I'll show you.

Another feature marked in transcription is overlapping. Overlapping is where sequences of speech are produced by both speakers at the same time. The genre of the political interview includes many examples of overlapping as it has an evident confrontational character:

- 1 **JP:** [yeah, there is]
2 **RB:** [SO WHAT AM I GONNA TUNE IN FOR THAT?]

In this example RB overlaps JP's statement with a highly increased volume in speech (marked by capital letters). This situation has visible notes of confrontation. A further convention used is notation showing the emphasis that a speaker puts on words or syllables. The journalist in the example uses emphasis in order to underpin important sequences throughout the interview or particular elements he wants the answer to:

- 1 **JP:** [what's what's] the scheme, that's all I'm asking. what's the scheme, you talk vaguely
2 about revolution – what is it?

The journalist in this example reformulates the question once again, because the answer was not provided. To ensure a response, he puts the emphasis on particular words within his turn so as to imply that he wants his guest to respond regarding the scheme and what it would look like.

The transcripts include conventions describing unfinished words and false starts. Media talk is a form of institutional talk but it also adopts features of everyday conversation (Hutchby 18). Therefore it sometimes leads to unplanned lapses:

- 1 **JR:** Ok we should point out er, we don't need to, but I mean I get the feeling
2 people will watch er an interview, I do with you more keenly /than any would- most
3 other interviews/we should point out, that you do not in any way endorse criminal
4 behaviour? (1.0)(laugh)

The talk show presenter in this extract makes several attempts to construct the sentence and cuts his speech to start a new turn.

Non-linguistic information codes including laughter, audience reactions and others are marked in brackets.

It should be noted that data transcription is a time-consuming process, but it is important that analysts transcribe their own data extracts as it is a key tool for analysis.

4. Methodology

The method of analysis follows the principle of Conversation Analysis (CA). CA studies conversations of all kinds and is an approach to analyse discourse, originating from Ethno methodology, a field within Sociology initiated by Harold Garfinkel. It analyses the structure of interaction with focus on its participants. CA tries to describe the mechanisms that participants use to develop successful conversation. Besides linguistic characteristics of talk, also such features as laughter, pauses, repairs, and overlapping must be marked. Actions in CA are described as they emerge from the data.

Conversation analysts see interaction as an event constructed by its participants. The meaning of an utterance is seen according to the speakers, interpretations and context. The interpretation of recipients is the key concept as they create the interpretation and understanding of the ongoing interaction. In the case of the data analysed, there is a focus on utterances produced by the interviewees — journalist Jeremy Paxman and talk show host Jonathan Ross. The interviewer's turns in the form of questions or utterances performing the task of questioning are interpreted with regard to the response provided by the interviewee.

4.1. Conversation analysis: history

CA originated in the 1960s in the work of American sociologist Harvey Sacks, who worked at the University of California. He is known for his practice of tape-recording and transcribing lectures so that they could be posthumously distributed not only to his students but also to the wider public. Many of his early CA studies were co-authored between Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. They have all had a

significant influence among the first CA researchers. CA is a broad movement, used not only in linguistics but also in sociology, psychology and anthropology.

The central tendency in linguistics at that time was to describe language as something abstract. This meant that linguists were removing language from its actual context of use. An alternative understanding came from the pragmatics Ludwig Wittgenstein and J.L. Austin. They argued that the "meaning of any sentence could not be fully grasped if it were removed from the context of social interaction" (Hutchby 19). In other words, the meaning of a sentence is dependent on its actual context of use. In the 1960s, CA undoubtedly meant a radical departure from then general linguistic concepts in claiming that analysis should concentrate on "recorded talk in natural settings of social interaction" (Hutchby 21). Researchers were focusing on recorded everyday conversation occurring in a natural setting rather than on invented sentences.

Hutchby states that "focus on sequences is key to the conversation analytic approach (21). Utterances in interactional sequences are produced as "turns", that are believed by conversation analysts to help us grasp the participants own understanding of one another's action (Hutchby 21). For example, when an interviewee responds to the previous turn in terms of the question asked, they display a positive understanding of prior turn. In cases where the participant does not understand the prior turn, it will be illustrated in the following turn and the participant seeks correction of the misunderstanding.

CA principles have, since its origin in the 1960s, been applied to a wide range of different forms of discourse. While some analysts have focused on everyday talk, for example Atkinson, Heritage and Lerner, others have considered the language of institutional interaction.

4.2. Applying CA to the study of media talk

Conversation Analysis was originally applied to the study of everyday talk by its founders Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. Clayman and Heritage explain that institutional Conversation Analysis first appeared in the book *Order in Court* (1979), a study of courtroom interaction written by J. Maxwell Atkinson and Paul Drew (16). Later it was applied to talk produced in institutional settings, for

example classrooms, courts, broadcasting and surgeries. Notable is the work of Heritage, Greatbatch, and Clayman who analysed various aspects of broadcasting talk.

The present study analyses and compares question techniques in two different television genres with the help of CA. Conversation Analysts use data in the form of naturally occurring conversation and describe the interaction from the perspective of the participants (Goodwin and Heritage, 288). The interviewer and interviewee enable us to analyse the questioning techniques of the political and talk show interview from their points of view. That is how they interpret the questions and what is achieved by them. The conversation in this data is described as it emerges.

4.3. Institutional talk

Institutional talk differs from naturally occurring conversation mainly in the way participants know and use specific rules. Institutions such as a court, school, television studio or doctor's office constrain the communication of participants and thus make the interaction different from everyday conversation.

Although a participant's interaction determines the difference between an institutional discourse and everyday talk, it is not always easy to determine the type of discourse as there are other defining factors. As Heritage states in his article *Conversation Analysis and Institutional Talk*

The difficulty of definition is further compounded by the fact that institutional talk is not confined to a particular physical or symbolic setting such as hospitals, offices or classrooms (Drew & Heritage 1992): institutional talk can occur anywhere, and by the same token ordinary conversation can emerge in almost any seemingly institutional context. (107)

In other words, we cannot rely on context when determining an institutional talk, because everyday talk could occur within an institutional setting and institutional talk could occur outside of the institutional setting.

The only reliable way to define the type of discourse is to focus on the participants and their interaction. Speakers are able to distinguish the type of discourse they are situated in and according to the situation they use the set of rules required for it. In the case of the news interview, the interviewer knows their task is to ask questions

and the interviewee is aware that they are bound to answer them. Hutchby states that being participants of institutional talk means that "we know what we are doing and are aware of social settings for our actions" (25). For instance, during the interview, it is unlikely that the guest would start questioning the host, but there are common exceptions when one of the participants deviates from the question-answer system. Basically, speakers in conversation adapt their talk to the given situation and knowingly use a set of rules suitable for a certain discourse. This helps conversational analysts to classify interactions in different environments and find differences between them.

Clayman and Heritage distinguish two types of institutional discourse; formal and non-formal. In non-formal systems there is no "turn-type pre-allocation system" to constrain the participant's options in their institutional roles (Hutchby 27). This means that such a discourse is closer to everyday conversation, offering participants a far wider range of turn types than question-answer. This would be the case with talk show interviews (in this case, the *Jonathan Ross Show*) which carries many features of ordinary talk, for example use of third-turn recipients. Formal systems are those in which the institutional character of interaction is represented mainly through its form, most notably in "turn-taking systems" (Hutchby 26). In broadcasting, it is in the news interview that participants restrict themselves to their roles – asking questions and giving answers. Characteristics of both formal and non-formal institutional discourse can be applied to our respective genres – the talk show interview (non-formal) and political interview (formal).

Speakers of institutional talk act upon special rules of the given situation, which subsequently influence the interaction. Discourse is often shaped into a question-answer format, where one speaker asks questions and the other answers them. Both speakers have to adjust to their roles and keep following the rules, whereas in everyday conversation it is not prescribed who is doing what. Representatives of media dialogue are the interviewer and the interviewee. Although the participants are assigned the tasks of questioning and answering, the interview includes much more than the basic structure suggests. Speakers in institutional interactions also follow specific rules of turn-taking system, which is one of the main subjects of interest in Conversation Analysis.

4.3.1. Turn taking

Conversation analysts base the accomplishment of a speech exchange on a series of principles known as turn-taking. This term, first used by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, refers to a model of the organisation of talk between participants.

4.3.2. Rules of turn-taking

Media talk as a form of institutional discourse follows specific rules of turn-taking. It is important to understand how turn-taking in media interaction works in order to comprehend turn-taking in political and talk-show interviews. The term 'rules', describing obligations of speakers in institutional discourse (for example turn-taking), needs to be specified. We are not talking about normative or prescribed rules, but a set of rules accepted by speakers in a given situation. Speakers in interactions generally know about the existence of such rules and use them in order to achieve a successful conversation.

While the representative of the institution asks questions, the interaction partner is required to give answers. The question and answer sequence form an adjacency pair (one of the fundamental Conversation Analysis terms). An adjacency pair is "a two-part sequence in which the first part sets up a strong expectation that a particular second part will be provided" (Fasold and Connor-Linton 182). Therefore, when a first speaker provides a turn in the form of a question, a second speaker is supposed to provide the answer to it. Speakers in news interviews therefore create question-answer sequences in the form of an adjacency pairs.

Sometimes it happens that the answer is not provided and thus the second part of the adjacency pair is missing. In such cases, depending on a given situation, this can lead to formal or informal sanctions (formal in the case of a court). In the interview, the most likely reaction of the journalist would be to try to find a solution to the unexpected situation. For example, they would ask the same question once again, reformulate or find other ways to obtain an answer. It could also lead to negative consequences for a public figure, as not answering the question might imply having something to hide.

The journalist is the person who leads the conversation through asking questions. Therefore we can see the journalist as the more powerful participant in the conversation, because they can determine the topics through their choice of questions

and can imply the answer through journalistic discourse practises. Asymmetry is a typical feature of the news interview, where the roles of participants in this institutional environment are unequally distributed.

4.3.3. Whose turn is it?

The question-answer sequence partially describes rules of turn-taking in media discourse. When we consider everyday conversation, this can also take the form of a question-answer sequence but speakers can switch roles because these roles are not determined. Speakers have the possibility of releasing themselves from the position of questioner or answerer. This is not possible in media talk because each participant has a prescribed role to follow.

The role of the journalist in media talk is to ask questions and the guest usually waits to be asked a question before they can speak. Turn-taking in media talk, can be described in a simplified way as a conversation where the host gives the opportunity to speak. If there is more than one speaker in the conversation, the host chooses the next speaker by addressing them by name, turning towards them or making eye contact.

4.4. Media talk

Media talk is a form of discourse used by broadcasters on television or radio. Broadcast talk offers a rich variety of genres. This thesis works with data from interviews, namely talk show and political interviews. This section focuses on description of those discourse forms in the context of media talk.

4.4.1. Characteristics of media talk

In order to describe the role of media talk in our lives, Čmejrková uses the term "confrontainment", describing the nature of current media talk (244). This term combines the words confrontation and entertainment, both possible aspects of news interviews. Political and talk show interviews which offer conflict between participants attract the audience who is looking for confrontation as a type of entertainment.

Nowadays programmes with some degree of confrontation predominate and viewers are able to choose from a wide range of confrontation shows.

The development of private broadcasting rapidly changed the purpose of the news interview. Most TV and radio stations wish their programmes to attract as many viewers as possible. In order to do so, they introduced new forms of shows including confrontational shows (for example, the political interview). In most cases we can see that shows based on interaction between two or more speakers, with elements of spontaneity and the presence of an audience, are found more interesting by the audience.

Considering the news interview, the whole show is performed for the benefit of the audience which is sometimes present in the studio, sometimes absent. Media talk is a talk that can be addressed to the audience directly or produced for them to witness (Hutchby, 12). The news interview is an interview between two or more participants who speak to each other and knowingly orient their talk towards the audience. For instance, the interviewer always asks questions that the public wants to know answers to and the interviewee responds with a statement that seeks to influence what the public thinks. The existence of an audience influences the form of the interview and its whole course. To simplify how the audience influences the interaction: the guest answers the questions asked by the journalist whose words are directed to the audience and who asks questions of public interest.

4.4.2. Analysing media talk

Conversation Analysis is one of the main methods successfully applied to the study of media talk. As Hutchby states, conversation analysts have made a major contribution to the field of media talk studies from the mid 1980s and focused mainly on discourse forms including the interview, debates, talk shows, and phone-ins (17).

Hutchby also suggests that methods originally developed in a study of everyday conversation are applied to the study of mass communication, because what we know about how humans communicate in everyday life can reveal a lot about how people communicate in a media context (in our case, television) (17). It may seem strange to apply methods from ordinary talk to the analysis of mass media

communication, but it is useful to gain a different perspective and fresh insights by approaching the study of media talk using the application of Conversation Analysis.

Hutchby distinguishes three key features of media talk on radio and television which help us to understand the analysis of media talk in this paper. Firstly, media talk "adopts elements of everyday conversation" (18). How we talk and use language in ordinary conversation influences and shapes our conversation in an institutional environment, for example our knowledge of lexicology and syntax. In the example of our data, journalist Jeremy Paxman and TV show presenter Jonathan Ross are experienced broadcast speakers using language efficiently as a powerful tool to achieve their targets. Paxman is famous for his tough and incisive questioning, yet sometimes criticised for being aggressive and intimidating. Jonathan Ross on the other hand employs sharp wit and a relaxed persona. Public figure Russell Brand uses expressions connected to his profession and lifestyle, regularly using a humorous tone to underpin his image of comedian. Secondly, media talk is, different from everyday conversation "by virtue of being an institutional form of discourse (Hutchby, 18). Institutions such as court, school or television studio constrain the participants within a set of specific rules that they knowingly use. In the case of a news interview, participants are restricted to tasks of questioning and responding, but in fact, they also produce other turns, knowingly departing from question-answer sequences. Thirdly, media talk is understood as "a specific type of institutional discourse because it is directed at an overhearing audience". Speakers in media talk do not talk for each other but for the benefit of the audience. The interviewer questions the guest in order to reveal information for the public and the guest promotes his own image so as to become popular. Without the audience, the whole interview would lose its purpose.

4.4.3. Questions in media talk

The previous chapter discussed issues closely related to the activity of questioning. This thesis analyses Questioning Techniques in Spoken Media Discourse and therefore Question is one of the key concepts that needs to be described in order to understand our analysis.

4.4.4. What is a question?

The term question is typically associated with a syntactic form of the interrogative. But the editors of the book *Why do you ask? The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse* suggest that there are "other kinds of syntactic forms that routinely do questioning". By contrast, the syntactic interrogative form does not always have a questioning function. For example, the rhetorical question is not intended to elicit an answer (Freed, Ehrlich, 4). This means that for our purpose we cannot define question by its syntactic function. The news interview has a fairly strict turn-taking system of question-answer sequences. Steven Clayman argues that while a journalist is restricted to the activity of asking questions, "the constraints on what can count as a question are somewhat loose" (257). He describes various forms that perform the task of questioning in a news interview, including interrogative, non-interrogative forms and "elaborating questioning forms" typical of the news interviews (258). This suggests that what is considered a question depends on the institutional setting where the question is used.

Considering the fact, "that no single linguistic factor determines whether a particular utterance is understood as doing questioning" a definition of question including both functional and sequential factors is needed for our purpose (Freed, Ehrlich 6). For linguistic purposes, it is impossible to define question in terms of syntactic form (existence of incomplete turns and back-channel cues). For this reason, we will adopt a definition of question combining functional and sequential features as defined in the volume *Why do you ask? The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse*. Questions are defined as utterances that a) solicit (and/or are treated by the recipient as soliciting) information, confirmation or action (Hultgren and Cameron 324) and b) "are delivered in such a way as to create a slot for the recipient to produce a responsive turn" (Ford 212).

5. Data analysis

5.1. Roles of participants in media talk and asymmetry

The roles of participants in institutional discourse are unequally distributed, which means that institutional interaction is asymmetric since speakers are in different power situations (Hutchby 89). In the case of news interviews, the interviewer is

supposed to ask questions and manoeuvre the whole conversation. The interviewee is supposed to acknowledge the interviewer's role, focus on answering given questions and stick to question-answer sequences. This implies that the role of the interviewer is dominant to the role of the interviewee. The interviewer gains power and achieves their targets through questions.

The following examples illustrate two major differences between political and talk show interview genres in terms of asymmetry.

(1): Political interview

- 1 **JP:** [How do you] imagine that people get power?
2 **RB:** well I imagine there are sort of hierarchical systems that's been preserved through
3 generations=
4 **JP:** =they get power by being voted in=, that's how they get power.[you] can't even be
5 arsed to vote.
6 **RB:** =well you say that, Jeremy, [but,] it's quite narrow, quite a narrow prescriptive
7 parameter that changes within the ee,
8 **JP:** in a democracy, that's how it works.

JP in this example determines the topic of interaction and tries to enforce the idea that a decision not to vote is wrong. The journalist's design of questions in this situation strongly influence RB's responses and it is impossible for him to manoeuvre the conversation.

(2): Talk Show interview

- JR:** er, ok let me ask you about your life at the moment Russell, because, I see you occasionally, not as often as I'd like to, because I very much enjoy your company. (.) you are very focused on er (.) the spiritual side of your life, (.) it seems to me. on meditation, (0.5) on the yoga that you do (.) er (.) (02:40) how much of your time is taken up with these kind of pursuits?
RB: LOADS! (laugh) it's a lot of time consuming if you start getting into meditation and yoga, it will devour your day quite easily. How do you know when you've finished? [JR: hm] (laugh) if you're trying to think of nothing and blend with the infinite divinity that encompasses (.) all things, all phenomena, it's difficult go (.) oh enough of that. (03:00) [JR: yeah yeah] (laugh) put the telly back on.
JR: you carry it with you ?
RB: it's there with you, [RB: ok] there's a limit- there is consciousness accessible to us all, we can get it through techniques. I used to try and get it through the old Persian rugs (.) drugs (cockney dialect), (.) (laugh) but that way you can receive a headache or a criminal record. (laugh)
JR: of which you've had plenty of both, I believe?

This data transcript illustrates a different distribution of power than the basic asymmetry description implies. JR is asking questions but he simply allows RB to determine the direction of conversation and to change the subject. Compared to Paxman, who enforces his opinion and does not let the guest to escape from topic, Ross asks questions related to the guest's previous turns. Instead of controlling the situation through the activity of asking questions, he simply lets the guest to choose the subject to talk about.

5.2. Flexibility and constraint of question design

This analysis of questions in a news interview environment starts with the important observation that, "questioning in this environment is not merely a choice; it is an obligation" (Clayman 257). Questioning is one of the main tasks of a journalist. On the one hand, questioning confines the journalist to the act of asking questions and, on the other, it creates an expectation as to which contributions will be regarded as allowable. As a result, news interviews are organised into "turn-taking systems" that are built by "sequences of questions and answers" (Clayman 257). In this specialised organisation of the interaction, the journalist jointly with the party being interviewed co-constructs the news content for the ears of the wide and varied audience.

While it is possible to say that the obligation to ask questions is "a pervasive constraint on a journalist" because the majority of what they can say is limited to questioning the interviewee(s), as Clayman states, the limitation of the journalist's conduct is not absolute since the constraints on what counts as a question are "rather loose" (257). In other words, it is not only the interrogative form that can perform the task of questioning. Apart from pure interrogatives, such as yes/no questions, wh-questions, alternative choice questions or others, there are also statements or elaborated question forms performing the activity of questioning. Such forms of enquiry are typical of news interviews and but rarer in other institutional interactions and settings.

This section discusses the flexibility of question design in a political interview and talk show interview and compares differences between the two genres.

One of the forms of elaborated questioning can be found in the following example from the *Jonathan Ross Show*. The talk show interview host Jonathan Ross

(JR) frames his question with a “question preface”, a term described by Steven Clayman in the article Questions in broadcast journalism (258). Question prefaces can be found in the form of elaborated declarative statements and, as Clayman suggests, they might stretch the boundaries of questioning, yet are acceptable on the basis that they provides key information for the interviewee to understand and respond to and for the audience (258). The following data examples from a talk show and a political interview illustrate the difference between the use of question prefaces by Jeremy Paxman and by Jonathan Ross.

(3): Talk show interview

1 **JR:** er, ok let me ask you about your life at the moment Russell, because,
 2→ I see you occasionally, not as often as I’d like to, because I very much
 3 enjoy your company. (.) you are very focused on er (.) the spiritual
 4 side of your life, (.) it seems to me. on meditation, (0.5) on the yoga
 5 that you do (.) er (.) (02:40) how much of your time is taken up with
 6 these kind of pursuits?

In this example, the host JR uses a declarative statement (lines 1-5) in order to introduce background for a question about Russell's spiritual life. If the question itself (lines 5-6) were left to stand on its own, it could be confusing for most of the viewers who do not know the context explained in the "prefatory statement" (Clayman 258).

Contrary to the talk show interview, as a journalist in a political interview, Jeremy Paxman uses the question preface to avoid taking up positions that could be seen as expressing his own opinion. We can see this in the example below:

(4): Political interview

1 **RB:** a minute ago you were having a go at me because I wanted a- (laughs) a revolution, [I
 2 know I'm asking you] now I’m trivial. I’m bouncing about all over the place.
 3 **JP:** [I’m not having] a go at you because you want a revolution. many people want a
 4 revolution. but I’m asking you what it would be like?

The public figure RB is, in this excerpt, blaming JP for criticising his calling for revolution (lines 1-2). In order to avoid taking this position, JP frames his following question with a defence statement. RB's statement (line 1) implies that the journalist

takes the stance towards the guest's calling for revolution and therefore the journalist uses the question preface to explain that he does not take any position towards the revolution idea and in order to defend his position as a neutral journalist.

Although journalists in political and talk show interviews have to focus mainly on the activity of questioning and this can seem to be an extensive restriction, they have a wide choice of questioning forms to choose from. From a grammatical point of view, there are not only interrogative forms but other forms that perform the task of questioning. The host of the talk show interview in our first data example uses a question preface in order to give background information for his following question. The background information is given for the benefit of the audience who need it in order to fully understand the question. In contrast to the first example, the journalist in the political interview uses the question preface in order to defend his supposed neutrality. The journalists in our data examples use question preface, one of the question elaborated forms, for different purposes.

5.3. Questioning sequences

A news interview, according to Hutchby, may be described as a typical example of a formal institutional discourse. He states that “the institutional character of the interaction is firstly and mainly represented through its form” (122). In the case of a news interview, the form is dictated through a “specialised turn-taking system” (Clayman and Heritage 216). The basic turn taking system for a news interview takes the form of question-answer sequences, where participants follow their own interactional role and restrict themselves to one or other of the turn-types (interviewer-asking questions, interviewee-answering them).

5.3.1. Political interview

Participants in a political interview interact to produce question-answer sequences by consciously organising their speech according to the normative conventions of the interview (Hutchby 123). Obligations are placed on both parties to either create the question or the answer. According to Hutchby, the standard news interview sequence is “question-answer-next question-answer” (124). This presents a

considerable limitation as to how individuals conduct themselves. If participants depart from their obligations, a sanction – such as a challenge or a rebuke – follows. Although participants are confined to their role, they have considerable latitude in how they deliver their questions and answers.

The subject of the analysis is the political interview with journalist Jeremy Paxman who questions public figure Russell Brand on his political opinions. To comment on the general structure of this data - the journalist Jeremy Paxman (denoted as JP) strives to maintain the structure of question-answer sequences throughout the whole interview, but there are some major deviations to be found in this interaction mainly caused by the interviewee Russell Brand (further denoted as RB):

(5): Political Interview

- 1 **JP:** it's possibly [because-]
2 **RB:** [AND IF THE] DAILY MAIL DON'T WANT IT, I DO! (03:40) I'm against
3 them, grow it longer,= TANGLE IT INTO YOUR ARMPIT HAIR! (highly
4 personal humour)
5 **JP:** =you are, you are a very trivial man. (delivered in a cold and slightly
6 disparaging fashion)

In this example RB interrupts JP in the middle of his statement (line 2). Although he is supposed to wait to be assigned to speak, he breaks the rule and makes a very personal remark by commenting on JP's beard. The journalist responds with a disapproving statement commenting on RB's personality. In this situation it would normally lead to a sanction in the form of a verbal warning. The journalist usually points out the fact that the public figure stepped out of his/her role and asks them to stick to answering questions, but we can see that JP instead makes a general comment about RB's personality.

To summarise, the exceptions deviating from interview question-answer turns are commonplace in a political interview. As Hutchby states, far more is going on within the question-answer sequence than the basic description implies (122). Although participants are aware of the interview structure, they knowingly break it and produce other turns, for example when the interviewee decides not to answer the question.

talk between two friends. If the speakers' names were not marked, it would be impossible to determine who is a host and who is a guest, contrary to the style of the political interview journalist JP whose power dominance is strongly implied in most of his turns. Conversation of this type is a commonplace of talk show interviews, used to evoke a fun, bantering atmosphere.

5.4. Function of questions

Although we can see that both data excerpts share very similar question-answer sequence forms, there is something that makes the two genres different; namely the function of the questions. To compare the functions of questions and the reactions they evoke, the first two turns of different TV genres are discussed below:

(7): Political Interview

JP: Russell Brand, who are you to edit a political magazine?

(8): Talk Show Interview

JR: look at you, look at- look at the state of you, look at the state.

Formally, both of these utterances are produced for the purpose of eliciting some sort of response. According to the definition of question by Freed and Ehrlich, which defines question as an utterance soliciting some sort of response, both of these utterances perform the task of questioning (6).

The role of a political interview question in the first example, coming as it does, can be described as an aggressive attack on a public figure. JP implies that RB is not competent to edit a political magazine and he wants him to justify this activity. For the start of an interview, it is a very provocative question. This utterance carries one of the main functions of question in a political interview as it is adversarial but also aims to create the impression of neutralism and objectivity. This question is supposed to elicit information for the benefit of the public. All of those features can be understood as representing the character of questioning in a political interview.

Looking at the above statement from the talk show interview, it is not syntactically a question but performs the task of questioning. After entering the room, RB sits down on a sofa in the television studio, dressed up with a smile on his face.

Jonathan Ross starts the interview with a comment on his appearance. The audience laughs and the public figure responds in a witty tone. Compared to JP and his provocative question, JR starts the interview with an easy-going statement to make the audience laugh and to evoke the atmosphere of an informal chat.

5.5. Question design and journalistic norms

Clayman and Heritage state that "journalistic questioning in broadcast news is shaped by two broad professional norms, objectivity and adversarialness" (227). Firstly, the interviewer should stay "objective" and "unbiased", avoid taking up positions or any other actions that could indicate agreement, support or disagreement with the public figure. For instance, third-turn receipt tokens such as ("yeah", "oh", "right") are rarely to be found in the news interview. As Clayman suggests, absolute neutrality is impossible to achieve, but journalists strive to hold a 'neutralistic' posture through a set of specialised discourse practises (262). In order to address this norm of neutralism, journalists focus on asking the type of question that "assures an accountable basis for objectivity" (Clayman and Heritage 277). Interviewers independently ask questions on behalf of the public and knowingly address questions and subjects that they know the audience will be interested in.

It must be noted that both journalistic norms are dependent on each other. Clayman and Heritage compare the interviewing to "sumo wrestling sport" (228). Both the interview and sumo wrestling action takes place within the ring and stepping out of this ring leads to sanctions. In the news interview, the interaction must occur within the boundaries of a "neutralistic circle" (288). In this case, the interviewer can safely use adversarial questions. Norms of neutralism and adversarialness play an important role in the understanding of talk shows and political interviews as two different television genres. Questions are used as a tool to achieve the appearance of neutralism and adversarialness in the news interview. However, as the following data examples illustrate, there is a major difference in how journalists conform to the norms of objectivity and adversarialness in different television genres.

5.5.1. Dimensions of adversarialness

Journalists in a news interview achieve the appearance of a neutralistic posture and adversarialness through the form and content of their questions (Clayman 265). Jeremy Paxman and Jonathan Ross, as representatives of two different television genres, approach the norms of neutralism and adversarialness in different ways. This section will compare the design of questions in political and talk show interviews and determine major differences between the uses of questions aiming to achieve those two norms.

5.5.1.1. Agenda setting

On occasion, questions set agendas that the public figure would rather not talk about and not answer questions on; however, as Clayman and Heritage state, "respondents are accountable in terms of these agendas" (229). In other words, they are responsible for answering the question. In the following example, Russell Brand is asked a question about the scheme of revolution. We can see that although JP clearly sets the agenda for a response, Russell fails to answer the question:

(9): Political Interview

- 1 **JP:** [I'm not having] a go at you because you want a revolution. many people want
2 a revolution. but I'm asking you what it would be like?
- 3 **RB:** well, I think what it won't be like (04:00) is hu- a huge disparity between rich
4 and poor where 300 Americans have the same amount of wealth as the 85 bill-
5 million poorest Americans, where there is an exploited and underserved
6 underclass that are being continually ignored, where we- where welfare is
7 slashed while Cameron and
8 Osborne go to court to defend the rights of bankers to continue (04:20)
9 receiving t- their bonuses. [that's all I'm saying.]
- 10 **JP:** [what's what's] the scheme, that's all I'm asking. what's the scheme, you talk
11 vaguely about revolution – what is it?
- 12 **RB:** I think a socialist egalitarian system based on the massive
13 redistribution of wealth, heavy taxation of corporations, and massive
14 responsibility for energy companies and...

JP is asking RB to explain the scheme of revolution (line 2). Instead of describing what it would be like, he starts to explain what it won't be like, which can be understood as a failure to orient towards the question agenda. At line 9 JP reformulates

his original question once again. In this way he sanctions RB for not responding to the question properly and forces him to answer it.

While the public figure Russell Brand does not always respond in a political interview in terms of the question asked, he seems to answer questions in the talk show interview without any problem. In the following question, JR sets the agenda to answer by referring to a previous comment about headaches and criminal records:

(10): Talk show interview

- 1 **JR:** of which you've had plenty of both, I believe?
2 **RB:** many headaches and er what I like to call an (03:20) impressive criminal
3 record. I have been- well, I've been even since clean from drugs, I still
4 managed to get arrested sometimes.

In this example we can see that RB answers every component of the question. He mentions headaches and criminal records and also elaborates his answer with a statement supporting his first answer.

Some topics may invoke action agendas that a public figure would rather not respond to, but this is more usual in the case of a political interview, because the journalist in a political interview strives to unmask the truth that can sometimes be harmful to the interviewee. That is why the interviewee seeks to avoid the question in such a situation. In contrast, the host of a talk show interview strives to create an appealing show for the audience, employing witty conversation and presenting interesting facts about the public figure. The public figure presents his or her image to the public in order to achieve popularity and the host of the talk show only brings out the topics that would be pleasant to talk about in order to make the interview as a whole popular and appealing.

5.5.1.2. Presupposition and question preferences

Like questions in court or medicine, questions in news interviews are carrying presuppositions that influence the ways responses are constructed. (Clayman Heritage, 231). Questions in the interview might be designed with a presupposition which

strongly influences a respondent's answers because, once the presupposition is said, the accusation is out and it is not easy for the interviewee to convince the audience about its truthfulness.

As an example of presupposition question design, let us look again at the very first sentence of the political interview.

(11): Political Interview

JP: Russell Brand, who are you to edit a political magazine?

In this data example JP starts the interview with a provocative question. It carries a presupposition that RB is a person not competent to edit a political magazine. Although RB tries to justify his role of a political magazine editor, the accusation has already been said and will make it difficult for the interviewee to convince the audience of the opposite.

Sometimes questions asked by the interviewer strongly invite a yes or no answer response. In the following example, journalist JR strongly invites RB to answer a question in the way he expects:

(12): Talk show interview

1 **JR:** Ok we should point out er, we don't need to, but I mean I get the
2 feeling people will watch er an interview, I do with you more keenly
3 /than any would- most other interviews/we should point out,
4 that you do not in any way endorse criminal behaviour? (1.0)(laugh)

In the excerpt, the host suggests that the guest RB answers the question so as to agree with what JR has said, but regardless of the fact that this question strongly invites a 'no' answer response, RB answers with a 'yes'. Talk show presenter JR uses the no-answer inviting question in order to entertain the audience, whereas journalist JP in a political interview uses question presupposition in order to bring about a provocative attack.

5.5.2. Defensible questioning

Some of the questions in a political and talk show interview carry defensive elements that go beyond the questioning task (Clayman and Heritage 234). Two of the main defensive question elements to be discussed in this section are justifying the question and footing shift. Journalists use the footing shift in order to attribute views which could be understood as expressing their own point of view to a third party (Clayman 263). They distance and separate themselves from those views in order to remain neutral.

5.5.2.1. Justification and footing shift

In the following example, it can be seen that JP uses the footing shift because his statement could be understood as a personal point of view:

(13): Political interview

1 **JP:** there are many people who would agree with you,

2 **RB:** GOOD!

3 **JP:** the current system is not engaging with all sorts of problems, yes, and they feel

4 apathetic,[RB: mmm] really apathetic. [yes] but if they were to take you seriously, (.)

5 and not to vote,

JP's opinion about the guest's decision not to vote could be understood as expressing his own point of view. In line 1 JP mentions people and further refers back to them in lines 3-5 with the personal pronoun 'they'. The journalist in this example uses footing shift. He avoids taking up any stance that could indicate he is expressing his own point of view. Stepping outside of the neutralistic circle in the political interview could have a negative effect on a journalist's future career. Therefore as an experienced journalist, JP uses several discourse practises in order to avoid taking up positions.

In contrast, the journalist in the example of the talk show interview knowingly steps outside of the neutralistic circle. One of the examples is his use of third-turn receipt tokens. As Clayman states, third turn receipt tokens can be understood as expressing agreement or support of a public figure's remarks (262). The example below illustrates such a deviation:

(14): Talk show interview

1 **RB:** LOADS! (laugh) it's a lot of time consuming if you start getting
2 into meditation and yoga, it will devour your day quite easily. 'ow do
3 you know when you've finished? [JR: hm] (laugh) if you're trying to
4 think of nothing and blend with the infinite divinity that encompasses
5 (.) all things, all phenomena, it's difficult go (.) oh
6 enough of that. (03:00) [JR: yeah yeah] (laugh) put the telly
7 back on.
8 **JR:** you carry it with you?
9 **RB:** it's there with you, [RB: ok] there's a limit- there is consciousness
10 accessible to us all, we can get it through techniques. I used to
11 try and get it through the old Persian rugs (.) drugs (cockney
12 dialect), (.) (laugh) but that way you can receive a headache or a
13 criminal record. (laugh)

We can see that journalist JR in lines 3, 6 and 9 knowingly uses third-turn receipt tokens such as *hm*, *yeah*, *ok* as back channel cues. They are common feature of everyday conversation where their use usually indicates understanding and agreement. Third-turn receipt tokens are common feature in everyday conversation. Although they would be rare to find in a political interview, they are commonly used in a talk show interview because the interaction is much close to everyday talk.

6. Discussion and conclusion

The purpose of the study was to analyse and compare questioning techniques in two different television genres: the political interview and the talk show interview. Data analysis was accomplished on the basis of two video recorded interviews obtained from *The Jonathan Ross Show* and *Newsnight*. The focus of the present study was on questions presented by the journalist, i.e. the host, and also on the interviewer's impact on the interviewee's form of response. Data transcripts were used as a core tool for the analysis.

In the first part of the analysis concerning asymmetry, it was found that there are different power distributions by participants in the two different television genres. In the political interview, the interviewer controls the interaction, determines the topic of

questions and influences the interviewee's response. The main power he gains is through the design of questions. In the talk show interview, on the other hand, the talk show host lets the guest change topic through his answers and does not control the interaction as strictly as Jeremy Paxman does in the political interview. Hutchby states that the institutional interaction of the news interview is asymmetric since participants occur in different power situations (89). The role of the interviewer is supposed to be dominant to the role of the interviewee as journalists gain power through questions; but in the talk show interview it is not always clear that the talk show presenter Jonathan Ross leads the conversation.

Furthermore, three major differences were found in the use of question prefaces by both journalists. Jeremy Paxman uses a question preface in order to avoid expressing his own opinion. The talk show presenter Jonathan Ross, however, uses a question preface in order to introduce the context for his question to the audience. This case illustrates that both journalists use question preface for a different purpose. Ross produces it for the benefit of the audience, whereas Paxman aims to protect his journalistic norm of neutrality. Use of question preface in news interview was discussed in relation to flexibility and constraint of question design as it is one of the question elaborated forms. It should be noted that the limitation as to what counts as a question in news interview is rather loose, because besides interrogative forms there are other statements and elaborated forms completing the task of questioning (Clayman 257) and one of these is the question preface.

In the section discussing forms of questioning sequences, it was found that participants in both interview genres produce many other different turns than a basic description implies. The form of a news interview is dictated through a "specialised turn-taking system" (Clayman and Heritage 216). The basic turn-taking system is found in a form of question-answer sequences, however, as the data transcripts show, far more is going on within the news interview. It was found out that participants in data extracts produces other turns than the basic description implies. For instance journalist Paxman answering the question or commenting to guest's response or RB in an example of talk show interview asking question.

As seen in the section analysing the function of questions in the two genres, questions in a political and talk show interview aim at different respective

conversational targets in order to elicit a response. The first two utterances analysed are believed to carry characteristic features of both television genres. The question in a political interview is a provocative statement produced in order to elicit information from the guest and, although adversarial, the journalist's question occurs within the neutralistic circle. The statement starting the talk show interview is intended to make the audience laugh and evoke the atmosphere of an informal chat. These two examples show that questions in political and talk show interviews differ mainly in their function. While journalists questioning politicians use questions primarily to elicit information and bring new interesting facts to light, talk show interviewers strive to entertain the audience. The typical sharpness of the questions in the political interview stands in contrast to the relaxed questioning approach in the talk show interview.

The last section of the analysis examined question design and journalistic norms. Clayman and Heritage state that "journalistic questioning in broadcast news is shaped by two broad professional norms, objectivity and adversarialness" (227). This issue is closely related to the design of questions, because interviewers achieve neutralistic posture and adversarialness mainly through the design and content of their questions.

Jeremy Paxman and Jonathan Ross as representatives of two different television genres approach the norms of neutralism and adversarialness in different ways. In agenda setting it was found that, due to these differences in content and design of question, in the political interview Russell Brand fails to orient towards the question agenda and tries to avoid providing a straightforward answer while focusing his speech on a new topic. However, in the talk show interview he does not seem to have any problem responding in terms of the question asked. This is because questions in a political interview are used as a tool to unmask and reveal important facts and therefore are more adversarial, whereas questions in a talk show interview have an entertaining character.

Both data examples illustrate that their questions carry presuppositions and question preferences, which bring out certain information that strongly influences the interviewee's response. It was found that JP in a political interview uses presupposition as a tool to verbally attack the guest and provocatively elicit a revealing response, whereas JR uses presupposition in order to entertain the audience and make them laugh.

In this case, JR cooperatively interacts with RB to make the conversation funny and appealing.

The last part of the analysis illustrates how the use of a footing shift in a political interview stands in contrast to the use of third-turn receipt tokens in a talk show interview. The journalist JP avoids taking up positions that could indicate he is expressing his own point of view through shifting the authorship of a statement to a general group of people to avoid losing neutralism. The talk show host JR, however, knowingly uses third-turn receipt tokens indicating the agreement and support of the public figure's statement. As mentioned, the talk show interview is partly an institutional talk, partly an everyday conversation, in which use of third-turn-receipt tokens is typical.

From the analysis that has been carried out, it is possible to conclude that both interviewers use, besides questions in an interrogative form, other elaborated questioning forms and statements that perform the task of questioning. Regarding basic forms of question-answer sequences, the data transcriptions illustrate several deviations from this structure, for instance the interviewee asking questions and journalists answering or commenting on question themselves.

Differences between questions in both genres are significant mainly in their function. The main purpose of questioning in a political interview is to gain information, whereas a talk show presenter strives to entertain and provide information as well. This has an influence on how Russell Brand responds to the question asked. In the example of the political interview which has an adversarial and attacking character, he often tries to escape from the discussed topic and justify his opinion. In a talk show interview, on the other hand, he presents his image to the public with the help of the host's questions regarding topics that help to promote the public figure's career.

Concerning journalistic norms of neutralism and adversarialness, Jeremy Paxman uses different questioning techniques in order to achieve maximum adversarialness and still remain neutral, whereas Jonathan Ross leads the conversation so that it appears similar to everyday talk. This has a considerable influence on the way the guest answers the question.

Since relatively few studies were focused on comparison of question design in talk show and political interviews, it would be desirable to study the types of questions with more samples in other television genres which would probably offer other interesting interpretations of question design. This work offers a contrast analysis of two different television genres which is an innovation, because most studies study genres on their own. Both data samples are found to be representative of current political and talk show interview genre. It might be contributive for those who work in the media discourse business (interviewers, interviewees) or academics and others who focus on media communication training.

Works Cited

- Bhatia, Vijay K. *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1993. Print.
- Čmejrková, Světlá. *Styl Mediálních Dialogů*. Praha: Academia, 2013. Print.
- Drew, Paul. *Talk and Interaction in Social Research Methods*. London: Sage Publications, 2006. Print.
- Drew, Paul, and John Heritage, eds. *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. Print.
- Edwards, J.A. and M.D. Lampert (1993) *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*. Hillsdale, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Fasold, Ralph W., and Jeff Connor-Linton, eds. *An Introduction to Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.
- Freed, Alice, and Susan Ehrlich, eds. *Why Do You Ask? the Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. Print.
- Goodwin, Charles, and John Heritage. "Conversation Analysis. ." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19 (1990): 283-307. Web. 29 July 2015.
<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2155967>>.
- Hepburn, A. and Bolden, G. B. (2013). Transcription. In Sidnell, J. & Stivers, T. (Eds). *Blackwell Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp 57-76). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Heritage, John. "Conversation Analysis and Institutional Talk. ." *Handbook of language and social interaction* (2005): 103-47. Print.
- Heritage, John, and Steven Clayman. *Talk in Action: Interactions, Identities, and Institutions*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010. Print.
- Heritage, John, and Steven Clayman. *Talk in Action: Interactions, Identities, and Institutions*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010. Print.
- Hutchby, and Wooffitt. *Conversation Analysis*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Polity, 2008. Print.
- Hutchby, Ian. *Media Talk: Conversation Analysis and the Study of Broadcasting*. BUCKINGHAM: Open UP, 2006. Print.
- Swales, John. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings (Cambridge Applied Linguistics)*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. Print.
- Tolston, Andrew. "Televised Chat and the Synthetic Personality. ." *Broadcast Talk*(1991): 178-200. Print.

Appendix 1: Transcription Conventions

Transcription Conventions

- AB:** the abbreviation of speakers' names at the beginning of the turn
- .** falling intonation at the end of the turn
- ,** slightly rising intonation at the end of the turn, showing continuation
- ?** highly rising intonation at the end of the turn
- (.)** a brief pause, less than 0.5 seconds
- [text]** indicates the start and end points of overlapping speech
- =** indicates latching
- CAPS** shouting or highly increased volume in speech
- (01.20)** marks every 20 seconds in the speech flow
- underline** indicates the emphasising of the word
- indicates unfinished word
- indicates false start- sound abruptly cut off
- //** uncertain transcription, transcribers' best guess
- /?/** indicates inaudible word
- (laugh)**
- (animated)** when the speaker changes his intonation
- (cold)** when the speaker says something with a sharp, cold voice

Use of standard contractions, e.g. I'm, it's, that's, you've

Appendix 2: Political interview

The following extract comes from the political interview *Newsnight* broadcast on BBC One. This interview was aired on 23rd October 2013. There are two speakers included in the transcript: celebrity Russell Brand (**RB**) and journalist Jeremy Paxman (**JP**). The interview takes place in a hotel room which we know as this was mentioned by Russell Brand and there is no audience present. This extract opens with a question.

1. **JP:** Russell Brand, who are you to edit a political magazine?
2. **RB:** well, I just suppose like a person, who's been politely asked by an attractive woman. I don't know what the typical criteria is, I don't know many people that edit political magazines, Boris, he used to do one, didn't he, so I'm a kind of a person with crazy hair, quite a *good sense of humour (animated)*, don't know much about politics,(00:20) I'm ideal.
3. **JP:** but is it true you don't even vote?
4. **RB:** yeah, no, I don't vote (0.5). (delivered in sarcastic voice)
5. **JP :** well, how do you have any authority to talk about politics then?
6. **RB:** well, I don't eh get my authority from this pre-existing paradigm which is quite narrow and only serves a few people, I look elsewhere for alternatives that might be of service to humanity (1.3). (00:40) alternate means alternate political systems.
7. **JP:** ee they being?
8. **RB:** *well, I've not invented it yet, Jeremy! I had to do a magazine last week. I've had a lot on me plate.(animated) but* I say, but here's the thing you shouldn't do, shouldn't destroy the planet, shouldn't create massive economic disparity, shouldn't ignore the needs of the people. THE BURDEN OF PROOF is on the people with the power, not people who like (01:00) doing a magazine [for a novelty.]
9. **JP:** [How do you] imagine that people get power?
10. **RB:** well I imagine there are sort of hierarchical systems that's been preserved through generations=
11. **JP:** =they get power by being voted in=, that's how they get power.[you] can't even be arsed to vote.
12. **RB:** =well you say that, Jeremy, [but,] it's quite narrow, quite a narrow prescriptive parameter that changes within the ee,
13. **JP:** in a democracy, that's how it works.
14. **RB:** well, I don't think it's working (01:20) very well, Jeremy, given that the planet is being destroyed, given that there is economic disparity of a huge degree, what you saying, there's no alternative, there's no alternative, [just this system.]
15. **JP:** [NO, I'M NOT SAYING THAT.] I'm saying [RB: brilliant] if you can't be arsed to vote, why should we be arsed to listen to your political point of view?
16. **RB:** you don't have to listen to my political point of view. it's not eh that I'm not voting out of apathy. I'm not voting out of absolute indifference (01:40) and weariness and exhaustion from the, lies treachery, deceit of the political class that has been going on for generations now and which has now reached fever pitch where you have a disenfranchised, disillusioned, despondent underclass that are not being represented by that political system, so voting for it is tacit complicity with that system and that's not something I'm offering up.
17. **JP:** well, why don't (02:00) you change it then?

18. **RB:** *I'm trying to! (animated)*
19. **JP:** well, why don't you start by voting?
20. **RB:** (laughs satirically) I don't think it works, people have voted already and that's what's created the current [paradigm.]
21. **JP:** [what] when did you last vote?
22. **RB:** never.
23. **JP:** you've never, ever voted.
24. **RB:** no, do you think that's really bad?
25. **JP:** so you struck an attitude what, before the age of 18?
26. **RB:** well, I was busy being a drug addict at that point, because I come from the kind of social conditions that are (02:20) exacerbated by an indifferent system that really just administrates for large corporations and ignores the population [that it was voted in to serve.]
27. **JP:** [but you're /blaming/] you're blaming the political class for the fact that you had a drug problem?
28. **RB:** no, no, no! I'm saying I was part of a social and economic class that is underserved by the current political system and drug addiction is one of the problems it creates. when you have huge underserved, (02:40) impoverished populations, people get drug problems, and also don't feel like ee they want to engage with the current political system because they see that it doesn't work for them, they see that it makes no difference, they see that they're not served. [I say that the apathy-]
29. **JP:** [WELL, OF COURSE IT DOESN'T WORK] for them if they didn't bother to vote.=
30. **RB:** =JEREMY, my darling, I'm not saying that the the apathy doesn't come from us the people, the apathy comes from the politicians. (03:00) they are apathetic to our needs. they're only interested in servicing the needs of corporations, *look at where-* (animated) ain't the Tories going to court, to taking the EU to court, it's because they're trying to curtail b- bank bonuses. is that what's happening at the moment in our country, isn't it?
31. **JP:** [yeah, there is]
32. **RB:** [SO WHAT AM I GONNA TUNE IN FOR THAT?]
33. **JP:** you don't believe in democracy. [RB: No I need] you want a revolution, don't you?
34. **RB:** the planet is being destroyed, we are creating an underclass, (03:20) we're exploiting poor people all over the world, and the genuine legitimate problems of the people are not being addressed by our political [class.]
35. **JP:** [all of] those things may be true.
36. **RB:** THEY ARE TRUE!
37. **JP:** but you took - I wouldn't argue with you about many of them.
38. **RB:** well, how come I feel so cross with you? it can't just be because of that beard it's gorgeous.
39. **JP:** it's possibly [because-]
40. **RB:** [AND IF THE] DAILY MAIL DON'T WANT IT, I DO! (03:40) I'm against them, grow it longer,= TANGLE IT INTO YOUR ARMPIT HAIR! (inappropriate humour)
41. **JP:** =you are, you are a very trivial man. (delivered in a cold and slightly disparaging fashion)
42. **RB:** (laughs) what do you think I am trivial?
43. **JP:** yes!
44. **RB:** a minute ago you were having a go at me because I wanted a- (laughs) a revolution,[I know I'm asking you] now I'm trivial. I'm bouncing about all over the place.
45. **JP:** [I'm not having] a go at you because you want a revolution. many people want a revolution. but I'm asking you what it would be like?
46. **RB:** well, I think what it won't be like (04:00) is hu- a huge disparity between rich and poor where 300 Americans have the same amount of wealth as the 85 bill- million

poorest Americans, where there is an exploited and underserved underclass that are being continually ignored, where welfare is slashed while Cameron and Osborne go to court to defend the rights of bankers to continue (04:20) receiving their bonuses. [that's all I'm saying.]

47. JP: [what's what's] the scheme, that's all I'm asking. what's the scheme, you talk vaguely about revolution – what is it?
48. RB: I think a socialist egalitarian system based on the massive redistribution of wealth, heavy taxation of corporations, and massive responsibility for energy companies and any companies exploiting the environment. I think they should be (04:40) ta– I think the very concept of profit should be hugely reduced. David Cameron says profit isn't a dirty word, I say profit is a filthy word because wherever there is profit there is also deficit. and there this system currently doesn't address these ideas. and so why would anyone vote for it, why would anyone be interested in it?
49. JP: who would levy these taxes?
50. RB: I think we do need to like there needs to be a centralised administrative (05:00) system, [but built on-]
51. JP: [government,] [RB: yes I-] (0.5) what used to be a government.
52. RB: yes well may- maybe call it something else. call them like the adminbots [so they don't get ahead of themselves.]
53. JP: [right. and how would they be chosen?]
54. RB: Jeremy, don't ask me to sit here in an interview with you in a bloody hotel room and devise a global utopian system. I'm merely pointing out [that the current-]
55. JP: [YOU'RE CALLING] FOR REVOLUTION
56. RB: yeah! absolutely, absolu- (05:20) I'm calling for change. I'm calling for genuine alternatives.
57. JP: there are many people who would agree with you,
58. RB: GOOD!
59. JP: the current system is not engaging with all sorts of problems, yes, and they feel apathetic,[RB: mmm] really apathetic. [yes] but if they were to take you seriously, (.) and not to vote,
60. RB: yeah they shouldn't vote, they should – that's one thing they should do, don't bother voting. because when(05:40) it reaches, there's a point, see these little valves, these sort of like little cozy little valves of recycling and Prius and like you know turn up somewhere, it stops us reaching the point where you think, I see, this is enough now. stop voting. stop pretending. wake up. be in reality now. time to be in reality now. *why vote, we know it's not going to make any difference, (animated)* we know that already.
61. JP: [it does make a difference.]
62. RB: [so like I I have more impact] (06:00) at West Ham United cheering them on, *and they lost to City, unnecessarily, sadly.(animated)*(delivered in satirical voice)
63. JP: now you're being facetious.
64. RB: well, facetiousness has as much value as seriousness. I think you're making the mistake of /r/-mistaking seriousness[for the /limity/]
65. JP: [you're not gonna to solve world] problems by facetiousness.
66. RB: WE'RE NOT GOING TO SOLVE THEM with the current system! at least facetiousness is funny. (06:20) (1.4)
67. JP: sometimes. (delivered in cold voice)
68. RB: yeah, yeah, sometimes, Jeremy. so, listen. so let's approach this optimistically. you've spent your whole career berating and haranguing politicians, and then when someone like me, a comedian, goes, yeah they're all worthless, what's the point in engaging with any of them ,you seem to have a go at me because *I'm not poor anymore. [Well, I'm sorry.](animated)*

69. **JP:** [I'm not] having a go at you] about that. I'm just asking you why we should take you seriously (06:40) when you're so unspecific (0.5) [about what,]
70. **RB:** [YOU DON'T HAVE TO TAKE-] well, firstly, I don't mind if you take me seriously. I'm here just to draw attention to a few ideas. I just want to have a little bit of a laugh, I'm saying there are people with alternative ideas that are far better qualified than I am and far better qualified, more importantly, than the people that are currently doing that job (07:00) because they're not attempting to solve these problems, they're not, they're attempting to placate the population. their measures that are currently being taken around climate change are indifferent, will not solve the-[will not solve the problem.]
71. **JP:** [you don't think that it's-] it's possible as human beings they're simply overwhelmed by the scale of the problem?
72. **RB:** not really, well possibly it might be that, I mean, but that's all just semantics really, whether they're overwhelmed by it (07:20) or tacitly maintaining it because of habitual, I mean like, mate, this is what I noticed when I was in the Houses of Parliament, it's decorated exactly the same as Eton, it's decorated exactly the same as Oxford, so a certain type of people goes in there and thinks *oh, this makes me nervous, (animated)* and another type of people go in there and go *this is how it should be. (animated)* and I think that's got to change now. we can no longer have erroneous, (07:40) duplicitous systems held in place unless it's for the serv- only systems that serve the planet and serve the population of the planet can be allowed to survive, not ones that serve elites, be they political or corporate elites, and this is what's currently happening.
73. **JP:** you don't really believe that. (delivered in cold sharp voice)
74. **RB:** oh, I completely believe it. don't look at me all weary like you're at a [fireside with your pipe and your beard] (laughs).
75. **JP:** [ED- I MEAN ED MILIBAND] wasn't elite. (08:00)
76. **RB:** well, he went to the same priv- primary school as Boris, though, didn't he?
77. **JP:** he did, but he then went to a comprehensive school in north [London.]
78. **RB:** [that's] very good. that's all well and good. but ehm what I'm saying is that within the existing paradigm the change is not dramatic enough, not radical enough, so you can well understand public disturbances and public dissatisfaction when there are not genuine changes and genuine alternatives being offered. (08:20) and I say when there is a genuine alternative, a genuine option, then vote for that. but until then *PFFFFT, (animated)* don't bother. why pretend, why be complicit in this ridiculous illusion?
79. **JP:** because by the time somebody comes along you might think it worth voting for, it might be too late.
80. **RB:** I don't think so because the time is now, this movement is already occurring, it's happening everywhere, we're (08:40) in a time where communication is instantaneous and there are communities all over the world. the Occupy movement made a difference in – even if only in that it introduced to the popular public lexicon, the idea of the 1% versus the 99%. people for the first time in a generation are aware of massive corporate and economic exploitation. these things are not nonsense and (09:00) these subjects are not being addressed. they're-no one is doing anything about tax havens, no one is doing anything about the political affi- affiliations and financial affiliations of the Conservative Party. so until people start addressing things that are actually real, [JP: hm] why wouldn't I be facetious? why would I take it seriously, why would I encourage consi- a constituency of young people that are absolutely indifferent (09:20) to vote, why would we, aren't you bored? aren't you more bored than anyone, ain't you been talking to them year after year, listening to

their lies, their nonsense, then it's this one gets in, then it's that one get in, but the problem continues, why are we going to continue to contribute to this facade?

81. JP: I'm surprised you can be facetious when you're that angry about it.

82. RB: yeah I'm angry,(0.7) I am angry, (0.5) (09:40) because for me it's real. cause for me it's not just some peripheral thing that I turn up once in a while to a church fete for. for me, this is what I come from, this is what I care about. (2.0)

83. JP: do you see any [hope?]

84. RB: [remember] that- yeah, totally, there's gonna be a revolution, it's totally going to happen. I don't know- I ain't got even a flicker of doubt, this is the end. this is time (10:00) to wake up. I remember I seen you in that program where you look at your ancestors and you saw the way your grandmother, would have to brass herself or had to have got fucked over by the aristocrats who ran her gaff, and you cried, because you knew that it was unfair and unjust. and that was, what was that a century ago, that's happening to people now, I just come from a woman who's being treated like that, I just been talking to a woman (10:20) today who's being treated like that, so if- if we can engage that feeling, instead of some moment of lachrymose sentimentality trotted out on the TV for people to pore over emotional porn, if we can engage that feeling and change things, why wouldn't we, why is that naive, why is that not my right because I'm an actor? I mean, I- I've taken the right. (10:40) I don't need the right from you. I don't need the right from anybody. I'm taking it.

Appendix 3: Talk show interview

The following extract comes from the *Jonathan Ross Show* broadcast on BBC One on 2nd February 2013. The transcript features three speakers: Journalist Jonathan Ross (JR) public figure Russell Brand (RB) and a second guest David Attenborough (DA). The interview takes place in a TVstudio where the presenter interviews the guests for one at a time. The audience also sits in the studio and plays a very important role in the extract. The reaction of the audience is marked in brackets as ‘laugh’ or other non-linguistic features. The transcript begins 01:25 into the interview. Jonathan Ross is continuing a previous conversation that the pair he and Russell Brand had when Brand was sitting in the guests waiting room and was initially introduced to the audience.

1. **JR:** look at you, look at- look at the state of you, look at the state.
2. **RB:** this is what I'm wearing.
3. **JR:** well it's lovely to see you. so you did I was just saying you flew in this morning from Los Angeles, you actually only arrived this morning, (0.6) okay, but you'll be not jet-legged, you're okay?
4. **RB:** I feel tired (01:40) and delirious, and I've been in an aquarium full of national treasures, (laugh) waffling in there.
5. **JR:** how nice for you to meet er Sir David Attenborough, I know you've been a big fan of his for so many years, you haven't met him before, have you?
6. **RB:** I once introduced him at an award ceremony, (.) er where I was er rivalling him for TV personality of the year. you will be (02:00) astonished to learn that Sir David Attenborough (.) won that prize. (laugh)
7. **JR:** er but I know, I believe, Sir David you are a fan or certainly you approve of Russell's (.) er way of carrying himself?=-
8. **DA:** =he is a very very bright guy [/JR: so that's it/]
9. **RB:** see?
10. **DA:** and I say, a lot of his jokes, lot of- I I don't appreciate [JR: yeah] and I I (laugh)(02:20) they're over my head
11. **JR:** er, ok let me ask you about your life at the moment Russell, because, I see you occasionally, not as often as I'd like to, because I very much enjoy your company. (.) you are very focused on er (.) the spiritual side of your life, (.) it seems to me. on meditation, (0.5) on the yoga that you do (.) er (.) (02:40) how much of your time is taken up with these kind of pursuits?

12. RB: LOADS! (laugh) it's a lot of time consuming if you start getting into meditation and yoga, it will devour your day quite easily. 'ow do you know when you've finished? [JR: hm] (laugh) if you're trying to think of nothing and blend with the infinite divinity that encompasses (.) all things, all phenomena, it's difficult go (.) oh enough of that. (03:00) [JR: yeah yeah] (laugh) put the telly back on.
13. JR: you carry it with you ?
14. RB: it's there with you, [RB: ok] there's a limit- there is consciousness accessible to us all, we can get it through techniques. I used to try and get it through the old Persian rugs (.) drugs (cockney dialect), (.) (laugh) but that way you can receive a headache or a criminal record. (laugh)
15. JR: of which you've had plenty of both, I believe?
16. RB: many headaches and er what I like to call an (03:20) impressive criminal record. I have been- well, I've been even since clean from drugs, I still managed to get arrested sometimes.
17. JR: well how did that happen?
18. RB: *CAUSE A LOT OF THE LAWS DON'T SEEM TO MAKE VERY MUCH SENSE. (animated)* (.) (laugh) drive in a particular way, in a particular time, (laugh) this colour means stop, this one means go,
19. RB: *who should really decide? WE THE PEOPLE!* (directed to the audience, audience responds with laugh and applause) (03:40)
20. JR: Ok we should point out er, we don't need to, but I mean I get the feeling people will watch er an interview, I do with you more keenly /than any would- most other interviews/we should point out, that you do not in any way endorse criminal behaviour? (1.0)(laugh)
21. RB: depends really, I mean, (laugh)[I actually it does because]
22. JR: [no, no, no, Russell, Russell, Russell]! I AM TRYING TO KEEP YOU OUT TROUBLE, let me [[ask that question again]](04:00) ?
23. RB: [[OH YEAH, YOU'VE DONE A GREAT JOB]] IN THE PAST, AINTCHA, (laugh) THANK YOU, UNCLE JONATHAN, [JR: /I'm trying not/] I'VE BEEN LOOKING AT A TEN STRETCH, YOU'RE LIKE BLOODY FAGIN.
24. JR: I I'm trying to keep you on the straight and [narrow].
25. RB: [I WAS] REGARDED AS A TWINKY LITTLE SEX ADDICT WHEN I MET YOU, THEN I NEARLY ENDED UP IN JAIL. (04:20) (laugh)
26. JR: yeah but then you, buggered off out of the country and left me to deal with it! (laugh)

27. RB: oh sorry about that, I 'ad to go on a special 'oliday. (laugh)
28. JR: a special holiday?
29. RB: for America I went to=
30. JR: =okay, let's deal with this, 'cause er, I- [/RB: it's very warm/] I don't know- I don't- we're both keen to put this behind us, but we should mention the Sachsgate incident, because that's what [we're joking] about (04:40)
31. RB: [I am alright with that]=
32. JR: =Ok I know you do, but people I think are perhaps curious, as to er, not necessarily what went on, that was very well documented, (laugh) but certainly how we felt about it afterwards. (0.3) [RB: yeah] and we we did both regret the furore that we caused, not an easy thing for me to say obviously, (.) (laugh) and also the the the hurt it may have caused to Mr Sachs and his family.
33. RB: no obviously we regretted it because, be- became difficult (05:00) to ascer - became difficult to distinguish the media phenomena from the obvious impolite act. I I consider myself quite a polite person, alright, but like sometimes you get excited when you're doing a joke, and what happened, you know when David Attenborough, Sir David Attenborough, he was saying when the cameramen are filming a (sic) animal, and they sort of think *this is brilliant! (animated)* and they forget it's actual reality. [JR: yeah] I sometimes feel like that with comedy, like I sort of (05:20) think I'm doing a joke I mean this is brilliant! *this is BRILLIANT! and then you sort of, (animated)* I realise oh that's reality, with real consequences. (laugh) someone was filming me when I got that tattoo done, look I've got tattoo on my hand of a Kundalini snake, etched by the eminent psychiatrist Carl Jung, who was also a very mystic man. this represents the energy of our core, being taken up our body, so there our consciousness (05:40), our primal consciousness can connect with our divine consciousness. I've been filmed when it happened Jonafan (sic) and then after I went *oh no! that's there now (animated)* (laugh) (0.5), I didn't realise it was real, 'cause it was being filmed, [I didn't think] it was real.
34. JR: [I thought,]- how many tattoos do you have now, so you have too many tattoos [[in my opinion?]]
35. RB: [[I'm smothered]] in the bleedin' [things.]
36. JR: [why did] you get tattoos?=-
37. RB: =because I'm an addict, and if like I start doing something and it feels (06:00) nice, I'll do it all the time, you know it's like chocolate, 'ow's yer father, monkey business, hullabaloo tomfoolery, [I've done 'em all.]
38. JR: [hold on, that's] all the same thing

39. RB: I know I've been /doing all day/ [JR: okay] /I've been kicked off my aeroplane/(laugh)
40. JR: how - how many tattoos you now have, Russell?
41. RB: alright I'll show you.
42. JR: oh I didn't ask you to, (.) *cheering* so we don't wanna see, (audience encourages Russell) (06:20)
43. JR: *please don't encourage him. (directed straight to the audience)*
44. RB: I feel encouraged by that.
45. JR: ok hold it, /??/ beautiful on your arm there, is these aren't like Harry Styles tatoos [/aren't they, just made out of paper?/]
46. RB: [Krishna, lord of the] seen and unseen universe, seventy percent of the universe is- er we cannot ascertain with our senses, it's dark matter, yet Krishna rules it all. Ganesh, with his infinite compassion removing the obstacles (06:40) between us and our higher selves, and then *Westham United, you are invited to Upton Park. (animated)* (laugh, applause)
47. JR: so there is a mixture of the spiritual and the temporal there, your interest in the spiritual world /undo/, and the actual world of physical reality?
48. RB: we are flesh, n't we Jonafan, [JR: we are] how can we escape our primal [[natures?]]
49. JR: [[now]] you are more flesh than most of us, and you do seem to have (07:00) more trouble escaping your primal nature than others, or perhaps you just give in to the flow of primality.
50. RB: sometimes people are so beautiful, what can you do?
51. JR: do you have that under control Russell?
52. RB: what? the old S.E.X ?
53. JR: yes.
54. RB: yeah I now meditate, and do yoga much more than I have physical intercourse, because I suppose really, all desire is the inappropriate substitute for union, (07:20) for togetherness, we do all wanna be together, like Eddie was saying, ain't our natural state to be, well, you know tribal nature is part of humanity, but we wanna connect and sometime's the simplest way to do that is through the old pink winky bridge. (laugh) but there are more divine ways to do it which also should be investigated, although they are less humorous (laugh) (07:40).

- 55. JR:** er and you have love in your life, I know you have great love for your mother, and you have [many friends?]
- 56. RB:** [she's] alright ol' mum, I remember I used to live in 'er.
- 57. JR:** ok. (laugh)
- 58. RB:** she hasn't come out here. I don't know what's next.
- 59. JR:** she is not here tonight, though normally she comes along to your appearances? (0.5)
- 60. RB:** yeah, she said she don't- she just won't take the risk me and you together. (laugh)
- 61. JR:** ah I do wanna say, Russell and I we went through an (08:00) unusual experience together, and even though, we're both a little embarrassed by what we did (.) that's fair enough, (.) the only really genuine /nice in a kind of way/ was the fact that we became very close, and I value you as a friend, and I admire you as a human being=
- 62. RB:** =thank you
- 63. JR:** and I'm /?/ you here and good luck with that, and I'm sure it will be a huge success, (.) Mr Russell Brand [ladies and gentlemen].
- 64. RB:** [cheers, Jonathan, thank you]