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Abstract

Differences between male and female speakers have been explored by linguists without their arriving at any general agreement. Female speakers are viewed differently by different theorists. The questions that women have of themselves and others have also been viewed differently. In this discussion, I examine a particular register, interviewing, in which female speakers employ questions or requests for information both to get information and maintain conversation. I examine differences between male and female interviewers in topical and political interviews on radio and television. The female interviewers in my study employ more indirect requests for information than do the male interviewers; however, since indirect requests for information can be provocative as well as polite, use of provocative forms constitutes an enabling strategy. While the male interviewers favour indirect forms that foster attunement, the female interviewers favour indirect forms that engage their interviewees analytically. The female interviewers employ indirect requests for information to ask 'tough' questions, maintain a line of questioning, and maintain their position as speakers who have power. © 2001 Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved.
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1. Introduction

Although linguists have examined the relationship between gender and language for the last thirty years, there is little consensus about this relationship. With regard to female speech, argument continues to focus on whether or not female speakers express powerlessness in their discourse or whether they express a form of speech only different from that of males. In the latter view female speakers are not so much
powerless in speech as culturally distinct from male speakers. The two-cultures approach essentially redeems female speakers from differentiation of status with males. Recent feminist theory has focussed on the social construction of gender, not exclusively in childhood but over a lifetime, but this still begs the question of what constitutes the 'masculine' or the 'feminine', at least within Western culture. These terms are no longer easily defined. Notably lacking in discussions of female speech are either hypotheses or representations of females as powerful rather than powerless or different. To employ the terminology of Davies and Harré (1990) with regard to what they term 'positioning' in discourse, female speakers are capable not only of being ‘positioned’ through discourse, but can also position themselves: “[P]osition is what is created in and through talk as the speakers and hearers take themselves up as persons” (1990: 62). In this discussion, I wish to explore the ways in which male and female interviewers position or take themselves up as persons in the linguistic enterprise of interviewing. There are differences in the interviewing styles of the male and female speakers in my study, but the female interviewers also position themselves as powerful speakers.

2. Women and questions

The question of women asking questions is a complex one. Since Robin Lakoff’s famous discussion of language and women’s place, linguists have been examining the function of questions in female speech. Lakoff argued that tag questions and questions generally were more often employed by female speakers because they lacked complete confidence in what they were saying. With questions or requests for information, Lakoff noted that “the more one compounds a request, the more characteristic it is of women’s speech, the less of men’s” (1973: 57). A request such as Won’t you close the door?, which is an indirect speech act, is characteristic of female speech, while Close the door, a direct speech act, is characteristic of male speech. Lakoff further noted that female speech “sounds much more ‘polite’ than men’s” because of features such as tag questions and the greater use of compounded requests (1973: 56). Lakoff’s interpretation of such differences in male and female speech has been challenged by a number of theorists. Like Lakoff, Fishman found that female speakers ask more questions than male speakers: “[O]ut of a total of 370 questions asked in twelve and a half hours of conversation, the women asked 263” (1990: 36). However, Fishman also noted that when women attempted to introduce new topics into conversation, they were more successful when they employed questions to do so (males did not do this). Since questions require answers, Fishman hypothesized that females’ “greater use of questions is an attempt to solve the conversational problem of gaining a response to their utterances” (1990: 273). According to Fishman, “[w]omen’s conversational troubles reflect not their inferior social training but their inferior social position” (1990: 240).

Dubois and Crouch (1979) found that in a question period following a small professional meeting, only men employed tag questions. Holmes (1982) argues that tag questions are not unfunctional. Epistemic modal tags express uncertainty
as Lakoff suggests, but challenging tags allow the speaker to challenge or confront the addressee, while facilitative tags engage the addressee and are a positive politeness strategy. Coates (1996: 176), investigating women in relation to other women, also notes that questions are not unifunctional: "Questions can be used to seek information, to encourage another speaker to participate in talk, to hedge, to introduce a new topic, to avoid the role of expert, to check the views of other participants, to invite someone to tell a story". However, Coates also states, "There are few examples of information-seeking questions in women's friendly talk where information is the only goal of the question" (1996: 177). According to Coates, this is because "information-exchange" is not as significant for females as is "the maintenance and development of friendship" (1996: 176). Coates found that information-seeking questions were important only to teenage girls who ask one another questions about boys and adolescent problems. This is consistent with the view of Maltz and Borker (1982) who argue that functional use of questions differentiates the sexes. Females use questions to maintain conversation; males use questions to request information. Maltz and Borker argue that males and females employ two different 'styles', functioning out of two different 'cultures'. In contrast, Freed and Greenwood (1996) found that there were few differences between male and female speakers with regard to the number of questions asked in conversation by each sex. However, Freed and Greenwood do not employ naturally occurring data, but put speakers into situations where they elicited 'spontaneous talk', 'considered talk', and 'collaborative talk' for periods of between 6 to 15 minutes. Such a protocol may not reflect how men and women talk to one another in real life situations.

Although Fishman hypothesizes that questions in female speech signify social status inferior to males, little attention has been given to female interviewers for whom asking questions reflects status equal to that of males. Holmes (1995) summarizes the work of one of her students, Margaret Franken, who investigated differences between male and female interviewers' strategies. Franken looked at interaction between one male interviewer and two female interviewers engaged with the same subject. She found that the male interviewers appropriated more of their fair share of interviewing time, and that the female interviewers "facilitated the interviewee's contributions, while keeping their own contributions brief" (1995: 33). Winter's analysis (1993) of two political interviewers, one male and one female, agrees with Franken's. Winter found that the male interviewer took more and longer turns than did the female interviewer, and that the male interviewer also interrupted more frequently. Winter also found that the male interviewer employed more declaratives as part of his interviewing strategy and that such use supported a more confrontational style. However, in the data supplied by Winter both male and female interviewers employ declaratives to engage or challenge their interviewees. Holmes herself examined differences between male and female participants in formal seminars during question time. She found that the males asked more questions in this context, and asked twice as many of what she terms 'antagonistic elicitations' as did females. Such elicitations were formed by assertions which were challenging and aggressive. Both males and females employed approximately the same number of positive elic-
tations, and according to Holmes, approximately the same number of critical elicita-
tions. Holmes' data show, however, that while males and females employ essentially
the same number of positive elicitations which show agreement and interest, females
favour 'critical elicitations' when they disagree, while males favour 'antagonistic
clicitations'. The females employ negative elicitations which are more mitigating
and face-saving than do the males.

In examination of same-sex and cross-sex opinion-poll interviews, Johnstone et
al., (1992) found that female interviewers were required to deviate from their scripts
(written set of standard questions) much more with male participants. Female partic-
ipants were managed less and thanked more. Johnstone et al., explain this by noting
that male participants "resorted to banter, teasing, playfully wrong or hard-to-code
answers in an attempt to alter the balance of power in the exchange" (1992: 425).
Male participants showed much less tolerance when they were not in control of the
discourse. In contrast, Goldman (1986) examined a situation where male speakers
were in control. Goldman looked at how female participants were treated in Huli
Moot and Village Court situations and found that male and female litigants were
questioned differently by mediators and magistrates. Females were asked more
closed or coercive forms of questions than were males, while men were more gener-
ally asked open questions permitting choice of response. When males were asked
coercive interrogatives, these were also softened. Many more 'why' questions were
asked of females who in turn responded with many more expressions of result and
cause. Goldman concluded that the interrogative process in Huli courts was "a
means of playing out inter-sex dramas" (1986: 378). Questions were used as a
means of control, an observation Harris (1984) also makes about use of questions in
magistrates' courts in the West.

In interviewing, asking questions signifies power rather than powerlessness.
Female interviewers have social status comparable to that of male interviewers. The
use of questions as such does not differentiate the sexes. Moreover, since inter-
viewers on radio and television are concerned with both getting information and
maintaining conversation, these two uses of questions also do not differentiate male
and female speakers. Holmes, citing Franken, suggests that male interviewers are
more long-winded in their requests for information, while females are briefer and
function to facilitate their interviewees' contributions. However, this provides little
specificity about how questions are asked and also what sorts of questions are asked
by male and female interviewers. Johnstone et al. indicate that female interviewers
were challenged by their male interviewees and so had to go beyond their standard
written text to 'handle' them. Given what appeared to be a 'role reversal' for the
male interviewees, the female interviewers needed to employ separate strategies
apart from asking questions directly in order to get the information they required. If
female interviewers are facilitators as Holmes, citing Franken, suggests then we
would expect a high percentage of neutral non-conducive direct requests for infor-
mation along with numerous politeness forms in order to maintain conversation. If
they are 'handlers' as Johnstone et al. suggest is the case at least with male inter-
viewees, we would in turn expect the presence of linguistic strategies to get desired
information.
3. Requests for information

My data consist of 23 interviews done by four interviewers (two female, two male, three Canadian, one American), and include topical to political interviews on both television and radio. All three of the Canadian interviewers work or worked on the CBC or Canadian Broadcasting Company, a state-owned network designed to serve Canadians as a whole. The American interviewer works for the American network CNN which is seen not only in the United States but around the world. These interviewers employ an extensive repertoire of speech acts which includes requests for information, assertions, requests for confirmation, rhetorical questions, socratic questions, clarifications, and comments or evaluations. As one would expect, however, requests for information are the principal speech act employed by interviewers. I examined a total number of 1435 speech acts of which 935 were direct and indirect requests for information. Requests for information compose the principal competence of interviewers and are therefore the focus of my investigation. Labov and Fanshel (1977) analyse questions in speech act terms as 'requests for information'. Requests for information are represented as a means of supplying a need on the part of the speaker. The prototypical direct request for information is realized either as an imperative (say more, tell me) or as an interrogative where the speaker orders that information be given or presumes that by the means of the utterance of the illocutionary act itself the hearer is obligated to provide information. A profound asymmetry is usually the case in requests for information, where there is also high expectation of compliance on the part of the hearer, so much so that failure to respond or silence is considered as dispreferred. In his discussion of the pragmatics of answers, Kiefer (1988: 264) delineates the ‘epistemic-imperative approach’ which analyses questions as embedded within imperatives. The hearer is commanded to ‘bring it about’ (imperative) that ‘I know’ (epistemic). The request for information imposes a condition of expectancy on the hearer who must fulfil it. Of course there are occasions when hearers indicate that the speaker does not have the right to ask a certain question, that a given request for information is too personal or inappropriate under the circumstances. In general, however, requests for information carry with them a strong obligation on the part of the hearer. Blum-Kulka (1983: 147) goes so far as to call them ‘control acts’: ‘questions [whether or not interrogative in form] can also be considered control acts, since by requiring or demanding a response they often carry a strong command message [Goody, 1978]’.

Not only is the relationship between speaker and hearer asymmetrical in requests for information, but the relationship can also be coercive. Interviewers often downplay the power they have (‘I just have questions’), and indeed there can be extensive struggles for control surrounding the speech act as Johnstone et al. report. Labov and Fanshel point out that requests for action (and so by extension, requests for information) have mitigating and aggravating forms which address the social relations between the speaker and the hearer. Requests for information, however, are by definition aggravating or face threatening. Minimally, questions threaten negative face but they can also threaten positive face. Bublitz (1981: 852) notes that “[i]t is a characteristic feature of questions often overlooked that the speaker by asking is not only
able to cause the hearer to take the floor and react in a certain way, e.g. to answer ... but that in addition [and similar to directives] he is also exerting his influence as to the CONTENT of the hearer’s response”. Requests for information are not neutral acts any more than ‘information’ is neutral. The relationship between the speaker and the hearer is central to the activity and is being constantly monitored, negotiated and adjusted in the course of conversation.

Extending Labov and Fanshel’s analysis of requests for information, I have provided an analysis of indirect requests for information (Macaulay, 1996). We can formalize indirect requests for information through reference to preconditions for general directives. Using Searle (1991), we can analyse indirect requests for information through four principal felicity conditions for indirect directives: the preparatory condition (ability), the sincerity condition (wish or desire), the propositional condition (performance of future act, willingness to perform future act), and essential condition (counts as an attempt to get hearer to perform act). Thus a speaker can employ an indirect request for information by invoking the preparatory condition: ‘Can you explain the difference?'; the sincerity condition: ‘I wanna talk about health care because that’s one of the things you’ve had to tackle’; the propositional condition: ‘Will you tell me more about your tactics?’; or the essential condition: ‘Dr. Chopra, I’m interested in knowing where there are Arethetical alternatives for Aids-related problems’.

Searle analyses the essential condition in terms of efforts on the speaker’s part to get a hearer to perform a given task. This category largely concerns reasons given by the speaker for the performance of a speech act. Speakers can also query a hearer’s belief or knowledge state to determine if the hearer has the desired information. Forms such as Do you think, you think invoke a precondition anterior to that of the preparatory condition. Invocation of the preparatory condition, although not threatening to negative face, can be threatening to positive face, if, for example, the hearer does not have the ability to explain. A precondition prior to the preparatory condition, which first ascertains if the hearer is in possession of the information desired, avoids any possible threat to the hearer’s positive face. Forms such as Do you think or Do you know are the most highly conventionalized forms of indirect requests for information:

(1) But do you think this is a justice denied, this is a Donald Marshall case after all this time?

Such an indirect request for information is positively conducive, the speaker expects that the hearer thinks what is proposed, but nonetheless threatens neither positive nor negative face and as such is one of the most polite means of requesting information.

In contrast to polite forms, which function essentially as prompts to encourage the hearer to ‘say more’, speakers also have available to them indirect requests which are provocative, that is, forms which provoke the hearer into revealing information. Rather than being hearer-oriented, such forms are speaker-oriented and privilege the speaker’s rights or concerns over those of the hearer. For example, when a child utters an indirect directive such as I wanna ice cream cone rather than Buy me an ice
cream cone, though one form is indirect and the other direct, there is little to suggest difference in politeness. The child’s invocation of the sincerity condition privileges his/her own needs and desires before those of anyone else. This is not politeness but provocation, since the needs or rights of the speaker are given priority. Equally, in indirect requests for information, a speaker who invokes the sincerity condition reinforces his/her right to ask a question and in fact enhances his/her power as a speaker:

(2) I want to hear your view about NATO and and what in fact the members of NATO are not doing
(3) I wanna talk about health care because that’s one of the things you’ve had to tackle.

Such indirect requests for information signal and signify the speaker’s right to ask questions as well as the hearer’s obligation to answer. More than any other forms these mark an asymmetrical relationship between speaker and hearer.

Just as indirect requests for action can be made through assertions, e.g. *It’s cold in here*, so indirect requests for information can also be made through what Labov and Fanshel term assertions of A-, B-, A-B- or D-Events. They define A-Events as events or information known only to the speaker, B-Events as those known only to the hearer, and A-B-Events as shared between speakers. D-Events are disputable between speakers. A-, B-, A-B- and D-Events can all be asserted by an interviewer rather than making a direct request for information or a conventional indirect request based on a felicity condition. Rather than querying the hearer’s state of belief or opinion, the speaker can assert his/her own as a means of making a request for information indirectly. However, the hearer’s response, although still technically an ‘answer’, is more accurately termed response since above all what is required is a response to the assertion which is made by the speaker. Because of the social constraints placed on the hearer by a request for information, the hearer is obliged to respond to the substance of an assertion which s/he might otherwise avoid if questioned directly or through conventional indirect requests for information.

(4) Would you you be offended if I told you my feeling as I read the story? And ah this is really awkward because the man who wrote the book never makes judgements. But I thought in some way that a human being has in some way to be a bastard to survive. That saints maybe don’t make it.

In this example, which is taken from an interview between the Canadian interviewer Barbara Frum and one of the survivors of a plane crash in the Andes who was forced to resort to cannibalism, Frum first sets up her principal request with an initial indirect request for information, ‘Would you you be offended if I told you my feeling as I read the story?’ This is a conventional indirect request except that the felicity conditions which pertain concern the hearer’s positive face (‘Would you be offended’) rather than negative face (*Would you mind*). This is a highly polite request. She follows this with an evaluative assertion which further indicates her unwillingness to attack the hearer’s positive face. However, such politeness is entirely strategic
because what follows is a D-Event assertion with a B-Event implicature, 'But I thought in some way that a human being has in some way to be a bastard to survive. That saints maybe don't make it'. This assertion of a D-Event, that human beings who survive by cannibalizing others are bastards, functions as an indirect request for information.

Barbara Frum could have asked directly, *Are you a bastard for surviving such an ordeal in the way that you did?* which would have been overtly offensive to her interviewee and would also be positively conducive, or she could have employed a more polite indirect request which invokes a precondition prior to the preparatory condition, *Do you think that you are a bastard for surviving such an ordeal in the way that you did?*. Such an indirect request would have avoided any overt determination of the interviewee's status as 'bastard', and simply queried the interviewee's state of mind. To these requests, the interviewee could simply have answered, 'No, I'm not' or 'No, I don't'. However, Frum's D-Event assertion, although not directly referencing her interviewee as a 'bastard', provokes the interviewee to respond emotionally in his own defence. In effect, Frum says to her interviewee 'I think that you are a bastard because you have survived this particular ordeal - what do you have to say about that?'. When one speaker makes an assertion that has relevance for another, such an assertion can be provocative. For example, when a mother says to a child *There was a full tray of cookies on the counter only 10 minutes ago* by virtue of the Conversational Maxim of Relevance, the child understands that this assertion has relevance for him or her and in turn requires response. The mother is indirectly asking the child 'What do you have to say about that' as opposed to *Did you eat some cookies off the tray?* or *Where are the cookies that were on the tray?*. The child cannot not respond, and the child cannot simply say 'No, I didn't take any' or 'I dunno where they went'. Since the assertion is relevant to the interlocutor, the interlocutor must do more than simply 'answer', the interlocutor must provide response that either cancels the conversational implicature of relevance or affirms it. Equally, if an interviewer makes the disputable assertion that human beings who survive in difficult circumstances are bastards, and this is the case for her interviewee, then the interviewee must respond to the conversational implicature of relevance such an assertion has for him. In this instance, the interviewee is so upset by this provocation that he responds by forming his own indirect request for information of Frum, 'Do you really think we’re bastards?'. What is controversial and provocative, and might have been avoided for this reason, has been brought into the conversation and is made available for examination and response.

Holmes (1995) notes a similar phenomena when she analyses 'elicitations' employed in a question period after a presentation as either 'critical elicitations' or 'antagonistic elicitations' (1995: 44-45). In one of her examples, 'I can see what you’re getting at, but it seems to me the material in your figure 5 could be interpreted somewhat differently' (1995: 44), the speaker elicits response from the presenter, but also conveys disagreement. Had this speaker asked the presenter, *Do you think that the material in your figure 5 could be interpreted somewhat differently*, which is also an indirect request for information, the speaker would query if the presenter has entertained an alternative interpretation, to which the presenter could sim-
ply say ‘yes’ or ‘no’. However, in the expression of a disputable assertion, *but it seems to me that the material in your figure 5 could be interpreted somewhat differently* the speaker in fact provokes a response from the presenter. Again, the assertion has relevance for the presenter, since it carries with it the further implicature that the presenter has not entertained an alternative interpretation and could do so. If the relevance of the assertion to the presenter is acknowledged by the presenter, then the assertion must be taken up and responded to. The presenter in this situation must in fact justify his or her interpretation of the material. He or she has been put on the spot by virtue of a disputable assertion functioning as an indirect request for information.

Harris also remarks on the use of B-Event assertions used in courtrooms (1985: 9). Harris views B-Event assertions as requests for confirmation, as do Labov and Fanshel, but they also function as indirect requests for information:

(5) You’re unemployed
(6) So sometimes it’s more each week
(7) And then you did two weeks work

In the second of Harris’ examples, ‘So sometimes it’s more each week’, Harris notes that the response to this B-Event assertion is not simply ‘yes’ but ‘yes’ along with an explanation. Magistrates can employ B-Event assertions much the way interviewers do. By asserting privileged or private information known only to the witnesses or defendants, they can provoke revelation of more information that would not necessarily be forthcoming.

Direct requests which can be neutral, positively and negatively conducive, as well as indirect requests for information which can be formed through invocation of the felicity conditions for directives, and through query about a precondition prior to the preparatory (*You think, do you think, don’t you think*) as well as through assertion of D-, B- and A- and A-B-Events comprise a competence for interviewers which is expressed in strategic selection of one form rather than another. To examine differences in strategy between male and female interviewers, I have examined and compared their use of direct and indirect requests for information.

4. Direct and indirect requests for information

In my data, the male interviewers employ direct requests for information in 40% and 41% of all their speech acts respectively, while the female interviewers employ direct requests for information in 35% and 35% of their all their speech acts respectively. The male interviewers employ direct requests with approximately 5% greater frequency than do their female counterparts. In contrast, indirect requests are employed by the two male interviewers in 19% and 21% of all their speech acts respectively, while they are employed in 37% and 31% of all their speech acts by the female interviewers respectively. The female interviewers employ indirect requests with approximately 14% greater frequency than do the males. Although there is only
an approximate 5% difference between the male and female interviewers in their use of direct requests for information, there is a considerable difference in the percentage of use for indirect requests for information (see Table 1).

Table 1
Direct and indirect requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewers</th>
<th>Direct Requests</th>
<th>Indirect Requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frum (F)</td>
<td>127/35%</td>
<td>131/37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallin (F)</td>
<td>127/35%</td>
<td>114/31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gzowski (M)</td>
<td>83/40%</td>
<td>39/19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King (M)</td>
<td>205/41%</td>
<td>109/21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all indirect requests for information are polite forms; those which invoke the sincerity condition and those which are formed through assertion of D-, B- and A- and A-B-Events are all provocative. We need to look at differences in the use of ‘polite’ forms and ‘provocative’ forms of indirect request for information (see Table 2).

Table 2
Types of indirect requests in all speech acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewers</th>
<th>Indirect requests</th>
<th>Conv. indirect requests</th>
<th>‘Think’ forms</th>
<th>Assertions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frum (F)</td>
<td>131/37%</td>
<td>24/7%</td>
<td>24/7%</td>
<td>83/23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallin (F)</td>
<td>114/31%</td>
<td>14/4%</td>
<td>10/3%</td>
<td>90/24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gzowski (M)</td>
<td>39/19%</td>
<td>4/2%</td>
<td>2/9%</td>
<td>33/16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King (M)</td>
<td>109/21%</td>
<td>20/4%</td>
<td>2/3%</td>
<td>87/17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The female interviewers employ conventional indirect requests in only 7% and 4% of all their speech acts respectively. This is equally the case with ‘think’ forms, with 7% and 3% respectively. However, there is a marked increase in their use of assertions as indirect requests for information. Frequencies are high at 23% and 24% of use. For both female interviewers, approximately a quarter of all their speech acts are made up of provocative indirect requests for information.

We see the same pattern of use by the male interviewers, although with much less use of indirect forms overall. Both male interviewers employ conventional indirect requests with very low percentages of all speech acts, 2% and 4% respectively. And both employ ‘think’ forms in less than 1% of all speech acts. Assertions, however, are used with more frequency by both male interviewers, at 16% and 17% respectively. Male interviewers employ assertions as indirect requests for information in 16.5% of all their speech acts.

What is interesting is that the female interviewers employ both more polite and provocative indirect requests for information than do the males. They employ 3% more conventional indirect requests for information and approximately 5% more
'think' forms than do the male interviewers. And they employ approximately 7% more assertions as indirect requests for information. If the female interviewers are more polite than the male interviewers in their use of indirect requests for information, this would confirm the view of female speakers as more concerned with facilitation and conversational maintenance; however, if female interviewers also employ a greater percentage of provocative forms, this does not suggest a concern to facilitate but to get information. If we accept the current stereotypes of male and female speakers, female interviewers would seem to be androgynous.

We can further break down the use of assertions as indirect requests into use of A-Events, B-Events, A-B-Events, and D-Events (see Table 3).

### Table 3
Assertions as indirect requests for information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewers</th>
<th>Assertions</th>
<th>A-Events</th>
<th>B-Events</th>
<th>A-B-Events</th>
<th>D-Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frum (F)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7/8%</td>
<td>26/31%</td>
<td>1/1%</td>
<td>49/59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallin (F)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5/6%</td>
<td>23/26%</td>
<td>2/2%</td>
<td>60/67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gzowski (M)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1/3%</td>
<td>17/52%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>15/45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King (M)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1/1%</td>
<td>47/54%</td>
<td>1/1%</td>
<td>38/44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A-Events and A-B-Events are little used by either of the sexes in interviewing, although the female interviewers do employ A-Events with some degree of frequency at 8% and 6% respectively. For both sexes, however, provocative indirect requests for information are formed primarily through assertion of either B-Events or through D-Events. Moreover, in this data, we see significant variation between the sexes. With regard to B-Event assertions as indirect requests, the female interviewers use these much less than do the male interviewers. The average for use for the females is 28.5%, while the average for use for the males is 53%. This is a significant difference and seems to indicate a preference on the part of the male interviewers for indirect requests for information formed through B-Event assertions. Conversely, with regard to D-Event assertions as indirect requests, the female interviewers use these much more than do the male interviewers. The average for use for the females is 63%, while the average for use for the males is 44.5%. This is approximately a 19% difference in use, and again would seem to indicate a marked preference by the female interviewers.

In sum, we see that the female interviewers employ overall more indirect requests for information in all of their speech acts. However, in these indirect requests for information, they also employ both more polite forms and provocative forms than do the male interviewers. Lastly, looking only at provocative forms, the female interviewers show a marked preference for D-Event assertions as indirect requests for information. Indirectness for the females does not necessarily indicate politeness or a desire to maintain the 'conversation' or facilitate their interviewee's contributions. The female interviewers rely extensively on provocative forms in their interviewing; moreover, they show a preference for use of disputable assertions as a means of provoking response from their interviewees.
5. Indirect requests for information and gender

In the data which I have, there is no clear evidence that the gender of the interviewee plays any role in determining whether an interviewer will employ one form of request for information rather than another. One female interviewer, Barbara Frum, employs the highest percentage of assertions as indirect requests in her interview with the Canadian novelist Mordecai Richeler at 35%, but employs the next highest percentage (30%) in her interview with the American Ambassador to the United Nations, Jean Kirkpatrick. With Pamela Wallin, the highest percentage of assertions as indirect requests is used with a male interviewee at 36%, but the next highest percentage is used with a female interviewee at 24%, while her other interviewees, who are male, all average 22%. Provocative indirect requests for information are associated with ‘tough’ interviewing and are largely situational. For example, in one interview with René Lévesque, premier of Quebec as well as leader of the separatist movement in Quebec, Frum attempts to examine the economic consequences of separatist policies in Quebec. At one point Frum asks Lévesque a direct question: ‘Do you share that gloomy assessment? The economy’s in trouble, your political fortunes are way way down, some people say that you could not get elected again if a vote were held tomorrow. Are you that gloomy about it?’ To this Lévesque replies skilfully:

(7) That’s for sure. If we had a vote tomorrow we’d be licked. Ah that’s obvious. We’re really at the lowest point we ever were ah since 1981. But it doesn’t apply. There’s always a time lag before things get noticed. It doesn’t apply to the economic situation. It’s no it’s no gift from heaven because we’re picking up, it’s a recovery, it it comes faster in Quebec than in the rest of the country. The growth for this year overall has been confirmed by the Conference Board. What’s more serious than the Conference Board? Quebec is ahead of the rest of the country in investment, including ahead of Ontario for the moment in investment and in getting back the jobs that we lost for the first time second time in history in statistical history that goes back to the the sixties. Ah Quebec is below 29% of Canadian unemployment. That’s the first time ever below 29 per cent. We have to get to somewhere which would be the average that we should have 25 26 % you know as a first target. We’re working like mad to get there.

Lévesque initially responds positively to Frum’s direct request for information, but then modifies his response by actually challenging the validity of her request: ‘But it doesn’t apply … It doesn’t apply to the economic situation’. Lévesque’s strategic response to Frum’s direct request is that it is irrelevant, not a question of any significance. Frum’s function as interviewer is challenged since she has not asked a good question, a relevant question.

Frum’s next request is not direct, but indirect:

(8) I’m glad you added that, because you wouldn’t have delayed surely the opening of the National Assembly by a month so that you could put together an economic package if everything was wonderful.
This is technically a B-Event assertion functioning as an indirect request for information. Frum asserts information about Lévesque’s behaviour, that he has strategically delayed opening the Legislature. However, her subordinate clause also contains the disputable assertion ‘not everything is wonderful’ which itself functions as a provocative indirect request for information. Frum is in fact reiterating her original direct request for information ‘Do you share that gloomy assessment?’. Through her D-Event assertion ‘not everything is wonderful’ she provokes Lévesque into providing a less ‘political’ response. When Lévesque begins to respond, ‘Um, it’s obvious’, Frum then employs another indirect request for information:

(9) Now your critics say that was pure politics, an empty balloon. What did you do, you removed an unpopular gas tax. They say that 4 cents less a litre at the gas pump is not an economic plan.

In this D-Event assertion, Frum does not report her own assertions, but those of others, ‘your critics’. Lévesque is now confronted with a second disputable assertion functioning as an indirect request for information: ‘They say that 4 cents less a litre at the gas pump is not an economic plan’. To Lévesque’s own assertion that Frum’s ‘gloomy picture’ does not apply to the economic situation, and thus that her own question of him is irrelevant, Frum employs in sequence two D-Event assertions as indirect requests for information to which Lévesque must respond, since these assertions are conversationally relevant to him and the situation of his government. Lévesque is forced to address the ‘gloomy picture’ that Frum initially paints.

With Jean Kirkpatrick, a female interviewee and U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Frum is equally ‘tough’ in her questioning. In discussion with Kirkpatrick about funding for an unstable El Salvador government, Frum asks about the extent to which Congress is prepared to support the President’s (Ronald Reagan) initiatives in Central America:

(10) Let me ask you about your own Congress. Um they are acting as if they think you’ve got another unwinnable war on your hands, ah, when they start to give the President a hard time about 93 million dollars in aid that he says he needs on an emergency basis just to buy bullets for the election period in El Salvador and they want to give him

Frum initially asks a polite indirect request for information: ‘Let me ask you about your own Congress’. She is ‘asking to ask’ and in so doing also establishing a new topic in the conversation. What follows is an indirect request for information formed through a disputable assertion to the effect that the American Congress is reluctant to vote for American aid in El Salvador since it views the war there as ‘unwinnable’. Kirkpatrick interrupts Frum before she can complete what she has to say and supplies new information: ‘And medical supplies for the wounded’. This interruption from Kirkpatrick serves the purpose of modifying Frum’s assertion that the 93 million dollars in aid is only for bullets since it will also be used for ‘medical supplies for the wounded’. The purpose of Kirkpatrick’s interruption is not simply to cut
For a second time Frum employs a disputable assertion as an indirect request for information. She again asserts that the American Congress is reluctant to back the President in El Salvador. And again she is interrupted by Kirkpatrick who modifies Frum's original assertion: ‘Well, they are the Democratic Party, ah, you’re talking about the opposition leader, the leader of the opposition’. Kirkpatrick counters Frum’s disputable assertion by providing the new information that it is not Congress which does not back the President but the Democratic Party. Rather than the scenario of one branch of the government in conflict with another as presented by Frum, Kirkpatrick reanalyses the conflict as that between parties and in so doing significantly lessens the status or importance of the conflict. It is important to see that Kirkpatrick’s interruptions of Frum are the very responses that Frum has provoked through her D-Event assertions. In each instance Kirkpatrick responds to Frum’s indirect requests for information with information that either cancels or minimizes the relevance of the assertions to herself and her government.

Frum, however, not getting the new information that she wants, restates her request:

(12) They are very vocally suggesting that they suspect that this can only be won by U.S. troops. They have no interest in committing those troops and they don’t seem to have interest in giving you the kind of aid that you think you need to win the war.

In this indirect request for information, Frum reports the disputable assertions of those in Congress: ‘They are very vocally suggesting that they suspect that this can only be won by U.S. troops’. She reports their speech act of ‘suggesting’ which concerns the content of their own beliefs. She then reports their own internal intentions in a B-Event assertion which functions as an indirect request for information: ‘They have no interest in committing those troops and they don’t seem to have interest in giving you the kind of aid that you think you need to win the war’. With this combination of a D-Event and a B-Event assertion Frum succeeds in getting a more impassioned response from Kirkpatrick without being interrupted:

(13) Look look I really have to object to those pronouns if I may say so. They are suggesting that you have an unwinnable war on your hands. We are if I may
say in the Administration and the Congress all Americans and whatever it is we've got on our hands we've got on our hands the United States has on its hands. And what we have to try to do obviously is work out a satisfactory response. Now some of us are in the Administration and some of us are in the opposition party and some of those persons (bolding equals stress by speaker)

Kirkpatrick specifically challenges the 'they-you' dichotomy which Frum has consistently asserted in her indirect requests. Unable to employ interruptions as cancelling or modifying responses, Kirkpatrick must address the conflict as presented by Frum. She does this quite brilliantly by focussing attention on pronominal reference. Rather than the divisive 'they-you' of Frum's disputable assertion, Kirkpatrick responds with the salient and unified 'we': 'whatever it is we've got on our hands we've got on our hands the United States has on its hands'. Her response does cancel the relevance of Frum's disputable assertion, but it is also a dramatic response which carries with it a unified vision. Interestingly, Frum then interrupts Kirkpatrick by asserting with some amusement, 'Some of you ask for money and some of you say no to money'. Frum again reiterates her indirect request for information as well as her assertion of division between Congress and the Presidency.

This exchange between Frum and Kirkpatrick continues for some time with Kirkpatrick at one point stating, 'I I'm sorry I cannot accept the premises involved in the questions'. Here she is explicitly making reference to the disputable assertions which Frum has employed as indirect requests for information. Formally, Frum has not employed 'questions', but she has repeatedly employed D-Event assertions as indirect requests for information, as well as some B-Event assertions in order to provoke response from Jean Kirkpatrick about American policy in Central America. While Johnstone, Ferrara and Bean (1992) found that male interviewees sought to undermine their female interviewers' status because they were females in a position of power, the interviewees that I have examined here, both male and female, seek primarily to deflect a given request for information or as Kirkpatrick states, 'the premises involved in the questions'. Lévesque evaluates Frum's request as 'irrelevant', while Kirkpatrick uses interruption to reanalyse 'the premises'. Frum, however, is able to maintain a 'line of questioning' and to provoke response through consistent use of D-Event assertions as indirect requests for information. Through such indirect requests she exerts extensive influence over the content of the utterances she receives. In so doing, she is further able to maintain her own status and position as an interviewer.

The second female interviewer, Pamela Wallin, is equally strategic in her interviewing. For example in an interview with Roy Romanow, the Premier of Saskatchewan, Wallin initiates her interview conventionally with an invocation of a sincerity condition, 'Well, I wanna talk about health care …' which serves to introduce the topic. She then recounts for Romanow his own experience of coming into office and finding that the province’s financial situation was poor. Romanow explains that numerous cuts to services, including closure of 52 rural hospitals, were necessary because of this economic situation. Wallin at this point begins to explore the significance of these hospital closures:
But you’re a city boy and I’m a small town girl and there’s a difference in our approach to health care when you look at it from those two perspectives because you do have your hospitals in the city and the town where I come from, you know, those kinds of places, aren’t going to have their wellness clinics and practice all these things from birth. They’re just losing their hospitals.

Wallin above employs a D-Event indirect request for information in such a way as to provoke Romanow into looking at the consequences of cuts to health care. She asserts that cutbacks to health care affect people living in the city differently than they do people living in the country. Those in the country do not have wellness clinics to fall back on. This is followed by a second D-Event indirect request for information where Wallin, like Frum above, reports the assertions of others as a means of provoking response:

But the knock on on the the knock on your approach Mr. Romanow is that you went ahead and closed the hospitals and put that system into place without having the fallback the other new redesigned system ready to go.

Both female interviewers employ a similar strategy in interviewing politicians, in this case two premiers of provinces. They first summarize the action taken by the interviewee,

(a) What did you do, you removed an unpopular gas tax (Lévesque)
(b) You went ahead and closed the hospitals and put that system in place (Romanow)

and then they reiterate the disputable assertion,

(a) They say that 4 cents a litre at the gas pump is not an economic plan (Lévesque)
(b) But the knock on your approach is that … without having the fallback the other newly redesigned system ready to go (Romanow)

Both provoke the interviewee into examining his own actions and what has been perceived as being wrong with those actions. Moreover, because these D-Event assertions function as indirect requests for information which are provocative, the interviewee is placed in a circumstance where he must explain by means of response. This is very powerful interviewing strategy.

In a further interview by Pamela Wallin with Deepak Chopra, a self-help guru, we can again see the same strategy. Chopra’s interest in coming on Wallin’s program is to gain a greater audience for his particular brand of Eastern philosophy. In her interview with Chopra, Wallin first employs what amounts to a reversal of the normal conditions for the introduction of topics. Rather than introducing a topic through her own sincerity condition as an indirect request for information, she does so by means of expressing a sincerity condition expressing the interviewee’s needs and wants:
All right, you want (my emphasis) me to say this. Your official title is Executive Director of the Sharpe Institute for Human Potential and Body Medicine but you were a real live doctor, an endocrinologist.

‘All right’ implicates compliance, but such compliance amounts to a reversal in the power relations between the two interlocutors. By choosing topic or subject matter, Chopra is initially in control of the interview. Wallin, therefore, must be strategic to regain her role and function as interviewer. In contrast to the image the interviewee, Deepak Chopra, wants to put forward of himself, Wallin provokes a contrary response by asserting a B-Event functioning as an indirect request for information: ‘but you were a real live doctor, an endocrinologist’. Through this indirect request for information, Wallin reasserts her role as interviewer. She has complied with Chopra’s indirect request for topic selection, but she then selects the next topic: Chopra’s former incarnation as a ‘real live doctor’.

Having reestablished her role, Wallin next asks Chopra directly about what she sees as a conundrum in his transformation from traditional doctor to motivator and guru:

(17) How did you get from there to here? What made you give up on traditional medicine?

Chopra responds to this direct request by saying that traditional medicine does not provide the means by which to motivate people to make positive change in their lives. He presents himself as a motivator, thus his wish that Wallin employ his official title as Executive Director of the Sharpe Institute for Human Potential and Body Medicine. Wallin in turn asks the next logical question:

(18) So what does motivate us? How can you motivate?

Chopra responds as follows:

(19) I think you ah have to understand and get excited about what makes you who you are what makes you tick. You have to employ techniques that are not only useful but enjoyable and if you look at the healing traditions of the world ... the whole process is one of exultation and ecstasy. You encounter your own spirit your own life force and there’s a joyful experience there and at the same time it’s healing.

Chopra responds to the two direct questions rather obliquely. He replies that ‘you have to employ techniques that are not only useful but enjoyable’; ‘you encounter your own spirit your own life force and there’s a joyful experience there’. He specifies nothing about his techniques, but simply evaluates them as both ‘useful’ and ‘enjoyable’. He further states that one encounters one’s own life force, which in turn he evaluates as ‘joyful’. Chopra does not in fact explain his techniques nor explain what it means to ‘encounter your own spirit your own life force’. Given this level of
non-informativeness from Chopra, Wallin begins to employ indirect requests for information:

(20) I don’t want to make it sound too simplistic but I think even traditional medicine believes this that if you feel better about yourself or if you have a positive attitude towards an illness that you have you’re likely better able to cope.

Wallin provides a gist of what she believes Chopra is saying, ‘that if you feel better about yourself or if you have a positive attitude towards an illness that you have you’re likely better able to cope’, but subordinates this to her own D-Event assertion, ‘I think even traditional medicine believes this’. Through this indirect request for information, Wallin is asking Chopra ‘So what?’ She is continuing to ask him to explain the substantive differences between his own approach and that of Western medicine. Chopra must provide a response that specifies the relevance of his own approach to medicine and healing and which distinguishes it from medicine practised in the West:

(21) Yah, I mean traditional medicine recognizes the so-called placebo response where you give someone a dummy drug and you say this is going to relieve your pain and if the patient believes you then the pain is relieved but what people haven’t recognized until now is when that belief is incorporated in your consciousness you actually make an opiate. You actually make a pain reliever in your system that is more powerful than any heroin you can buy on the street. So your thought becomes a molecule. Wherever that thought goes a molecule goes with it. To think then is not only to practise brain chemistry but body chemistry because there are receptors to these molecules in different parts of your body including your immune cells. Your immune cells which help you to fight against cancer and infection. They’re eavesdropping on your internal dialogue.

Chopra’s response is that the mind and body are linked and thus to influence the mind is to influence the body, but he does still not specify how he himself is able to affect others lives positively. Wallin again brings Chopra back to concrete specifics:

(22) So what do you say to people, I mean is you have to look at their relationships and the stress levels in their workplace or their emotional lives or their personal lives their eating all of these thing where do you suggest. It’s easy on one level to say change the way you live. It’s really hard to do.

She again employs another disputable assertion as an indirect request for information: ‘It’s easy on one level to say change the way you live. It’s really hard to do’. The point of this indirect request is not ‘so what’ but ‘how’ as it was when she asked about motivation at the commencement of the interview. Chopra responds by saying:

(23) You you really get to know the person. And it takes several hours to do an evaluation. You recommend a diet. You teach them stress management tech-
In this last response Chopra avoids the language of spiritual encounter and provides the new information that he does an extensive consultation with any patient, then recommends a diet and teaches the patient stress management techniques. He does not in fact expand on this for the remainder of the interview; however, this concrete new information indicates that Chopra is acting very much as any Western doctor does despite his claims to deeper insight into the problem of healing. However, to get this information Wallin had to strategically employ D-Event assertions as indirect requests for information. Her provocations provide the revelation that Chopra, if not exactly a charlatan, is certainly not offering the world anything dramatically new.

6. Conclusion

In all the examples above, the female interviewers encounter some form of resistance to their line of questioning: René Lévesque’s asserts that Barbara Frum’s initial question is ‘irrelevant’; Deepak Chopra attempts to gain a degree of control over Pamela Wallin by having her report his official title and provides answers that have little informational value, and of course Jean Kirkpatrick actually interrupts Frum twice in the process of being questioned. All the interviewees in some way or another resist the requests for information which are put to them. There is no evidence, however, that they attempt to sabotage the interviewers simply because of their gender. Both female interviewers employ D-Event assertions as indirect requests for information to provoke salient response from their interviewees. In the examples that I have provided, these interviewers require their interviewees to address issues or concerns that they would otherwise ignore. Lévesque is made to address the economic consequences of his policies, Kirkpatrick is made to address the fact of opposition to her president’s policies in the American Congress; Romanow is made to address the consequences of health care cuts for those not living in cities, and Chopra is made to address his own disputable assertion that his methods are significantly different from those of standard medicine. Both Frum and Wallin also import assertions, which is to say that they report disputable assertions made by others. They further employ the strategy of first stating an action and then reporting an assertion as a means of confronting an interviewee with a situation that must be addressed. As Blum-Kulka (1983) and Harris (1984) argue, questions are a means of control, and both female interviewers maintain their control through strategic use of D-Event assertions and reported D-Event assertions as indirect requests for information.

If we return to the issue of questions and women asking questions, what we see in this data is that indirect requests for information are used by the female interviewers
in order primarily to ask tough questions, to maintain a line of questioning, and to maintain status. D-Event assertions as indirect requests for information carry the implicature 'what do you have to say about that' and it is the getting of a salient response that makes the interview successful and so maintains the status of the interviewer. Both female interviewers also employ B-Event assertions as indirect requests for information in their interviewing, but to a much lesser extent than do their male counterparts. There is less reliance on requests which assert knowledge about the interviewee, although both female interviewers do use B-Event assertions in between 25 to 30% of their provocative indirect requests. One might expect female interviewers to rely extensively on indirect requests which engage their interviewees through personal information, but both Frum and Wallin prefer a style of interviewing that is agonistic rather than interpersonal. Of course, in some interviews, where the life or behaviour of the interviewee is the topic of discussion, B-Event assertions as indirect requests for information are logical realizations of the topic. However, one male interviewer, Larry King, also uses B-Event assertions as indirect requests in political interviews to explore interpersonal relations between world figures. For example, in an interview with Margaret Thatcher he asks her about her relationship with Ronald Reagan:

(24) But you can have the same opinions and the same goals, but that doesn’t mean you have to like someone. And the two of you had genuine affection.

King’s B-Event assertion ‘And the two of you have genuine affection’ provokes Thatcher into talking about her feelings of chemistry with Reagan and eventually into providing an anecdote about Reagan. King does much the same thing with Mikhail Gorbachev whom he asks about Margaret Thatcher:

(25) It also sounds like you like her...you genuinely like her as a person.

Again, this assertion of a B-Event provokes Gorbachev into further revelation: ‘Oh, yes ... I’ll tell you that that also helped us to work together. Our families knew each other, and we met between our two families. It was not just political discussions and meetings, but as human beings’. Peter Gzowski, a Canadian interviewer, shows the same kind of interest in personal experience and feelings. For example, in an interview with a Canadian celebrity, he employs an extended B-Event assertion as indirect request:

(26) That privacy is really important to you, isn’t it, ‘cause when I came in, you and I shook hands. I said ‘Are you around her’ and immediately both you and Lena, your wife, your antenna went up as if I was trying to burst through that privacy to where you live. You really don’t want people to know. It’s it’s you wanna be away.

This B-Event assertion is clearly provocative since Gzowski’s interviewee, Stompin Tom Connors, is made to explore the impact of celebrity on his life, but Gzowski is
also indicating through this indirect request, his own degree of understanding of Stompin Tom. With both male interviewers, King and Gzowski, there is interest in the feelings and relationships of their interviewees. Both attempt to establish a kind of rapport with their interviewee, a kind of camaraderie out of which they can make their requests for information. It is in fact this ability to put interviewees at ease and make them feel understood which makes both male interviewers successful and respected. However, neither of the female interviewers employ B-Event assertions in this way. Neither make any attempt to get on the same wave-length as their interviewee. For example, in her interview with Margaret Thatcher, Barbara Frum also employs B-Events assertions, but not to explore Thatcher’s sense of chemistry with Ronald Reagan:

(27) Mrs. Thatcher, though, you’re going for attitudes. You’re trying to change the way people think about their role in life. It’s almost sometimes as though you think by your own resolve you can inspire people to be different. Your you still inside if I can suggest that very bright greengrocer’s daughter (pause) who made herself a chemist, who made herself a tax lawyer, made herself Prime Minister, anybody can.

In this B-Event assertion as indirect request, Frum attempts to get Thatcher to explain her political philosophy through an explanation of her own personal protestant work ethic. Thatcher does indeed respond, but not comfortably. Equally, in an interview with Grace Mirabella, the founder of *Mirabella* magazine, Pamela Wallin employs B-Event assertions as indirect requests to explore a controversial aspect of her fashion magazine:

(28) Now some of the articles that you put into a this magazine, your husband is a surgeon, a doctor. It’s made you quite militant on the subject of smoking.

Here Wallin provokes Mirabella into revelations about her magazine as a vehicle for social awareness by asserting the information that since Mirabella’s husband is a surgeon, she has herself become concerned and even militant about health care issues. Wallin’s purpose is to have Mirabella explain why her magazine contains articles that would not normally be placed in magazines such as *Vogue* or *Harper’s Bazaar.*

B-Events assertions as indirect requests are used to explore or make connections between inner feelings or beliefs and exterior action or behaviour, very much as D-Event assertions are used to explore what is problematic in actions or behaviour. The female interviewers are less interested in understanding their interviewees and more interested in engaging them in analysis of their own actions or behaviour. To this end they appear to be more confrontational than their male counterparts. Their preference for D-Event assertions particularly shows a disposition to ‘hold the mirror up to reality’ as Hamlet would have it, to make available to their interviewees a counterperspective to which they must attend. In this regard they function as educators for both their interviewees and their audience, while their male counterparts gain information more through perception of emotional and intellectual understanding.
While the male interviewers specialize in attunement, the female interviewers specialize in analytic engagement.

One cannot make generalizations based on an analysis of four participants; however, the two female interviewers I examine, who are both highly respected, can certainly not be called simple facilitators of their interviewees. They employ more polite indirect requests for information than do the two male interviewers examined, but they also employ more provocative forms. There is evidence that they are ‘handlers’, since provocative forms are used strategically to maintain a line of questioning. Their real expertise in fact is not in asking the ‘right’ questions or ‘tough’ questions, but in continuing to ask such questions or to maintain a line of questioning, and this they do largely through use of indirect forms. In this way they are able to get the information they want from their interviewees, and so both maintain their status and position themselves in talk as powerful speakers.
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