

## Questions in Broadcast Journalism

Steven Clayman  
Department of Sociology  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90095  
[clayman@soc.ucla.edu](mailto:clayman@soc.ucla.edu)

To appear in Alice F. Freed and Susan Ehrlich (eds.) "Why Do You Ask?": The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse.  
Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Draft 26 April 2007

## **Introduction**

Questions are a longstanding journalistic resource, although the deployment of this resource has evolved considerably over time. When journalism first emerged as a specialized occupation in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, questions were primarily a tool for gathering information, and the source interview continues to be a central means of generating the raw material out of which news stories are fashioned. But questions and their sequelae have played another and quite different role within journalism: they have been a basic form through which news itself is presented to the media audience. This function was at first marginal in the newspaper era when verbatim interviews rarely appeared in print, but it has become increasingly prominent since the advent of broadcasting and the emergence of public affairs programs organized around news interviews and news conferences. In moving from the backstage to the frontstage, questioning has become a key component of the public face that journalism presents to the world.

Journalists' questions are, in the first instance, questions plain and simple, and they share a family resemblance with other instances of this category of action. At the same time, these particular questions participate in a distinctive environment embodying a mix of professional and public accountability. Both of these dimensions, in turn, leave their imprint on the questions that reporters ask of public figures. What such questions are meant to accomplish, and the specific manner in which they are designed, are conditioned by specialized journalistic tasks and norms as well as general public attitudes and preferences. Correspondingly, new modes of questioning

can expand the boundaries of professional conduct as well as recondition what the public is prepared to accept vis a vis such conduct.

This paper explores the forms, functions, and normative foundations of journalistic questioning in broadcast news interviews and news conferences, synthesizing and consolidating the main findings from previous research.<sup>1</sup> The phenomenon of journalistic questioning will be explored first in the contemporary era, and then as it has evolved over the course of the last half-century. Throughout, attention will be focused on the relationship between questioning practices and the professional and public environments to which they contribute.

### **Journalistic Question Design: Flexibility and Constraint**

Any analysis of questions in broadcast news interviews and news conferences must begin with the fact that questioning in this environment is not merely a choice; it is an obligation. The news interview/conference is organized by a specialized turn taking system built around sequences of questions and answers (Clayman and Heritage 2002a: Chapter 4). Within this system of speech exchange, journalists are normally restricted to the activity of questioning.

The obligation to question is, on the one hand, a pervasive constraint on journalist's conduct such that the vast majority of journalists' contributions are indeed limited to questions (Heritage and Roth 1995). But this constraint, while pervasive, is also quite "loose" in the sense that what stands as an allowable question is rather broad. It includes the full range of interrogative forms (yes/no, wh-, alternative choice, statement plus tag questions) and other practices (B-event statements, rising intonation) that are routinely associated with questioning in other environments. It

also includes various elaborated questioning forms that are comparatively infrequent elsewhere.

One mode of elaboration, occurring mainly in news conferences involving large numbers of journalists, involves the production of *compound questions* comprised of two or more questioning components. For instance, here a journalist (JRN) uses his turn to put three distinct questions (arrowed) to President Clinton.

(1) [Clinton News Conference 23 March 1993]

1 JRN: 1-> Mr. President, would you be willing to hold the summit  
 2 meeting in Moscow if it would be best for President  
 3 Yeltsin's political health?  
 4 2-> Have you spoken to President Yeltsin?  
 5 3-> And don't you think that if you did go to Moscow,  
 6 it would engage the U.S. too closely in the power  
 7 struggle in the capital?  
 8 BC: You've got me on both sides of the issue before  
 9 I even started. Well, let me say, first, I have not  
 10 talked to President Yeltsin, but I have sent him two  
 11 letters... ((response continues))  
 12 JRN: Would you go to Moscow if it was called for?

Public figures do not necessarily answer every component of a compound question, but they may be held accountable for not answering in subsequent follow-up questions. In the preceding example, only the second question is addressed in a direct way (lines 8-10), prompting the same journalist to regain the floor and press for an answer to the first question (line 12).

The clustering of compound questions in news conferences is not coincidental; it is an adaptation to the conditions of speech exchange found in that environment. With many participating journalists who could in principle ask each successive question, some mechanism of turn-taking is needed to select among the participants, and this is typically managed by the public figure choosing from among those who are raising their hands, calling out the public figure's name, or otherwise "bidding" for the next question. This arrangement greatly restricts the capacity to ask follow-up questions or

to raise other matters, and journalists often gain the floor only once per conference. Correspondingly, it also creates an incentive for journalists to build multiple questions – typically, as above, a question and one or more follow-ups – into a single turn at talk.

Another mode of elaboration involves the inclusion *question prefaces* that are formatted as declarative statements and are often rather extensive. Such prefaces might seem to stretch the boundaries of questioning, but they are allowable on the grounds that they provide the kind of background information that the recipient and the media audience will need to understand the import of the question and why it is being asked. Consider this question to an anti-apartheid activist from South Africa, where the question proper (line 3) is preceded by a prefatory statement (lines 1-2).

(2) [US ABC Nightline: 22nd Jul 1985: South Africa]

1 JRN: .hh Two- two members of your organization (.)  
 2 supposedly arrested today:  
 3 D'you feel in some danger when you go back,

If left to stand on its own, the question – which raises the prospect of personal danger the interviewee – might seem to be coming from "out of the blue." The prefatory statement establishes a context for this inquiry, and in so doing it clarifies the relevance and import of a question that might otherwise be puzzling or incomprehensible to many viewers.

Because question prefaces allow journalists to set the context for a given question, they have the effect of releasing journalists from the confines of what might already be understood or presupposed in the context of the interview at that juncture. They thus enable journalists to ask about all manner of subjects – including those quite unrelated to the interviewee's previous remarks. Correspondingly, prefaces also facilitate the introduction of information that disputes, challenges, or criticizes the interviewee, which may in turn operate as a constraint on the interviewee's subsequent response. To illustrate some of these themes, consider this question (lines

5-6) to Margaret Thatcher on the circumstances under which she would have England join the European exchange rate mechanism.

(3) [UK BBCTV Newsnight: Jun 1989:Exchange Rate Mechanism]

1 JRN: Now turning to the exchange rate mechanism you:  
 2 have consistently said or the government has said  
 3 .hh that you will joi:n when the ti:me is right  
 4 but people are saying: .hh that that means never.  
 5 Could you defi:ne the ki:nd of conditions when  
 6 you think we would go in.  
 7 MT: Uh no I would not say it means never. For the  
 8 policy ...

The preface (lines 1-4) prepares for this question by contrasting prior statements by Thatcher concerning entry "when the time is right" with an unflattering interpretation of that statement as meaning "never" (lines 1-5). This portrays Thatcher's prior statement on the matter as improperly vague and indeed misleading regarding her true intentions. Furthermore, as a context for the ensuing question, the preface operates to disallow any response along the lines of the quoted "when the time is right," because it prospectively casts such a response as inadequate and evasive. Here, then, the preface enables the journalist to both challenge the interviewee's previously stated position, and to reduce her freedom to maneuver subsequently.

The capacity to produce elaborately designed questions and in particular extended prefaces is thus a major source of agency for journalists in this context. It is worth noting, however, that such agency rests on the tacit cooperation of the public figure, who must refrain from speaking for the elaborated turn to be completed. Public figures normally exercise such restraint (as the preceding examples illustrate), but they may become more prone to interject in the heat of argument (see excerpt 6 below). Elaboration also distinguishes *journalistic* questions from those that might seem superficially similar, namely *legal* questions asked in the courtroom context of trial examinations. In at least some contexts – i.e., direct examination in the American legal system – prefaced questions are

objectionable as "leading the witness," so examination questions tend to be structurally simple (see Atkinson and Drew 1979).

The flexibility that journalists experience is not without limits. Some interrogative forms that might appear to be straightforward questions turn out, on closer analysis, to depart from this activity framework as it is usually understood. A straightforward case is the *negative interrogative*, in which the copula incorporates a negative (i.e., *Isn't it, Doesn't that, Aren't you*). This example (arrowed) is from one of Bill Clinton's presidential news conferences.

(4) [Clinton News Conference 7 March 1997]

1 JRN: W'l Mister President in your zea:l (.)  
 2 for funds during the last campaign .hh  
 3 -> didn't you put the Vice President (.) an'  
 4 Maggie and all the others in your (0.4)  
 5 administration top side .hh in a very  
 6 vulnerable position, hh  
 7 (0.5)  
 8 BC: I disagree with that.hh u- How are we vulnerable  
 9 because ...

From a grammatical point of view, these are *yes/no* interrogatives, but the inclusion of the negative component has the effect of inviting a *yes* answer so strongly that these are regularly treated as opinionated in character and hence more assertive than questioning (Heritage 2002; Clayman and Heritage 2002a: 217-221. In the preceding example, Clinton's response ("I disagree with that") clearly treats the prior as embodying a viewpoint to be disagreed with, and not merely a question to be answered.

Another nonquestioning interrogative form, one that is highly assertive in a quite different way, is anything along the lines of "how can you X," "how could you X," or in the following question about cuts in social programs, "how is it possible for you to X" (arrowed).

(5) [Reagan News Conference 19 Jan. 1982]

1 JRN: Mr. President, since you took office a year ago,  
 2 there have been- unemployment has shot up to more than  
 3 million people. The recession has deepened. Two

4 Republican Congressmen say that the tax increases that  
 5 you may propose will hurt the little guy and give a  
 6 bonanza to the big corporations.  
 7 My question is, what are you going to do about the  
 8 people who are undergoing great hardship now,  
 9 -> and how's it possible for you to propose deep cuts  
 10 in the social programs in view of all this suffering?

Questions like this might seem to be seeking an explanation for the politician's conduct, but unlike other interrogatives that do so in effect without prejudice (such as "Why did you X"), the *how could you* form embodies the viewpoint that there is no adequate explanation. Hence, this form is less an information-seeking question than an accusation. In the preceding example, the accusatory import is encoded not only in the form of the interrogative ("how is it possible for you to...") but also in the prefatory material (lines 1-6), which describes current economic hardship that would make cuts in social programs indefensible.

The accusatory import of the *how could you* form can overwhelm its questioning character, pushing the boundaries of what is permissible journalistic conduct. Consider the following case, taken from Dan Rather's interview with the first George Bush concerning his involvement in the Iran-Contra scandal. Rather sets out to construct an elaborate question preface that places Bush in high-level meetings when the arms-for-hostages deal was hotly debated (lines 1-10), and juxtaposes this with Bush's status as an alleged anti-terrorism expert and Iran's status as a known terrorist state (12-15). Rather pushes forward over Bush's interjections to draw out the implications, eventually attacking Bush as having "made us hypocrites in the face of the world" (25-27). It is at this point that Rather comes to an interrogative, which takes the *how could you* form ("How couldja sign onto such a policy" in 28-30), and thereby proposes that there is no acceptable explanation for Bush's actions.

(6) [US CBS Evening News: 25 Jan 1988: Iran-Contra]

1 JRN: I- I want you t' talk about thuh record, y:ou



2           sat in thuh meeting with George Schulz,=  
 3 GB:        =Yes, ['n I've given ya 'n answer.]  
 4 JRN:       [He got apoplectic ] when 'e  
 5           found out [that you were- you an' thuh]=  
 6 GB:        [He didn't get ]=  
 7 JRN:       =[President were being PARTY TUH SENDIng MIS]=  
 8 GB:        =[apoplectic, why'ncha ask Don Regan ]  
 9 JRN:       = siles to the- Ayatollah of Ira:- eh- uh-  
 10           [the Ayatollah of Iran.=  
 11 GB:        [Ask-  
 12 JRN:       =.hhh Can you explain how- (.) you were supposed  
 13           tuh be the- eh- you are:. you're an anti  
 14           terrorist expert. .hhh we- (0.2) Iran was  
 15           officially a terrorist state. .hh you went  
 16           a[round telling eh::- eh- ehr- ]  
 17 GB:        [I've already explained that Dan, I] wanted  
 18           those [hostages- I wanted Mister ]=  
 19 JRN:       [( ) Mist' Vice President (thuh)=  
 20 GB:        =[ Buckley ] outta there.  
 21 JRN:       =[question is])  
 22 JRN:       But-  
 23           (0.3)  
 24 GB:        [before 'e was killed. ] [which he)]=  
 25 JRN:       [You've- you've made us hyp]oc[rites in ]=  
 26 GB:        =[( )]=  
 27 JRN:       =[thuh face o' thuh world.]=  
 28 JRN: -> =How couldja [gr- how couldja-] (.) sign on=  
 29 GB:        [(That was ba:d) ]  
 30 JRN:       =to such a policy. .hh[h And thuh question]=  
 31 GB:        [Well (half-) thuh]=  
 32 JRN:       =[is, what does that tell us about your]=  
 33 GB:        =[ same reason thuh President ]=  
 34 JRN:       =[ record.]  
 35 GB:        =[ signed on to it. (0.2) Thuh same reason  
 36           thuh President signed on to it. .hh When a CIA  
 37           agent is being tortured tuh death, .h maybe ya  
 38           err on the side of a human life.

That this is something other than a straightforward information-seeking question is apparent not only in the confrontational environment in which it is offered, but also in what happens next. Although Bush launches a response (31), Rather struggles in overlap to produce a subsequent interrogative that is explicitly framed as "the question" at hand ("And the question is..." in 30-34), thereby retrospectively casting the prior as a prefatory comment rather than a question in its own right.

As the preceding examples demonstrate, some interrogative forms are problematic for journalists because they are so assertive or accusatory that they are understood to depart from the activity of "questioning." Others are

undoubtedly questions, but are potentially problematic nonetheless because of the topics they raise or projects they pursue. Consider questions about a politician's personal life – these have traditionally been out of bounds, and even now they remain controversial and are rarely asked without cause. Moreover, journalists may go to extra lengths to justify the introduction of such topics, thereby marking them as problematic. For instance, before asking Senator Gary Hart about an alleged extramarital affair, this journalist first points out (lines 1-3) that "some days ago" he alerted Hart that this specific question would be forthcoming.

(7) [US ABC Nightline 8 September 1987: Gary Hart and Donna Rice]

1 JRN: Uh- (0.5) I told you::. (0.4) some days ago when we  
 2 spo:ke, and I told our audience this evening that  
 3 I would ask you both questions. I will ask you the  
 4 first now: (.) just before we take a brea:k because  
 5 I think I know what your answer's gonna be.=  
 6 =Did you have an affair with Miss Rice?

Broadcast news interviews are frequently preceded by backstage negotiations concerning the range of topics that will be fair game, but it is exceedingly rare for such negotiations to be mentioned on the air because it risks compromising the integrity of the interview as a spontaneous exchange with an independent journalist. Here, though, the journalist is willing to take such a risk in order to demonstrate that he has provided his guest with fair warning about the question that he is about to ask.

In a similar vein, "pop quiz" questions asked during election campaigns (i.e., "Can you name the President of Chechnya?") are also problematic. The manifest purpose of such questions is to test candidates' knowledge of domestic and international affairs as a service to voters. However, because they have the potential to embarrass and degrade recipients who are unable to answer correctly, such questions are regarded by many as "out of bounds" and they often wind up being more damaging to the journalist than to the candidate (Roth 2005). "Pop quiz" questions, much like questions about

politicians' personal lives, may not be entirely absent from contemporary news interviews/conferences, but they remain sensitive and problematic.

### **Question Design and Journalistic Norms**

Both the flexibility of journalistic questioning and its discernable limits are related to the professional norms that inhabit this environment.

#### Neutralism

On the one hand, consistent with the ideal of objectivity, broadcast journalists are supposed to remain neutral in their questioning. While absolute neutrality is unattainable, journalists do strive to maintain a formally neutral or "neutralistic" posture in a variety of ways. These include adherence to the activity of questioning while avoiding other actions that are not accountable as merely "seeking information." Even third-turn receipt tokens (*uh huh, yeah, oh, okay, right*), which might be taken to indicate agreement with or support for the public figure's previous remarks, are systematically absent in news interviews and news conferences.

A neutralistic posture is also maintained through the design of questions themselves (Clayman and Heritage 2002a: Chapter 5). This process is most conspicuous whenever journalists depart from the safety of interrogative syntax (which as the default method of questioning is normally neutralistic) to produce declarative assertions that can be taken to express a point of view. Recurrently at such moments, journalist work to separate themselves from the views they are expressing by attributing them to a third party, a practice that Goffman (1981) has referred to as a shift in the speaker's interactional "footing." For example, when this journalist asserts (in lines

9-12) that nuclear waste can be readily managed, he ascribes the viewpoint to "Doctor Yalow," a scientist who appeared earlier on the program (lines 6-8, arrowed).

(8) US ABC Nightline: 6 Jun 1985: Nuclear Waste

1 JS: ...And if you look et- simply the record in  
 2 the low level waste field over the last  
 3 fifteen to twenty years... the record is not  
 4 very good (0.3) an' it doesn't give one a cause  
 5 for optimism.=  
 6 JRN: -> =You heard what Doctor Yalow said earlier in  
 7 this broadcast she'll have an opportunity to  
 8 -> express her own opinions again but she seems to  
 9 feel that it is an EMinently soluble problem,  
 10 and that ultimately that radioactive material  
 11 can be reduced, to manageable quantities, 'n put  
 12 in the bottom of a salt mine.  
 13 JS: The p- the point that she was making earlier  
 14 about (.) reprocessing of: the fuel rods goes  
 15 right to the heart (.) of the way a lotta  
 16 people look at this particular issue...

Not only does he make a special point of indicating that this view belongs to Dr. Yalow ("her own opinions," "she seems to feel"), but he also refrains from either endorsing or rejecting this viewpoint, or offering any commentary of his own on the matter. In this way, he casts himself as disinterestedly invoking the opinions of a third party. Since he never actually comes to an interrogative in this case, the third party attribution is essential to maintaining a neutralistic posture. This posture may, of course, be a façade, but it is subsequently validated and reinforced by the public figure's response ("The point she was making earlier..." in line 13).

The significance of footing for the achievement of neutralism can be seen most clearly in cases where journalists shift footings selectively over the course of a turn at talk, deploying the practice only for statements that might be regarded as particularly opinionated or controversial. Consider this excerpt from an interview with Senator Robert Dole, then the Senate majority leader for the Republican Party.

(9) US NBC Meet the Press: 8 Dec 1985: Troubled Programs

JRN: 1-> Senator, (0.5) uh: President Reagan's elected  
 thirteen months ago: an enormous landslide.

(0.8)

2-> It is s::aid that his programs are in trouble, though he seems to be terribly popular with the American people.

(0.6)

3-> It is said by some people at the White House we could get those programs through if only we ha:d perhaps more: .hh effective leadership on on the Hill and I [suppose] indirectly=

RD:

[hhhheh ]

JRN:

=that might (0.5) relate t'you as well:. (0.6)

Uh what do you think the problem is really.

Is=it (0.2) the leadership as it might be

claimed up on the Hill, or is it the

programs themselves.

The initial statement beginning at arrow 1 - that Reagan was elected "thirteen months ago" in "an enormous landslide" - reports a concrete historical fact and a matter of public record, and this fact is asserted straightforwardly. In contrast, the subsequent claim that Reagan's programs are "in trouble" (beginning at arrow 2) and the suggestion that Dole is to blame for this (beginning at arrow 3) are by comparison matters of judgment and interpretation. Correspondingly, the journalist distances himself from these latter assertions, first by means of the passive voice with agent deletion ("it is said..."), and second by attribution to "some people at the White House" in the second (arrow 3).

Journalists also shift footings selectively over the course of a single sentence, such that a contentious word or two is singled out for attribution to a third party. In the next example, although the journalist begins (at lines 1-2 below) by attributing an upcoming viewpoint in its entirety (regarding violence and negotiations in South Africa) to a third party ("the Ambassador"), this footing is later renewed in subsequent talk (line 6, arrowed) just prior to a specific term ("collaborator") which is re-attributed to that party.

(10) US ABC Nightline: 22 Jul 1985: South Africa

1 JRN:

Reverend Boesak lemme a- pick up a point uh the

2

Ambassador made. What- what assurances can you

3

give u:s .hh that (.) talks between moderates

4

in that see:ms that any black leader who is

5           willing to talk to the government is branded  
 6       -> as the Ambassador said a collaborator and is  
 7       then punished.=  
 8 AB:       =Eh theh- the- the Ambassador has it wrong.  
 9       It's not the people who want to talk with  
 10       the government that are branded collaborators...

As a way of characterizing black leaders who negotiate with the South African government, "collaborator" has strong morally judgmental overtones. The journalist goes to extra lengths to disavow any personal attachment to this contentious term, and this stance is subsequently validated by the public figure ("The Ambassador has it wrong..." in line 8).

The orientation to neutralism is so powerful that a journalist, having launched into an opinionated utterance, may execute self-repair so as to shift to a neutralistic stance. Consider the following excerpt from an interview with a Reagan Administration official regarding the President's decision to continue to honor the Salt II arms control treaty.

(11) US PBS NewsHour: 10 Jun 1985: Nuclear Weapons

1 JRN:       How d'you sum up the me:ssage. that this  
 2       decision is sending to the Soviets?  
 3 IE:       .hhh Well as I started- to say:: it is ay- one  
 4       of: warning and opportunity. The warning is (.)  
 5       you'd better comply: to arms control::  
 6       agreements if arms control is going to have any  
 7       chance of succeeding in the future. Unilateral  
 8       compliance by the United States just not in the  
 9       works...  
 10       ((Four lines omitted))  
 11 JRN: -> But isn't this- uh::: critics uh on the  
 12       conservative side of the political argument  
 13       have argued that this is::. abiding by the  
 14       treaty is::. unilateral (.) observance. (.)  
 15       uh:: or compliance. (.) by the United States.

After the official carefully distinguishes the Administration's decision from "unilateral compliance" (lines 3-9), the journalist presents the opposite point of view. This is foreshadowed from the very beginning of his turn (line 10, arrowed) - the turn-initial "but" clearly projects that some form of disagreement is in the works, and the negative interrogative ("isn't this") begins to deliver this in a highly assertive manner. However, the journalist abruptly abandons the turn at this point, pauses briefly

("uh:::"), and then restarts on a different footing such that "critics on the conservative side" are cited as responsible for the forthcoming viewpoint. This revised version is no longer interrogatively formatted - it is a free-standing assertion that disputes the guest's previous point, but now does so on someone else's behalf.

### Adversarialness

Even as they are supposed to be neutral, journalists are also supposed to be adversarial in their treatment of politicians and other public figures. Consistent with the ideal of the press as an independent watchdog and counterweight to official power, public figures should not be permitted to transform a news interview or news conference into a personal soapbox. Journalists pursue the ideal of adversarialness in part through the content of their questions, subjecting the public figure's previous remarks to challenge and introducing critical and alternative points of view. Adversarialness is also pursued through the underlying form of such questions, which may be built in ways that exert pressure on the public figure to address issues not of their own choosing (Clayman and Heritage 2002a: Chapter 6).

Three forms of pressure may be distinguished. At the most basic level, questions *set agendas* that recipients are obliged to address. Such agendas encompass not only the *topical domain* raised by a question, but also the *action* that is called for in response. The topic/action distinction is highlighted in the following example, where British Prime Minister Edward Heath is asked whether he likes his political rival, Harold Wilson (line 1). Heath's response (lines 3-8) addresses the topic of the question - Wilson - but does not address the action it solicits, namely a yes/no answer as to

whether he "likes" Wilson. This prompts two rounds of follow-up questions pressing Heath for a more direct answer.

(12) UK BBC Omnibus: Unknown Date: Harold Wilson

1 JRN: Do you quite li:ke him?  
 2 (0.1)  
 3 HW: .hhh .h .h We:ll I th- I think in politics you  
 4 see: i- it's not a ques:tion of going about (.)  
 5 li:king people or not, hh It's a question of  
 6 dealing with people, °°h .h°° a:n::d u::h (.)  
 7 I've always been able to deal perfectly well with  
 8 Mister Wilson,=as indeed: uh- he has with me,  
 9 (0.4)  
 10 JRN: <But do you like> him?  
 11 (0.1)  
 12 HW: .hhhh Well agai:n it's not a question of uh (.)  
 13 li:kes or disli:kes. I::t's a question of  
 14 wor:king together:: with other people who are in  
 15 politics,  
 16 (0.6)  
 17 JRN: But do y'like him.  
 18 (0.4)  
 19 HW: .hhh (.) That'll have to remain t'be see:n won't it.

As this case illustrates, recipients may sidestep either the topic or action agenda set by a question, but they can be held accountable for answering in subsequent follow-up questions.

It should also be noted that a question's agenda may be further narrowed through the vehicle of question prefaces. Thus, as seen earlier in the question to Margaret Thatcher (excerpt 3), prefaces may block certain lines of response, and more generally they can be elaborated in ways that substantially reduce the public figure's freedom to maneuver.

A second form of pressure involves the incorporation of *presuppositions* into the design of a question – propositions that are not the primary focus of inquiry but are nonetheless assumed to be true. For instance, this question – from an interview with Arthur Scargill of the British mineworkers' union – asks about "the difference" between his marxism and the views of a political opponent, thereby presupposing that Scargill is indeed a marxist.

(13) [UK BBC Radio World at One: 13 Mar 1979: Marxism]

JRN: .hhh er What's the difference between your



marxism and Mister McGarhey's communism.  
 AS: er The difference is that it's the press that  
 call me a ma:rxist when I do not, (.) and never  
 have (.) er er given that description of myself.

When the presupposed information is hostile to the public figure and is deeply embedded – as in this example (see also excerpts 5 and 9 above) – then any response that actually addresses the agenda of the question will also confirm the undesirable presupposition. Conversely, digging out and countering the presupposition can be difficult, requiring something other than a straightforward answer. In the preceding example, while the recipient sidesteps the agenda set by the question in order to counter its premise, he finesses the maneuver by framing his response ("the difference is...") as if it were a direct answer.

It is this dilemma – having to choose between two problematic lines of response – that makes presuppositionally loaded questions so awkward for the public figure. Correspondingly, for journalists seeking to exert pressure on recalcitrant public figures, they are an important resource.

Finally, questions can be designed so as to *invite or prefer a particular answer*. This can be seen most clearly for the case of *yes/no* questions, which can in effect be "tilted" in favor of either a *yes-* or *no-*type answer. Most such questions embody at least some degree of preference one way or the other, but two practices stand out as particularly powerful their push for a particular answer. One such practice is the negative interrogative, already discussed in excerpt 4 above ("didn't you"). As noted earlier, this grammatical form leans so heavily in favor of a *yes* answer that it is recurrently treated as embodying a viewpoint to be agreed/disagreed with, rather than a question to be answered.

A marked level of preference can also be encoded in question prefaces. Consider this question to President Reagan on recent defense expenditures.

(14) [Reagan News Conference 11 Nov. 1982]

1 JRN: Mr. President, evidence mounts that key weapons  
 2 in your \$400 billion weapons procurement buildup  
 3 are in trouble. Navy testers say that the F-18,  
 4 on which you'd spend \$40 billion, is too heavy  
 5 for its major mission. Your closest military  
 6 science advisor says that the latest basing plan  
 7 for the MX won't fool the Soviets. The Pershing  
 8 missile, on which NATO defense would depend,  
 9 literally can't get off the ground. The anti-tank  
 10 weapon the Army wants to buy seems to be ineffective  
 11 against modern Soviet tanks. The Maverick missile  
 12 can't find its targets.  
 13 I wonder whether in light of all these failures  
 14 you have any reason to wonder whether a \$400  
 15 billion arms buildup is money well spent.

Here the preface (lines 1-12) presents a very long list of weapons failures, all of which strongly favors a *no* answer to the subsequent question about "whether a \$400 billion arms buildup is money well spent."

Question prefaces, like negative interrogatives and allied practices, exert pressure on the public figure to answer in a particular way. Moreover, when the solicited answer is contrary to the public figure's interests – as in the above, where the president is being pushed to admit that huge defense outlays have *not* been well-spent – such practices are also adversarial in character.

The professional norms that bear most directly on journalistic questioning – neutralism and adversarialness – are plainly in tension. This tension is substantially reduced in panel interviews involving multiple public figures with opposing viewpoints. With guests playing the adversary role vis a vis one another, journalists are free to act as more neutral mediators via their questions (e.g., "Senator, how do you respond to that?"). More generally, the balance that is struck between neutralism and adversarialness is a signature that distinguishes individual interviewers, the news programs on which they appear, and as we shall see historical periods characterized by dominant styles of interviewing.

### **Question Design and the "Overhearing" Audience**

Broadcast talk, in general, is distinguished by a communicative ethos whereby program participants speak not only for one another but also for the benefit of the media audience (Scannel 1989, 1990, 1996). Broadcast journalism, as a form of broadcast talk, is similarly audience-directed. Accordingly, the questions that broadcast journalists ask are sensitive not only to the professional context at hand but also to the broader public arena. The audience is rarely if ever addressed directly, except during the opening phase when the guests are introduced. For the main body of the interview, journalists address their questions to public figures. Nevertheless, they maintain a tacit orientation to the audience by treating them as a ratified if unaddressed party of "overhearers." This is manifest in part in journalists' wholesale avoidance of third-turn receipt items (acknowledgement tokens such as *uh huh*, *yeah*, or *okay*, news receipts such as *oh* or *really*, assessments, etc.) through which speakers ordinarily cast themselves as the recipients of prior talk (Heritage 1985). Such receipt items, utterly commonplace in ordinary conversation, are systematically avoided by journalists who remain silent while public figures deliver their responses, and who then simply move on to the next question. By eliciting but not receipting public figures' talk, journalists allow such talk to be understood as having been produced for the benefit of others. Correspondingly, an orientation to the "overhearing" audience as the primary but unaddressed recipient of the talk also enters into the design of questions themselves.

### Explicit References to the Audience

The most overt way that journalists attend to the audience is when they explicitly frame their questions as being asked on the audience's behalf (Clayman 2006; Clayman and Heritage 2002a: 171-176). For instance (arrowed):

(15) [ABC Nightline 5 June 1985: Corporate Mergers]

1 JRN:     Joining=us=now li:ve in our New York studios, Malcolm  
2           Forbes. chairman and editor in chief of Forbes magazine,  
3           one of thuh nation's best known business journals. ( )  
4           .hhh And from our affiliate WXYZ in Detroit.  
5           Professor Walter Adams, professor of economics and  
6           former president of Michegan State University.  
7     ->.hhhh Professor Adams to: those millions of people out  
8     -> there who uh never hope to control ay billion dollar  
9     -> corporation, an' frankly don't care one way or another,  
10    -> why should they.  
11         (0.9)  
12 WA:     .hhh Well thee: uh- problem with these megamergers...

(16) [NBC Meet the Press 8 Dec 1985: Bob Dole]

1 JRN:     We are back on Meet the Press, with the:  
2           Senate majority leader, Bob Dole of Kansas.=  
3           =Senator? ( ) u::m I wanna get- ( )  
4           clear:: in my own mind, and hopefully  
5     -> for those people who=watching the program,  
6           do you support. ( ) the:: bill that came outta the  
7           House Ways 'n Means Committee on tax reform.  
8           (1.4)  
9 BD:     Well I'm a=little like de: prez'den' I support...

This practice, a variant of the neutralistic footing discussed above, is clustered disproportionately in certain interactional environments. One such environment involves the launching of an interview (example 15) or its resumption following a commercial break (example 16). Why is it that opening and resumptive questions are affiliated with the public in this way? A clue may be gleaned from the immediately preceding talk (excerpt 15 lines 1-4, excerpt 16 lines 1-2), which is occupied with the task of introducing or re-introducing the public figure to the audience. A hallmark of such

introductory talk is that it is addressed *directly* to the audience, and is constituted as such through both nonvocal and vocal means. Journalists face the camera and talk into it during most of the introductory talk, while referring to their guests in the third person via expanded person reference forms ("Profesor Walter Adams," "Bob Dole of Kansas"). By contrast, when journalists proceed from audience-directed introductions to interviewee-directed questions, they mark the transition by redirecting their gaze away from the camera and toward the interviewee, and by using a reduced person-reference form ("Professor Adams," "Senator") to address the interviewee directly.

It is the reconfiguration of participation frameworks embodied in this shift in address that conditions the framing of opening/resumptive questions. On the one hand, invoking the public may be understood as a lingering remnant or trace of a prior direction of address and the participation framework that it embodies. What previously involved directing remarks toward the audience becomes, within the question, a matter of speaking on the audience's behalf. But this practice is not merely a residue of what came before; it is also a constitutive feature of the current participation framework. It furthers the reconfiguration whereby the audience is positioned as an "overhearer" of an interaction taking place primarily between journalist and public figure.

A second environment for audience-framed questions involves aggravated disagreements and attacks on public figures. The following instance occurred in an interview with a convicted child molester who had served out his sentence but remains in confinement because was judged a continuing threat to society. The interviewee, arguing for his release, makes an impassioned claim to have been cured of his propensity to molest (lines 1-5), and he begins to weep at this point (line 6-8). At this emotionally charged moment, just when the interviewee appears to be most distraught and vulnerable, the interviewer counters by proposing that he is merely putting on an act (lines

9-10), presumably as a ploy to win release from prison. And when the interviewee attempts to respond (line 12), the interviewer cuts him off to reiterate this point (cf., Jefferson, 1981) (lines 13-14).

(17) [CBS 60 Minutes 12 Jan 1998: Stephanie's Law]

1 IE: Well the law was the one that brought me here. (0.5)  
 2 But it was me that decided that I wanted to stop ( )  
 3 .hh I want to stop the molesting, I want to stop the  
 4 offending, I want to stop the hurting? (0.2)  
 5 ((sniff)) I want to heal myself. ((crying))  
 6 (2.5) ((sniff:::))  
 7 (2.5)  
 8 JRN: -> Do you know that there're people watching (0.7) who  
 9 will say: that that's: part of the deal he's doing=  
 10 ya know.  
 11 IE: Oh I know. But I was an em[osh-  
 12 JRN: [That's part of the act.  
 13 IE: ((sniff))=Well- (0.5) .h I wish they'da known me before....

This disparaging retort is framed as something that "people watching... will say" (arrowed). And the interviewee responds accordingly, framing his answer as a counter to a broadly-held sentiment rather than one belonging to the journalist per se ("I wish they'da known me before" in lines 15-16).

The conjunction of highly aggressive questions and overt references to the audience, or in some instances the general public, is not coincidental. Speaking on behalf of the public has both a neutralizing and legitimating import, validating the inquiry as something motivated by genuine public interest, while casting the journalist as an impartial "tribune of the people." For the same reason, journalists also invoke the audience/public when defending themselves against criticisms and attacks. Thus, in Dan Rather's infamous interview with Vice President George Bush on his involvement in the Iran-Contra scandal, Bush registered a series of complaints against Rather and the CBS Evening News team, accusing them among other things of having previously misrepresented the purpose of the interview, leading him to think that it would be a benign "political profile." Following these accusations, Bush calls for "fair play" (lines 1-

3), and he bids to broaden the agenda of the interview beyond Iran-Contra as he claims he was promised.

(18) [CBS Evening News Jan 25, 1988: Bush-Rather]

1 GB: ....I'm asking for: (0.3) fair play:, and I thought I was  
 2 here to talk about my views on education, or on  
 3 getting this deficit down=  
 4 JRN: =Well Mr. Vice Preside[nt we wanna talk about the re[cord o]n=  
 5 GB: [Yes. [Well lets]  
 6 JRN: =this, .hh because it-  
 7 GB: Well let's talk  
 8 abo[ut the (full) record, that's what I wanna talk about] Dan,  
 9 JRN: -> [th- the framework he::re:, is that one third of-]  
 10 JRN: -> one third o'the Republicans in this poll[: , one third=  
 11 GB: [Yeah  
 12 JRN: -> =o'the the Republicans .hh and- and one fourth of the  
 13 -> people who say:: that- eh y'know they rather like you:,  
 14 -> .hh believe y[ou're hi]ding something.=Now if you=  
 15 GB: [(wha-) ]  
 16 JRN: =[are: here's a ch-]  
 17 GB: [I am] hid[ing something]  
 18 JRN: [here's a ch]ance to get it out.

Rather simultaneously defends himself and justifies further questioning on Iran-Contra by reference to poll results (arrowed) indicating that a substantial segment of Bush's own supporters believe he's "hiding something." The concerns of the citizenry are thus offered as the rationale behind the adversarial line of questioning that Rather, despite the objections, continues to pursue.

#### Displaying Understanding for the Audience

Journalists' orientation to the audience is manifest not only in explicit references to the audience; it is also implicit in the action agendas that journalists pursue through their questions. Particularly noteworthy is the agenda that involves *articulating an understanding* of the public figure's previous remarks.

Such overt displays of understanding can operate on prior talk at varying levels of granularity. At the grossest level are *formulations* that summarize

or develop the upshot of an extended spate of talk by the public figure (arrowed) (Heritage 1985).

(19) [UK BBC Radio *World at One* Feb. 1979]

1 IE: I'm all for having a common agricultural policy, (0.6)  
 2 but I think it's absurd to suggest that decisions of  
 3 (.) immense economic magnitude .hhh should be taken  
 4 enti:rely by .hh (.) the ministers who are (.) most  
 5 int'rested in one particular segment of the community,=  
 6 I wouldn't want ministers d- defense to take all the  
 7 decisions on defense and I wouldn' want ministers of  
 8 .hhhh education to take all the decisions on education,=  
 9 JRN: -> =.hhh So you're suggesting there that the farm ministers  
 10 -> shouldn't decide this all entirely amongst themselves,  
 11 -> that it should be .hhh spread across the board amongst  
 12 -> all ministers.  
 13 IE: Exactly.=I'm saying that one must find some way...

At a finer level of granularity are displays of understanding that operate on particular lexical items (arrowed below).

(20) [US PBS NewsHour 25 July 1985]

1 JRN: =D'you think that people like uh Sheena Duncan are doing  
 2 more harm than good uh: to t'resolve thuh pro- this  
 3 [problem]  
 4 JC: [I- I'm ] afraid that they are::. that they've done  
 5 great things inside south africa but I think she's  
 6 doing something that is deeply deeply damaging to thuh  
 7 very people that she wants to help .hhhh and- .h if  
 8 thuh seh- action is ineffective. an' I believe thet  
 9 it will be ineffective  
 10 JRN: -> Thuh san[ction action,=  
 11 JC: [( )  
 12 JC: =Thuh sanction action, .hh it is going deeply tuh hurt  
 13 thousands of- of black people. An' I'm afraid Sheena's  
 14 gonna hafta take thuh respon[sibility for ur:ging that.

This example has some similarity to the phenomenon of repair (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks 1977), since the public figure has difficulty articulating the phrase ("thuh seh- action" at line 8) that the journalist subsequently produces more clearly ("the sanction action"). However, the "trouble source" is not treated as particularly troublesome by either party. The public figure continues the forward development of his talk following the focal phrase (lines 8-9), and the journalist plainly grasps what the original



phrase was meant to be and displays little uncertainty (c.f., "You mean the sanction action?"). In other instances, even without any discernable difficulty in speaking, journalists may furnish an understanding of what the public figure meant to say at a specific juncture. In an interview with a senator seeking to end a filibuster, the senator indicates that there are only 58 or 59 votes for cloture (lines 5-8). With at least 60 votes required for cloture in the U.S. Senate, the journalist supplies the upshot of a 58/59 vote level ("That means you lose" in line 10). Moreover, as in the previous example, he does so assertively, with downward intonation and without displays of uncertainty.

(21) [US: PBS NewsHour July 23, 1985]

1 JRN: Well is (th)is thing uh- is it- y- you lost on uh- on ay-  
 2 on thuh cloture vote again this afternoon [ S e]nator=  
 3 MM: [Yeah]  
 4 JRN: =Mattingly ya gonna try again duhmorrow, izzat right?  
 5 MM: Yes 'ere gonna be one more trial duhmorrow: and uh .hh  
 6 ya know it may be: (.) uh::: that the: high water  
 7 mark for: (.) for this: uh vote for thuh cloture .hh  
 8 will possibly be fifty eight er fifty nine votes. .hh  
 9 But uh::=  
 10 JRN: -> =That means you lose.  
 11 (.)  
 12 MM: Well (.) no:. Real[ly: what 'as happened is the: uh=  
 13 (JRN): [( )  
 14 MM: =thuh people of our country 'ave lost.

Explicit displays of understanding are highly unusual in ordinary conversation. Speakers' understandings of prior talk are normally implicit in the actions they choose to pursue in response (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974; Heritage 1984: 254-260). Thus, "how I understand what you're saying" is usually embedded in other actions rather than done as an action in its own right. Even in the context of repair, where problems of speaking, hearing, and understanding become the primary focus of talk, there is a structural preference for resolving such problems without recourse to explicit formulations of understanding (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks 1977). Moreover, when such displays are offered in conversation, they often precede disagreement and are indeed hearable as implicating disagreement,

especially in environments where agreement/disagreement is relevant (Pomerantz 1984).

In broadcast news interviews, by contrast, explicit displays of understanding are a recurrent feature of journalists' talk, and they lack the disaffiliative tone they carry elsewhere (Heritage 1985). Their frequency both reflects and makes visible journalists' orientation to the audience on whose behalf such understandings are offered. Correspondingly, their relatively benign character is intertwined with journalists' professional role and in particular the norm of neutralism discussed earlier. That role allows such practices to be understood, not as withholding agreement or foreshadowing disagreement, but rather as clarifying prior talk for the benefit of those who are listening in.

### **Journalistic Questioning in Historical Context**

In both England and the United States, journalists' questions have changed substantially over time, becoming less deferential and more aggressive over the past half-century (Clayman and Heritage 2002a: Chapter 2; Clayman and Heritage 2002b, Clayman, Elliott, Heritage, and McDonald 2006). This historic development entails a shift in the balance (noted earlier) from neutralism toward adversarialness, but it encompasses various other aspects of question design. To illustrate the magnitude of this transformation, consider how the issue of the federal budget was put before two U.S. presidents spanning almost three decades - Dwight Eisenhower and Ronald Reagan.

(22) [Eisenhower 27 Oct 1954: 9]

- 1 JRN: Mr. President, you spoke in a speech the other night of
- 2 the continued reduction of government spending and tax cuts
- 3 to the limit that the national security will permit.
- 4 Can you say anything more definite at this time about
- 5 the prospects of future tax cuts?

(23) [Reagan 16 June 1981: 14]

1 JRN: Mr. President, for months you said you wouldn't modify  
 2 your tax cut plan, and then you did. And when the  
 3 business community vociferously complained, you changed  
 4 your plan again.  
 5 I just wondered whether Congress and other special  
 6 interest groups might get the message that if they  
 7 yelled and screamed loud enough, you might modify  
 8 your tax cut plan again?

Although both questions concern budgetary matters and tax cuts, the question to Eisenhower is in various ways more deferential. Its agenda is essentially benign – indeed, it is framed as having been occasioned by Eisenhower's own previous remarks, and it contains nothing that disagrees with, challenges, or opposes his views. It is also non-assertive – it displays minimal expectations about what type of answer would be correct or preferable, and is formally neutral in that respect. And it is cautiously indirect – it exerts relatively little pressure on the president to provide an answer, and even allows for the possibility ("Can you say anything..." in line 4) that the president may be unable to answer.

Reagan's question, by contrast, is in various ways more aggressive. This question is similarly occasioned by the president's previous remarks (lines 1-4), but here the journalist details damaging contradictions between the president's words and his actual deeds, contradictions that portray the president as weak and beholden to special interests. This prefatory material thus sets an agenda for the question that is fundamentally adversarial. Moreover, the adversarial preface then becomes a presuppositional foundation for the question that follows (lines 4-7), which assumes that the preface is true and draws out the implications for the president's general susceptibility to pressure from special interests. And far from being neutral, the preface assertively favors a yes answer, thereby exerting pressure on the president to align with the adversarial viewpoint that the question embodies.

Quantitative research demonstrates that these two questions are fairly representative of the Eisenhower and Reagan eras (Clayman and Heritage 2002b). Indeed, across five decades of U.S. presidential news conferences, White House journalists have grown significantly more vigorous in a variety of ways (Clayman, Elliott, Heritage, and McDonald 2006). To a limited extent, this transformation has affected the basic repertoire of practices available to journalists. Certain extremely deferential practices (i.e., indirect questions on the order of "Would you care to talk about X") have fallen out of use and have essentially disappeared. Other extremely aggressive practices (i.e., coercive negative interrogatives and accusatory *how could you*-type questions), once virtually nonexistent, have become recurrent if not commonplace. For the most part, however, this transformation has affected the relative frequency of questioning practices. Journalists' are increasingly likely to exercise initiative via more elaborated (prefaced and compound) forms; the substantive content of their questions has grown increasingly adversarial; and they have exerted greater pressure on the president to address such content via increasingly direct and assertive design forms. Similar trends have been observed qualitatively in both American and British news interviews (Clayman and Heritage 2002a: Chapter 2).

Notwithstanding the cross-national scope of this transformation, the process by which it has occurred has been very different in England versus the United States. In England, a robust tradition of government regulation of broadcasting, coupled the absence of competition prior to 1958, combined to foster a highly deferential style of questioning in BBC interviews of the 1950s. When the BBC monopoly was replaced by a duopoly in 1958, the resulting competition fueled a sudden and dramatic rise in adversarial questioning. In America, where government regulation of broadcasting has been comparatively minimal and where competitive pressures have been present

from the outset, adversarial questioning appears to have grown more gradually from a higher baseline.

However, trends in U.S. presidential news conferences have been more volatile, with identifiable phases of relative deference/aggressiveness in question design (Clayman, Elliott, Heritage, and McDonald 2006). The deferential era of the 1950s and 1960s was followed by a marked rise in aggressiveness that extended through the 1970s and into the early 1980s. This suggests that a series of historical events and conditions prompted journalists to exercise their watchdog role much more vigorously in the latter period. The most proximate factor is declining journalistic trust in the president that followed in the wake of the Vietnam War and the Watergate affair (Broder 1987: 167-168; Cannon 1977: 289-292). Lou Cannon of the Washington Post cites these events as having a transformative impact on how reporters view administrative officials: "An attitude of basic trust that was tinged with skepticism was replaced with an attitude of suspicion in which trust occasionally intervened" (Cannon 1977: 291). As David Broder (1987: 167) has observed, even meetings with the president's press secretary were affected: "the style of questioning at White House briefings became, after Watergate, almost more prosecutorial than inquisitive." This shift toward more vigorous questioning was not short-lived; it endured across several administrations and is indicative of a basic "paradigm shift" in the norms of the White House press corps (Clayman, et. al. Forthcoming).

A second and perhaps less obvious contributing factor has to do with practical economic conditions. The 1970s and early 1980s also span a period of time when the long post-World War II economic expansion came to an end. Since aggressive questioning of the president is directly associated with both unemployment and interest rates (Clayman, Heritage, Elliott, and McDonald 2007), the persistent stagflation of the era was also a contributing factor in the trend toward rising aggressiveness.

A third possible factor is the decline of political consensus that characterized this period. The events of 1968 – in particular the Tet offensive and President Johnson's subsequent decision not to seek a second term – stimulated substantial elite and public opposition to the war (Hallin 1986: 167-174). Correspondingly, Nixon's election launched an extended period of divided government, with different parties controlling the presidency and congress. It has been demonstrated that elite discord is consequential for the tenor of news coverage (Bennett 1990; Hallin 1984). Given that such conditions tend to yield more independent and adversarial news stories, they might also influence how journalists conduct themselves when asking questions of political leaders. However, the elite discord explanation, while plausible, has thus far failed to yield significant results for news conference questioning (Clayman, et. al. forthcoming).

In any case, the trend toward increasingly vigorous questioning subsequently reversed itself – from Reagan's second term through the senior Bush administration (1985-1992), aggressive questioning was on the decline. This reversal may have resulted from a countervailing set of factors. Economic conditions steadily improved following the recession of the early 1980s. Reagan's persistent popularity after that point, his landslide re-election, and the fact that he weathered the Iran-Contra scandal may have suggested to White House reporters the limitations of the Watergate model of adversarial journalism. Moreover, during this period journalism came under increasing criticism for being excessively negative and overly concerned with strategy and scandal, and for fostering public apathy and cynicism. This would in turn stimulate a reform movement within journalism, the so-called "civic journalism" or "public journalism" movement. The latter development didn't get off the ground until the middle of Bush's term in office (Fallows 1996: 247-254), but it could have further contributed to trends already in

progress, trends that show journalists to be reining in their aggressiveness during this period.

Such restraint would not last forever. Aggressiveness was again on the rise over the course of the Clinton administration (1993-2000), with some dimensions of aggressiveness growing to unprecedented levels. It seems clear that question design, in its various manifestations, offers a running index of president-press relations, and more generally an index of the evolving and at times contentious relationship between journalism and the state.

## **Conclusions**

Questions in broadcast journalism are embedded within, and constitutive of, distinctive frameworks of professional and public accountability. This is in part what distinguishes journalistic interactions from other question-based interactional forms that might seem superficially similar. The specific configuration of questioning practices identified in this paper is a signature for an identifiably journalistic encounter, one that is led by a professional who is attentive to norms of neutralism and adversarialness, and who elicits talk on behalf of an audience.

At the same time, many of the practices examined here can be found in other contexts, although in different configurations intertwined with a different mix of conditions. Attorneys, for example, are attentive to the presence of an audience of jurors and are sensitive to norms of neutrality and adversarialness, but the relative salience of these norms varies greatly during direct versus cross examination. Moreover, legal codes constrain the elaboration of questions, so that compound questions are virtually

nonexistent, while statement prefaces tend to be relatively infrequent and exceedingly brief.

Finally, journalistic questions have evolved substantially over the course of the post-war era. While the basic repertoire of practices has changed only modestly, the relative frequency of practices has changed significantly in ways that have yielded a more adversarial relationship between journalism and the state.



## References

- Bennett, W. Lance 1990 "Toward a Theory of Press-State Relations in the United States," Journal of Communication 40(2): 103-125.
- Broder, David S. 1987 Behind the Front Page: A Candid Look at How News Is Made. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Cannon, Lou 1977 Reporting: An Inside View. Sacramento: California Journal Press.
- Clayman, Steven E. 2006 "Speaking on Behalf of the Public in Broadcast News Interviews." In Elizabeth Holt and R. Clift (eds.), Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction, in press. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clayman, Steven E., Marc N. Elliott, John Heritage, and Laurie McDonald 2006 "Historical Trends in Questioning Presidents 1953-2000," Presidential Studies Quarterly 36(4): 561-583.
- Clayman, Steve E., Marc N. Elliott, John Heritage, and Meagan Beckett Forthcoming "A Paradigm Shift in White House Journalism?: Circumstantial Versus Normative Explanations for the Post-1968 Rise of Aggressive Journalism.
- Clayman, Steven E. and John Heritage 2002a The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clayman, Steven E. and John Heritage 2002b "Questioning Presidents: Journalistic Deference and Adversarialness in the Press Conferences of U.S. Presidents Eisenhower and Reagan." Journal of Communication 52(4): 749-775.
- Clayman, Steven E., John Heritage, Marc N. Elliott, and Laurie McDonald. 2007 "When Does the Watchdog Bark?: Conditions of Aggressive Questioning in Presidential News Conferences," American Sociological Review 72: 23-41.
- Entman, Robert M. 2003 Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion, and U.S. Foreign Policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Greatbatch, David 1988 "A Turn-Taking System for British News Interviews," Language in Society 17(3): 401-430.
- Hallin, Daniel C. 1986 The "Uncensored War": The Media and Vietnam. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, Sandra 1986 "Interviewers' Questions in Broadcast Interviews," Belfast Working Papers in Language and Linguistics Vol. 8, pp. 50-85, ed. J Wilson and B. Crow. Jordanstown: University of Ulster.
- Heritage, John 1985 "Analyzing News Interviews: Aspects of the Production of Talk for an Overhearing Audience." In Teun A. van Dijk (ed.) Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol. 3, pp. 95-119. New York: Academic Press.
- Heritage, John 2002 "The Limits of Questioning: Negative Interrogatives and Hostile Question Content," Journal of Pragmatics 34(10-11): 1427-46.

Heritage, John and Roth, Andrew 1995 "Grammar and Institution: Questions and Questioning in the Broadcast News Interview, Research on Language and Social Interaction 28(1): 1-60.

Maltese, John Anthony 1994 Spin Control: The White House Office of Communications and the Management of Presidential News (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Roth, Andrew 2005 "Pop Quizzes" on the Campaign Trail: Journalists, Candidates, and the Limits of Questioning," Press/Politics 10(2): 28-46.

Scannell, Paddy 1989 "Public Service Broadcasting and Modern Public Life," Media, Culture, and Society 11(2): 135-166.

Scannell, Paddy 1990 "Introduction: The Relevance of Talk." In Paddy Scannell (ed.) Broadcast Talk, pp. 1-13. London: Sage.

Scannell, Paddy 1996 Radio, Television, and Modern Life. Oxford: Blackwell.

---

<sup>1</sup>For a more thorough treatment of the issues, readers are urged consult the primary literature on which this paper is based: Clayman 2006; Clayman and Heritage 2002a: Chapters 4, 5, and 6, Clayman and Heritage 2002b, Clayman, Elliott, Heritage, and McDonald 2006, Clayman, Heritage, Elliott, and McDonald forthcoming, Greatbatch 1988, Harris 1986, Heritage 1985, Heritage 2002, Heritage and Roth 1995, and Roth 2005.