

Article

Questioning Practices and Speech Style Shifting in Korean Entertainment Talk Shows

Kyung-Eun Yoon 

Department of Modern Languages, Linguistics and Intercultural Communication, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD 21250, USA; kyoona@umbc.edu

Abstract: This study explores the dynamics of questioning practices and speech-style shifting in Korean entertainment talk shows. While prior research has examined the topic of questioning practices in the Korean language, mostly in everyday conversation or educational discourse, this article expands this investigation to encompass semi-institutional discourse, particularly focusing on the context of entertainment talk shows. This research also contributes to understanding the pragmatic characteristics of two Korean honorific speech styles, namely the polite (-yo) and deferential (-(su)pnita/-(su)pnikka) styles, by investigating their interplay and transitions. Adopting an interactional approach to discourse and drawing upon membership categorization analysis and conversation analysis, this study analyzes the discourse of 15 entertainment talk shows, with a special focus on approximately 1500 sentential units, 325 of which are questions. The analysis of these utterances provides an account of the utilization of linguistic resources in questioning practices and the utilization of the two Korean honorific speech styles in the joint construction of social activities and identities within the entertainment talk show setting. The selection of linguistic resources for questioning practices and style shifting is closely intertwined with the management of entertainment and institutional dynamics among the participants in this particular setting.

Keywords: Korean; question; speech style; polite style; deferential style; talk show; institutional talk; semi-institutional discourse



Citation: Yoon, Kyung-Eun. 2023. Questioning Practices and Speech Style Shifting in Korean Entertainment Talk Shows. *Languages* 8: 286. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8040286>

Academic Editor: Julien Longhi

Received: 17 July 2023

Revised: 26 November 2023

Accepted: 5 December 2023

Published: 12 December 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Questions are widely employed in various contexts, serving multiple functions such as seeking information, making requests, extending offers, and presenting challenges (Enfield et al. 2010). Also, the question–response sequence is “a universal unit of conversational organization, and a pervasive type of sequence in all communities” (Enfield et al. 2010, p. 2616). Given the pivotal role questions and responses play in diverse social settings, extensive research has examined these sequences in a range of contexts such as news interviews (Clayman and Heritage 2002), criminal trials (Atkinson and Drew 1979), classrooms (Mehan 1985), and informal conversation (Stivers 2010; Yoon 2010). In line with this research, the present study explores the characteristics of questioning practices in Korean, specifically within the context of entertainment talk shows. The choice of entertainment talk shows is driven by their distinctive amalgamation of conversational and institutional characteristics within the discourse (Ilie 1999, 2001). Moreover, this research aims to delve into the intricacies of speech style dynamics in Korean, and this genre is apt for exploring how different speech styles contribute to the construction of discourse, shifting between informality and conversational tones on some occasions and formality and institutionality at other moments.

The topic of questioning practices in Korean has been the focus of many previous studies, primarily concentrating on regular conversations or educational discussions (e.g., Kim 2015; Park 2007; Yoon 2010). This article seeks to broaden the scope by investigating how questioning practices manifest in the context of entertainment talk shows. The target

context, a talk show setting in Korea, carries a social expectation of employing an honorific speech style. Given that Korean has two distinct honorific speech styles, the polite (*-yo*) and deferential (*-(su)pnita*/*-(su)pnikka*) styles, and that frequent shifts between these styles are common in various social contexts, including the talk show environment, it is important to examine the mechanism of this style shifting. Prior studies have extensively explored these two speech styles, looking into determining factors (e.g., Lukoff 1982; Sohn 1999) and their pragmatic and interactional functions (e.g., Brown 2015; Eun and Strauss 2004; Yoon 2014). While they have primarily focused on declarative or propositional sentence types, the current study encompasses interrogatives, aiming to provide a more comprehensive account of the pragmatic characteristics and to enhance our understanding of the two honorific speech styles in Korean.

Another primary focus of this article is to understand the rationale behind specific linguistic choices made in questioning practices and the shifting of speech styles within the context of Korean entertainment talk shows. This study suggests that these linguistic choices are related to the participants' orientations toward their institutional roles and the associated tasks at various moments in the given setting. The continuous formation and completion of participants' identities and tasks during ongoing interactions are pertinent to the level of institutionality constructed moment by moment in the talk show setting. Employing an interactional approach to discourse and drawing from the perspectives of membership categorization analysis and conversation analysis, this research analyzes the discourse of 15 entertainment talk shows, with particular emphasis on approximately 1500 remarks in a sentential unit, which includes 325 questions. Through this analysis, we aim to shed light on how linguistic tools are employed in the process of asking questions and how the utilization of the two Korean honorific speech styles influences the collaborative shaping of social interactions and identities within the domain of entertainment talk shows.

The study is guided by the following research questions:

- What are questioning practices in entertainment talk shows, and how do they differ from or resemble those in ordinary conversation in Korean?
- How are Korean speech styles, especially the two Korean honorific variants, polite (*-yo*) and deferential (*-(su)pnita*/*-(su)pnikka*), used in the discourse of entertainment talk shows? Specifically, how are they sequenced and how do they function in the interaction?
- How do linguistic choices in questioning practices and speech styles serve as resources for the collaborative formation of social activities and participant identities, displaying a fluid integration of conversational moments and institutional dynamics throughout each episode?

2. Background

Research on Korean interrogative sentences has extensively elucidated their morpho-syntactic features. Formal linguistic studies, such as Sohn (1999), have demonstrated that these sentences are constructed through overt morphological markings, *-na*, *-(nu)nya*, *-ni*, *-nka*, or *-kka*, on predicates at the sentence-ending position, without subject-predicate inversion or movement of *wh*-type question words to the sentence beginning. Additionally, Kim (1999) examines the morpho-syntactic forms and the pragmatic functions of Korean questions from a broader perspective, taking into account elements such as *wh*-type question words and a final rising intonation. His research was grounded in conversational data, adopting an interactional perspective. Expanding the scope, Yoon (2010) broadens the dataset to provide a more comprehensive overview of question practices in everyday Korean conversation. She notes that, despite the availability of the various morphological markers for forming interrogatives, declarative sentence endings are more prevalent, constituting over 80% of cases. Interrogatives, in contrast, make up only 19.3% of the total 176 questions analyzed in a sentential unit.

Further studies have explored different aspects of questioning practices in Korean, considering their designs and socio-pragmatic functions (e.g., Kim 2015; Jeong and Bae

2021; Kim and Suh 2021; Park 2007; Yoon 2006). For instance, Yoon (2006) focuses on the role of *wh*-questions in expressing complaints, while Jeong and Bae (2021) examine socio-interactional functions of overt interrogative markers, *-nya* and *-ni*. Similarly, Kim (2015) concentrates on a specific type of declarative question design and its interactional functions, and Kim and Suh (2021) analyze a particular category of questions and their responses in Korean TV talk show interactions. Park (2007) takes a broader approach, investigating various types of questions and their uses in tutorial discourse. Building upon these studies, the present study explores questioning practices in the context of entertainment talk shows, expanding beyond specific question types. Considering that prior research primarily examined everyday conversation, with exceptions being Kim and Suh (2021) and Park (2007), this study contributes to the understanding of semi-institutional talk as well. Its aim is to offer a comprehensive insight into Korean questioning practices in different communicative contexts.

The degree of institutionality and formality in talk-in-interaction is closely linked to the various speech styles in Korean. Korean comprises six speech styles indicated by distinctive suffixes attached to predicates as sentence enders (Sohn 1999). These styles primarily serve to indicate the social relationship between the speaker and the listener (Brown 2015). They encompass plain, intimate, familiar, blunt, polite, and deferential styles, with the first four falling under non-honorific categories and the latter two categorized as honorific styles (Sohn 1999), as outlined in Table 1. Among these, the plain, intimate, polite, and deferential styles are the most commonly used in modern Korean (Song 2005), while the other two styles have largely fallen out of use (Brown 2015).

Table 1. Six speech styles with the four major sentence types (adapted from Sohn 1999, p. 413).

		Declarative	Interrogative	Imperative	Propositive
–Honorific	Plain	-ta	-ni?/- (nu)nya?	-kela/-ela	-ca
	Intimate	-e/-a	-e?/-a?	-e/-a	-e/-a
	Familiar	-ney	-na?/-nka?	-key	-sey
	Blunt	-(s)o/-(s)wu	-(s)o?/-(s)wu?	-o/-wu	-psita
+Honorific	Polite	-eyo/-ayo	-eyo?/-ayo?	-eyo/-ayo	-eyo/-ayo
	Deferential	-(su)pnita	-(su)pnikka?	-sipsio	-sipsita

The present study primarily focuses on two honorific styles, polite style (-yo) and deferential style (-(su)pnita/-(su)pnikka) as these are commonly utilized by Korean speakers in public speech settings such as talk shows (Brown 2015). Traditionally, these styles were considered to be determined by factors like deferentiality, formality, or gender. Some studies suggested that -(su)pnita/-(su)pnikka is more deferential than -yo (e.g., Lukoff 1982), whereas others explained that -(su)pnita/-(su)pnikka is formal and -yo is informal (e.g., Sung 1985). This distinction is evident through the prevalent use of -(su)pnita/-(su)pnikka in highly formalized scripted speech such as news broadcasts (Brown 2015). Some other research also proposed that -(su)pnita/-(su)pnikka is associated with masculinity, while -yo is associated with femininity (e.g., Sohn 1999). However, there is a growing understanding that the choice between the two styles cannot be explained simply by such factors as shifting between them often occurs in the same discourse between the same speakers. Consequently, recent studies have highlighted the pragmatic and interactional meanings and functions that underlie the differences between these styles (Eun and Strauss 2004; Strauss and Eun 2005; Kim and Suh 2007; Park 2014; Yoon 2014; Chang 2014; Brown 2015).

Eun and Strauss (2004) and Strauss and Eun (2005) observe that the polite style serves to indicate shared or common-sense information and indexes a stance of inclusion by establishing or reinforcing common ground, whereas the deferential style is employed when introducing new or non-shared information and indexing a stance of exclusion by

creating bounded distance between the speaker and the addressee. Similarly, Yoon (2014) suggests that the distinction between the two styles lies in the polite form representing a soft affective stance, contrasting with the deferential style that is associated with information delivery, ritualized presentation, or announcement-making. Also, Chang (2014) reveals that the polite style conveys an individual or affective stance, whereas the deferential form exhibits a professional, epistemic stance. Brown (2015) presents *-yo* as a resource for casual and affective stances compared to *-(su)pnita* for signaling a formal presentational stance or performing actions that are public and ritualistic. While these studies utilize data from TV shows, Kim and Suh (2007) and Park (2014) analyze classroom discourse, finding that the deferential speech style is used to highlight key instructional elements such as pedagogical activities and the role of the teacher. This article aligns with this line of research and aims to broaden our understanding of the pragmatic characteristics of the two speech styles in Korean by including interrogatives, in addition to the declarative or propositive sentence types examined in previous studies.

The topics of questioning practices and speech style selection in Korean entertainment talk shows are well-suited for exploring the intricacies of institutionality in this particular setting. Institutionality of an interaction, according to Drew and Heritage (1992), is not solely determined by its setting, but is co-constructed by the participants as they make their institutional identities relevant to the work activities they are engaged in through the ongoing interaction. Drew and Heritage (1992) explain how participants address themselves to the specialized tasks in institutional settings based on three features of institutional talk (cited from Heritage 2005, p. 106):

1. The interaction normally involves the participants in specific goal orientations that are tied to their institution-relevant identities: doctor and patient, teacher and student, bride and groom, and so on.
2. The interaction involves special constraints on what will be treated as allowable contributions to the business at hand.
3. The interaction is associated with inferential frameworks and procedures that are particular to specific institutional contexts.

As some specific practices of institutional talk which are distinct from ordinary conversation, Heritage (2005) points out the pre-allocated asymmetrical turn-taking system in settings like the courts and news interviews. In the institutional turn-taking system, the party representing the institution is restricted to asking questions, while the other party is constrained to providing answers to the questions posed. Comparatively, Ilie (1999, 2001) examines the characteristics of media talk shows as semi-institutional talk, finding features of both conversational and institutional discourse. This means that the talk is institutionally rule-governed and topic-centered to a certain extent, but question–response sequences are less predictable and less conventionalized. Ilie also observes occurrences of spontaneous role switching and question asking initiated by show guests.

The present study builds upon this line of research and contributes to cross-linguistic investigations of semi-institutional discourse. The prior studies on Korean speech styles presented earlier do not directly address the issue of institutionality, but their findings suggest some relevance. First, their data are drawn from various institutional settings, including media talk shows, news broadcasts, instructional TV programs, sermons, and classroom discourse. Second, their observations regarding the deferential style are tied to institutional tasks and roles, while those regarding the polite style are linked to personal affect. This present study aims to widen the scope of previous research by examining questioning practices and speech style shifts in the context of entertainment talk shows. By doing so, it endeavors to explore the features of institutionality in the domain of the media talk show setting and deepen our understanding of the intricate characteristics of semi-institutional discourse.

3. Data and Methods

Following [Drew and Heritage \(1992\)](#), this study takes an approach that the institutionality of an interaction is co-constructed through the participants' language practices on a moment-by-moment basis. To explore the dynamic ways in which institutionality is constructed in Korean interaction, this research analyzes entertainment talk shows, which exhibit both institutional and conversational features. Given that entertainment talk shows are less rule-governed and less conventionalized ([Ilie 1999, 2001](#)), linguistic choices in question designs and speech styles in Korean play pivotal roles in creating institutionality and conversational interactions at different moments, making them an optimal type of discourse for the current study.

The data corpus of this study comprises one episode each from 15 entertainment talk shows. To ensure comprehensiveness, this study examines shows available across various media, including five TV shows, five radio shows, and five YouTube shows. Among these, ten TV and radio shows and one YouTube show are music programs comprising guest musicians' performances and interview sections within them. The analysis of this study focuses solely on the interview sections. The remaining four YouTube programs are straightforward talk shows where celebrity hosts interview celebrity guests. These YouTube shows, produced by professional teams, follow similar formats to those in TV or radio talk shows. However, they are not subject to the same regulatory constraints on themes or language use as TV or radio programs ([Eun et al. 2022](#)), which often results in more informal and casual features.

The hosts of the 15 programs consist of 16 celebrities, 9 males and 7 females, spanning ages ranging from the early 20s to the mid-50s at the time of broadcasting. There are 18 guests in total, 9 males and 9 females, ranging in age from late teens to the early 50s, as illustrated in Table 2. The duration of each show segment varies from five minutes to an hour. Including show participants spanning diverse age groups, a balanced gender distribution, and varying media formats and segment lengths is intended to facilitate an investigation into questioning practices and speech style selections across different settings and among various speaker profiles, aiming for a comprehensive analysis.

Table 2. Data.

	Title of Show	Year of Episode	Host (Gender and Age)	Guest (Gender and Age)
TV shows	<i>Chocolate</i>	2009	F—30s	M—20s
	<i>Live Talk Show Taxi</i>	2011	F—40s and M—40s	M—20s
	<i>Propose</i>	2012	F—30s	F—40s
	<i>Must</i>	2013	M—40s	F—20s and F—20s
	<i>Sketchbook</i>	2014	M—40s	M—40s
Radio shows	<i>Music City</i>	2012	M—30s	M—30s
	<i>Blue Night</i>	2015	M—20s	F—20s
	<i>Radio Show</i>	2016	M—40s	M—40s
	<i>Sisters' Radio</i>	2016	F—40s and F—40s	F—30s
	<i>Young Street</i>	2016	F—20s	F—18 and F—20s
YouTube shows	<i>5 Minutes</i>	2022	M—30s	M—30s
	<i>Limousine Service</i>	2022	M—20s	F—20s
	<i>Salon Drip</i>	2023	F—30s	M—40s
	<i>Turkiyes on the Block</i>	2023	M—30s	M—40s
	<i>Eseo-CEO (Vivo)</i>	2023	F—50s	F—50s and M—50s

To examine questioning practices, the 15 talk shows have been transcribed, and questioning utterances have been identified. A question is often asked in a lexical, phrasal, or clausal unit, or a tag question ([Yoon 2010](#)), but for the purpose of this study, the focus is exclusively on questions in a sentential unit. A total of 325 sentences containing questioning actions have been identified from the 15 talk show segments. These questions are analyzed

for their linguistic designs in the same approach as that taken by Yoon (2010), allowing for a comparison of practices with those in ordinary conversation identified in her study. To explore the use of different speech styles, all utterances in the transcribed data have been closely examined, leading to the identification of approximately 1500 remarks in a sentential unit, each marked with a specific speech style. Among these remarks, all instances of speech style shifting have been identified, and each case has been analyzed within its sequential context, considering the organizational and interactional features. These cases often involve questions and responses as well, providing an optimal interactional site for examining institutionality. The analytical approach for this examination is informed by conversation analysis (CA) and membership categorization analysis (MCA). Significant insights provided by these frameworks are a view from CA that social reality is realized in and through the publicly observable features of interaction (Schegloff 2007) and a perspective of MCA that social identities and relations can be negotiated and achieved through interaction (Hester and Eglin 1997). Building upon these approaches, this article delves into the dynamics of how institutional or non-institutional identities and activities are jointly constructed through linguistic practices at different moments in entertainment talk shows.

4. Questioning Practices

As noted earlier, Korean interrogatives are overtly marked with *-na*, *-(nu)-nya*, *-ni*, *-nka*, or *-kka* (Sohn 1999). Among these markers, *-na*, *-nka*, and *-kka* can be combined with the polite speech style ending, *-yo*, while *-(nu)-nya* and *-ni* are considered non-honorific or “plain-level” (Sohn 1999, p. 234) sentence endings. Additionally, the deferential speech style, *-(su)pnikka*, serves as an interrogative sentence ending. Despite the availability of the various morphological devices for formulating interrogatives, Yoon (2010) points out that declarative endings are more commonly employed than overt interrogative endings in Korean questions in ordinary conversation. In such cases, a rising intonation is often utilized to convey a question within a declarative sentence. Table 3 presents a detailed distribution of different endings in question sentences based on Yoon’s study.

Table 3. Distribution of interrogative and declarative sentence endings in 176 questions in ordinary conversation (adapted from Yoon 2010, p. 2784 *).

Interrogative Endings						Declarative Endings
<i>-nya</i>	<i>-ni</i>	<i>-na(-yo)</i>	<i>-nka(-yo)</i>	<i>-lkka(-yo)</i>	<i>-(su)pnikka</i>	
5	1	16	3	9	0	142
Total of 34						80.7%
19.3%						

* The format of this table is modified from the one presented in the original study.

The table demonstrates that declarative endings are starkly more prevalent, accounting for 80.7% of occurrences, while interrogative endings comprise only 19.3% in everyday conversation. In the interrogative category, the majority consists of *-na*, *-nka*, and *-lkka* with or without the polite speech style ending, *-yo*, while the deferential style, *-(su)pnikka*, is not utilized at all.

In comparison, the present study reveals notable differences in the proportions of overt interrogative endings and declarative endings in questions asked in the context of entertainment talk shows, as illustrated in Table 4. Across the 15 entertainment talk shows analyzed, declarative endings still outnumber overt interrogative endings, but the proportion of interrogatives remarkably increases to 42.5% compared to 19.3% in ordinary conversation.

Table 4. Distribution of interrogative and declarative sentence endings in 325 questions in entertainment talk shows.

Interrogative Endings						Declarative Endings
<i>-nya</i>	<i>-ni</i>	<i>-na(-yo)</i>	<i>-nka(-yo)</i>	<i>-lkka(-yo)</i>	<i>-(su)pnikka</i>	
1	0	49	30	36	22	187
Total of 138: 42.5%						57.5%

The higher proportion of overt interrogatives suggests a stronger orientation toward institutionality in entertainment talk shows than in ordinary conversation. First, the appearance of the interrogative ending in the deferential style, *-(su)pnikka*, in 22 questions, whereas it is absent in ordinary conversation, indicates a heightened level of institutionality. Given that the deferential style is a resource for signaling a formal stance and for performing public and ritualistic actions (Brown 2015), the stark increase in its occurrences underscores the elevated level of institutionality in these shows. The reduced numbers of *-nya* and *-ni* indicates the same aspect as they are non-honorific endings used by adults for speaking to children or younger siblings and by children among themselves (Pak 2008). The relational dimensions and the casual situations involving the use of these markers run counter to institutionality. Regarding *-na* and *-nka*, they are grammatical variants serving the same functions, with the choice between them depending on the linguistic category of the preceding element (Yeon and Brown 2011). They were traditionally associated with older adults addressing younger adults (Sohn 1999), but subsequent studies have found their use with sentence endings from other speech levels such as the plain and intimate styles (Ahn 2015) and the polite style with *-yo* (Yoon 2010). Notably, these two markers in the current data always occur with *-yo*, exhibiting the participants' strong emphasis on politeness and, consequently, institutionality. The function of *-lkka* is to make a weak suggestion or evoke an inquiry, with another use of inviting the interlocutor to collaborate on a given task in pedagogical settings (Kim and Suh 2004). Relatedly, the high number of occurrences of this marker, all with *-yo*, in the present study suggests that the interviewers frequently attempt to engage the interviewees in the given tasks, reflecting institutionality.

This section has elucidated the questioning practices in Korean entertainment talk shows, drawing comparisons with those in everyday conversation. Regardless of the differences, the common function of the overt interrogative endings is to render the questioning action more explicit. Given that the interviewers' role of asking questions is pivotal in the turn-taking system of institutional talk (Heritage 2005), formulating questions in more explicit ways contributes to the construction of institutionality. The notably elevated usage of overt interrogative endings overall thus reflects the heightened level of institutionality in the setting of Korean entertainment talk shows. Nevertheless, this discourse continues to employ implicit questions in declarative formats in 57.5% of all questions, a feature commonly observed in everyday conversation. These practices collectively position the entertainment talk shows as a form of semi-institutional discourse.

5. Polite Speech Style and Deferential Speech Style

This section explores the employment of the polite speech style and deferential speech style in the Korean entertainment talk shows. It examines various types of remarks such as greetings, announcements, and more, expanding beyond just questions and responses. The analysis focuses on the positions and functions of these remarks in the ongoing talk. As noted earlier, these two honorific styles are selected as the focus of this study because they are the ones typically used by Korean speakers in public speech settings such as talk shows (Brown 2015). This study reaffirms the previous observation by revealing that most of the remarks in a sentential unit end with either of the two honorific styles. Out of over 1500 sentential utterances, only 44 employ non-honorific styles, comprising 2 with the plain style and 42 with the intimate style¹.

Between the two honorific speech styles, the polite speech style (-*yo*) emerges as the more prevalent choice in the current research, aligning with Yoon's finding in 2014. However, it is noteworthy that the deferential speech style (-(*su*)*pnita*/-(*su*)*pnikka*) predominates in the introductory and concluding segments of the shows. Out of the 15 shows under examination, the deferential style is employed in the opening and closing sections of 13 shows². Excerpts (1), (2), and (3) provide examples of the use of the deferential style during the opening and closing activities of the shows. These excerpts are drawn from YouTube shows. The choice of presenting YouTube data is driven by the expectation that they are not likely to use the formal, deferential speech style compared to TV and radio shows because YouTube content often exhibits a more casual format and language usage since it operates outside the regulatory scope of the Broadcasting Act that applies to Korean TV and radio programs (Eun et al. 2022). Another reason is that they are more recent productions than the other two types of shows in the data corpus. Considering the tendency for decreased use of the deferential style and increased employment of the polite style in modern Korean (Yoon et al. 2014), it is reasonable to expect a higher usage of the deferential style in the earlier productions compared to the recent ones. However, this study uncovers that even the YouTube content, which is typically associated with informality, predominantly employs the deferential speech style to establish formality and an institutional tone during show openings and closings, reflecting similar practices that are observed in TV and radio shows.

(1) [Eseo-CEO]

- 1 H: *onul-uy keysuthu-lul mosy-e po-tolok ha-keyss-supnita*³.
today-POSS guest-ACC bring-AUX-PROJ do-INCT-DEF:DC⁴
'I will introduce today's guests-[DEF:DC].'
- 2 G1: *annyengha-sey-yo tulama cakka Kim Unhi-lako ha-pnita*.
well-HON-POL drama writer NAME-QUOT do-DEF:DC
'Hi-[HON-POL]. I am a drama writer, Kim Unhi-[DEF:DC].'
- 3 G2: *ipyangtoy-n cwul al-ass-una impotoy-n ((chuckle)) Cang Hangcwun-i-pnita*.
adopted-ATTR BN know-PST-but fostered-ATTR NAME-COP-DEF:DC
'I am Cang Hangcwun who thought was adopted ((chuckle)) but was actually fostered-[DEF:DC].'

In Excerpt (1), the host (H), a female in her 50s, introduces the guests in the deferential style in line 1. It confirms Brown's observation (2015) that -(*su*)*pnita* utterances convey the speaker's formal presentational stance, and they perform public or ritualistic actions, even in a casual YouTube show setting. The two guests (G1 and G2) reciprocate this formal presentation style in describing their identities in lines 2 and 3, following the patterns of ritualized self-presentation identified in Yoon (2014). It is notable that while the two guests play their defined formal roles through the deferential style, which "would appear to embody an emotionally restrained and therefore distancing style of speech" (Brown 2015, p. 48), G2 delivers a joke in his self-presentation. He is G1's husband and he is well-known to praise his wife for having a highly successful career as a drama writer, although he is famous as a film director and a funny celebrity himself. He has often joked in public that he is a dependent of his wife as opposed to being the breadwinner of his household. The particular joke he delivers in this talk show is that he thought he could depend on his wife forever just like an adopted pet but he just realized that he was only being fostered and so he could not depend on her permanently. Telling this joke appears to be his attempt to soften the mood and connect with the audience. Such a way of delivering an informal, affective stance tends to be established more through -*yo* than -(*su*)*pnita* (Brown 2015; Yoon 2014), but G2, here, does so while using the deferential speech style and thereby completes both tasks of playing a formal role as a guest for self-presentation and being funny as a guest on an entertainment talk show at the same time. The intricate ways of managing a balance between formality and humor in the show will be discussed further in Section 6.

Excerpt (2) also demonstrates the use of the deferential style in presenting the guest. The show host is a male in his early 20s, and the guest is a female in her mid-20s. They employ the same practices of using the deferential style in presenting the guest (line 2) and the self (line 9) as public ritualistic actions in the opening of the show; although, they are in a different age group from those in Excerpt (1).

(2) [*Limousine Service*]

- 1 H: *choisang-uy laipu-lo, choiko-uy mancok-ul tuli-nun*
best.quality-POSS live-with best-POSS satisfaction-ACC give-ATTR
- 2 *Limwucin Sepisu onul-un, Kwen Cina nim-kkeyse thapsungha-sy-ess-supnita*
Limousine Service today-TC NAME Ms-NOM:HON ride-HON-PST-DEF:DC
- 3 *pankap-supnita!*
glad-DEF:DC
'Limousine Service provides the best satisfaction with the best live music. Today, Ms. Kwen Cina is riding with us-[DEF:DC] Glad to see you-[DEF:DC]'
- 4 G ((laugh and applaud))
- 5 H: *ah annyengha-sey-yo*
well-HON-POL
'Ah Hi'
- 6 G: *annyengha-sey-yo:*
well-HON-POL
'Hi:-[HON-POL]'
- 7 H: *nemwu hwanyengha-pnita. iltan cengsikulo insa han pen pwuthak*
too welcome-DEF:DC first officially greeting one time favor
- 8 *tuli-lkey-yo*
give-INT-POL
'We welcome you very much-[DEF:DC]. First we'd like to ask you to greet (the audience).'
- 9 G: *ney. annyengha-sey-yo Kwen Cina-i-pnita. pankap-supnita*
yes well-HON-POL NAME-COP-DEF:DC glad-DEF:DC
'Okay. Hi I am Kwen Cina-[DEF:DC]. Glad to see you-[DEF:DC]'

In addition to the actions of opening the show in a ritualistic way and presenting the guest and the self, the two participants use the *-(su)pnita* style in exchanging social pleasantries through phatic expressions (*Glad to see you*-[DEF:DC]! in line 3, *We welcome you very much*-[DEF:DC] in line 7, and *Glad to see you*-[DEF:DC] in line 9), corroborating observations in Yoon (2014).

As the deferential speech style is commonly used in the ritualistic utterances in opening activities in the talk shows, it is routinely employed in closing activities as well. Excerpt (3), an excerpt of a YouTube show with a host in his 30s and a guest in his 40s, demonstrates an example. The host initiates a closing activity by asking the guest to share his thoughts on being on the show in an announcement with the deferential style in line 1. The guest responds by sharing how he felt on the show and then delivers a congratulatory remark in the deferential style for a milestone the show achieved.

(3) [*Turkiyes on the Block*]

- 1 H: *ca kulem sokam han pen tut-tolok ha-keyss-supnita. sokam sokam.*
DM then thought one time hear-PROJ do-INCT-DEF:DC thought thought
'Well then we will hear what you thought (of being on our show today) -[DEF:DC] Your thought thought.'
- 2 G: *a sokam-i-yo. e iltan-u:n Yongcin ssi-lang ilehkey saceki-n*
oh thought-COP-POL uh first-TC NAME Mr-with like.this private-ATTR
- 3 *cali malko pangsong-eyse tto ilehkey tayhwa-lul ha*
place not broadcasting-LOC again like.this conversation-ACC do
- 4 *-key toy-se te: culkep-ko pankaw-ess-ko; paykman kwutokca. cinsimulo*
-become-because more joyful-and glad-PST-and million subscriber sincerely

- 5 *chwukhatuli-supnita.*
congratulate-DEF:DC
'Oh, my thought. Uh first, it was more joyful and nice to talk with Mr. Yongcin in
a show rather than a private situation, and a million subscribers (of your show).
I sincerely congratulate you-[DEF:DC].'

The consistent use of the deferential speech style in the opening and closing sequences, as demonstrated by the three provided excerpts, is closely tied to the characteristics of institutional talk. As previously mentioned, institutional talk operates in a pre-allocated, asymmetrical system (Heritage 2005). This system "permits the institutional representative to maintain control over the overall structure of the occasion—particularly its beginning, end, and internal phrase transitions" (Heritage 2013, p. 6). The three excerpts examined in this study showcase how the hosts, who function as institutional representatives in the talk show context, initiate the opening and closing activities, thereby shaping the structure of the discourse. In this process, they employ the deferential speech style, which is reciprocated by the guests. The joint utilization of the deferential style by both parties in the opening and closing activities underscores its critical role as a tool for establishing a sense of institutionality in Korean discourse.

While Excerpts (1), (2), and (3) present short segments containing opening and closing announcements and ritualized phatic expressions in the deferential style, an extended excerpt can provide a more detailed illustration of how the deferential style operates differently from the polite style. Excerpt (4) is an example. It is a segment from a show titled *Pak Myengswu's Radio Show*, featuring a male host and a male guest in their 40s talking with each other. Line 1 is an example of the host's presentational statement in the deferential style, and Line 2 presents three remarks by the guest, a greeting (*Hi*-[DEF:Q]), a ritualized self-presentation (*This is Sengcinwu*-[DEF:DC]), and another greeting-like phatic expression (*Nice to see you*-[DEF:DC]), all conveyed in the deferential style. The host acknowledges the greeting in line 3 (*Uh okay*), which could have concluded the greeting sequence, but it is not closed here. In fact, in none of the shows within the data set do the hosts and the guests limit their greeting activity to a simple exchange of hellos. Instead, the participants in all the shows extend their greeting activities through various types of expansion sequences. In this excerpt, the guest opens an expansion after the first greeting sequence in line 4 by mentioning the show's title (*Pak Myengswu's Music Show*) and explicitly recognizing the site of the conversation, likely to express his delight at being invited to this particular show. This can be seen as an attempt to extend the greeting activity. The stated show title is, however, incorrect, prompting the host to correct it in line 5 (*It's Radio Show*-[POL]), which is other-repair. The guest treats this direct correction as teasing and responds with laughter after accepting the correction in line 6 (*Oh, Radio Show*).

(4) [Radio Show]

- | | | | |
|---|----|---|---------------------------------|
| 1 | H: | <i>insa han pen ha-si-ki pala-pnita</i>
greeting once do-HON-NML hope-DEF:DC
'I would like you to greet (the audience)-[DEF:DC].' | |
| 2 | G: | <i>annyengha-si-pnikka. Sengcinwu-pnita. pankap-supnita.</i>
well-HON-DEF:Q NAME-DEF:DC glad-DEF:DC
'Hi-[DEF:Q]. This is Sengcinwu-[DEF:DC]. Nice to see you-[DEF:DC].' | |
| 3 | H: | <i>a yey</i>
DM yes
'Uh okay' | → Greeting sequence closed |
| 4 | G: | <i>Pak Myengswu-uy Mywucik Syo.</i>
NAME-POSS Music Show
'Pak Myengswu's Music Show.' | → Opening an expansion sequence |
| 5 | H: | <i>Latio Syo-yey-yo.</i>
Radio Show-COP-POL
'It's Radio Show-[POL].' | → Other-repair |

- 6 G: *a Latio Syo. ((laugh))*
DM Radio Show
'Oh, *Radio Show. ((laugh))*'
- 7 H: *mwuncey-ka manh-ayo.* →Opening another expansion
problem-NOM a.lot-POL sequence: teasing
'You have a lot of problems-[POL].'
- 8 G: ((laugh)) *Pak Myengswu-uy Latio Syo.*
NAME-POSS Radio Show
- 9 *a kuntay caymiiss-te-lakwu-yo.*
DM but funny-RT-QUOT-POL
'((laugh)) *Pak Myengswu's Radio Show. Oh I found it funny-[POL].*'
- 10 H: *al-ko o-n ke-ya?*
know-and come-ATTR BN-INT
'Did you even know about this show before coming-[INT]?'
- 11 G: *a kulem. caymiss-eyo.*
DM sure funny-POL
'Oh sure. It is funny-[POL].'
- 12 H: *al-keyss-supnita.* →First attempt to close
know-INCT-DEF:DC the expansion sequences
'OK, I see-[DEF:DC].'
- 13 G: *caymiss-nuntay way han sikan-pakkey an ha-nun ci.*
funny-but why one hour-only not do-ATTR BN
'Why is just one hour although it's funny.'
- 14 H: *yey yey, yelekaci mwuncey-ka iss-nuntay-yo.*
yes yes various problem-NOM exist-CIR-POL
- 15 *ku mwuncey-lul selmyengha-ki pokcapha-nikka.*
that problem-ACC explain-NML complex-because
'Yes yes. There are various issues-[POL],
but it's complicated to explain, so.'
- 16 G: *yey al-ko iss-supnita.*
yes know-AUX--DEF:DC →Closing the expansions
'Yes I know-[DEF:DC].'
- 17 H: ((opening a new sequence))

The host intensifies the teasing in line 7 by explicitly saying that the guest has many problems (*You have a lot of problems*-[POL]), implying that he appeared on the show without even knowing its correct title. The guest produces another laugh token (line 8) and an assessment that the show is funny (*I found it funny*-[POL], line 9), claiming that he was indeed aware of the show. In line 10, rather than acknowledging the guest's claim, the host escalates the teasing/accusing action by overtly questioning it (*Did you even know about this show before coming*-[INT]?). In line 11, the guest responds with *Oh sure* and reiterates that it is funny, persistently maintaining his claim of prior knowledge about the show. During these exchanges from lines 5 to 11, the host teases the guest through multiple turns, resembling the banter between close friends, and the guest playfully engages with it. In doing so, the participants employ the polite *-yo* style or even a non-polite, intimate style (*-ya* in line 10), to foster a casual and affective interaction. In line 12, the host finally acknowledges the guest's claim (*OK, I see*-[DEF:DC]) in the deferential style, indicating the host's orientation to closing the entire greeting activity, not just the teasing sequences. However, in line 13, the guest further extends his assessment about the show, saying *Why is it just one hour*, which implies that the show should be longer because it is entertaining. In lines 14 and 15, the host suggests wrapping up the expanded activity, and the guest aligns with this suggestion in line 16 (*Yes I know*-[DEF:DC]). This remark, expressed in the deferential style, demonstrates his orientation towards concluding the entire activity, ultimately bringing closure to the greeting activity in that line.

This section has demonstrated the usage of the deferential speech style in the opening and closing activities of entertainment talk shows. It has also compared its usage to that of the polite style, based on an extended excerpt of an opening activity. While the deferential

style is employed at the beginning and the end of the activity, the polite style is utilized in the middle when the participants engage in conversation akin to close friends. The use of the deferential style at the beginning and the end of the greeting activity can be explained not only by its sequential positions but also by the level of institutionality involved. The beginning and the end of an activity represent moments of heightened institutionality, exhibited through the participants' orientations towards the given tasks within the setting. In the example, the tasks include opening the show by presenting themselves in their respective roles and concluding the opening to transition to the next part of the show. As these tasks involve initiating and completing planned activities, the use of the deferential style helps the participants establish their positions as host and guest, effectively achieving the institutional goals associated with each activity transition point where the completion of an activity is marked. In other words, the use of the deferential style reflects the participants' orientation towards particular institutional tasks and identities during these moments. On the other hand, the use of the polite style in the middle of the activity shapes the talk with non-institutional, conversational characteristics, thereby creating a friendly atmosphere for the remaining parts of the show. It indicates the participants' orientation towards a different type of social relationship with each other at a personal level. This infusion of personal and affective qualities makes the talk inviting, friendly, and entertaining for the audience of the show. In essence, the participants employ the polite style to cultivate an engaging and enjoyable discourse environment, serving the purpose of entertainment.

6. Questioning Practices, Speech Style Shifting, and Institutionality

This section further explores how participants utilize different linguistic resources, such as speech style shifting and questioning practices, to construct activities and identities connected to institutionality within the given context. The analysis extends beyond the opening and closing activities to other activities in the middle of the entertainment talk shows. Excerpt (5) illustrates the use of the deferential speech style and the polite style in a segment from a radio show where the participants showcase a song. In this particular activity, the deferential speech style and the polite style serve distinct purposes in establishing institutional and conversational orientations at different points in the semi-institutional talk. This aligns with the previous observation in the opening activity discussed in Excerpt (4). To provide more context on Excerpt (5), the host of the radio show is a female in her 20s, and there are two female guests, one in her late teens and the other in her early 20s. Together, they introduce a song that one of the guests is about to perform live during this segment. Looking at the organization of the activity in this example, it is opened through an announcement and a question–answer sequence regarding the singer's attitude towards the upcoming live performance. This is followed by another question–answer sequence about the choice of song, culminating in the official announcement of the song title. The subsequent part involves the guest's actual live performance, followed by multiple assessment sequences, and concludes with a closing announcement.

(5) [Young Street-Activity of Showcasing a Song]

- | | | | |
|---|-----|--|---|
| 1 | H: | <i>a cengmal wuli Se Yeyan ssi icey laibu ha-sy-eya toy</i>
DM really our NAME Ms now live do-HON must | → Opening the activity:
Announcement and |
| 2 | | <i>-nuntey etten kako-lo pwulu-si-keyss-supnikka?</i>
-CIR which determination-with sing-DEF:Q
'Now our Ms. Se Yeyan should sing live. Then,
what kind of determination will you sing
with-[DEF:Q]?' | Question |
| 3 | G1: | <i>e:: kok-ey simchwihay-se pwulu-keyss-supnita.</i>
DM song-in indulged-and sing-INCT-DEF:DC
'U::h I will sing, indulged in the song-[DEF:DC].' | → Answer |

- 4 H: *etten nolay pwul-le cwu-si-l ke-n-tey-yo?* → Question
which song sing-AUX-HON-ATTR BN-CIR-POL
'What song are you going to sing?'
- 5 G1: *Sumyetunta-la-nun nolay-i-pnita.* → Answer
SONG.TITLE-QUOT-ATTR song-COP-DEF:DC
'It is a song titled *Permeate*-[DEF:DC].'
- 6 H: *ney Se Yeyan ssi-uy laibu tut-tolok ha-keyss* → Announcement
yes NAME Ms-POSS live listen-PROJ do-INCT
7 *-supnita.Sumyetunta*
-DEF:DC SONG.TITLE
'OK, we will listen to Ms. Se Yeyan's
live-[DEF:DC]. *Permeate*'
- 8 ((G1 sings live)) → Singing
9 ((All clap))
- 10 H: *a:: mwe sen-hwupay-ka mwe-ka nolay twul ta nolay* → Assessment
EXC DM senior-junior-NOM song two both song
11 *nemwu cal ha-nikka kwi-ka hayngpokha-pnita.*
too well do-because ear-NOM happy-DEF:DC
'Wo::w uh both of you, senior and junior, sing
really great and so uh my ears are
happy-[DEF:DC].'
- 12 *Pak Polam ssi ettehkey tul-usy-ess-eyo?* → Asking for another
NAME Ms how listen-HON-PST-POL participant's assessment
'Ms. Pak Polam, how did you find the
song-[POL]?'
- 13 G2: *cengmal sumyetu-ney-yo.* → Assessment
really permeate-REAL-POL
'It really permeates into me-[POL].'
- 14 H: *e:: i cwunpihay-ss-e. cwunpihay-ss-e.* → Assessment
EXC this prepare-PST-INT prepare-PST-INT
15 *cwunpihay-ss-e.*
prepare-PST-INT
'Wo::w, you prepared this (comment)-[INT]. You
prepared-[INT]. You prepared-[INT].'
- 16 ((All laugh))
- 17 H: *Se Yeyan ssi-uy laibu Sumyetunta tut-ko wa* → Announcement:
NAME Ms-POSS live SONG.TITLE listen-and Closing the activity
come
- 18 *-ss-supnita.*
-PST-DEF:DC
'We came back from Ms. Se Yeyan's live, *Permeate*
-[DEF:DC].'

A close look at each step of the activity reveals the distinction between the deferential speech style and the polite style, in terms of how they are employed to fulfill different tasks. First, the host initiates the activity in lines 1 and 2 by announcing it (*Now our Ms. Se Yeyan should sing live*) and posing a question in the deferential speech style (*what kind of determination will you sing with*-[DEF:Q]?). The guest reciprocated the deferential style in her answer in line 3 (*I will sing, indulged in the song*-[DEF:DC]). The host then follows up with a question in the polite form (*What song are you going to sing*-[POL]?, in line 4), but the guest answers in the deferential style (*It is a song titled Permeate*-[DEF:DC], in line 5). The task performed in these sequences is to open the activity of delivering a live performance of a song to the audience of the show. To achieve this, the two participants utilize two question-answer sequences to present the song title in a somewhat dramatic manner. The first question about the singer's determination may seem arbitrary at first, but it leads to the singer's answer saying that she will sing indulged in the song, which turns out to be connected to the song title, *Permeate*, which is revealed as the answer to the second question. By doing so, the participants jointly present the song title, which is an institutional task at

hand. Their use of the deferential style, particularly in the initial turn (the first question) and the concluding turn (the second answer), reflects their orientation towards the institutional task, where the institutional norms hold significance.

They employ the same linguistic resource for the same purpose at the opening of the subsequent sequence following the live performance (line 8) and the participants' applause (line 9). In lines 10 and 11, the host delivers an assessment of the live performance, concluding the sentence with the deferential style, expressing her satisfaction (*my ears are happy*-[DEF:DC]). Although she delivers this assessment remark in an expressive way, using an exclamation mark at the beginning (*Wo::w*), she concludes it with the deferential style ending, indicating the initiation of an institutional task. After opening this assessment sequence, the participants transition to other speech styles. In line 12, the host poses a question, ending it with the polite style and asking the other guest, G2, about her reaction to G1's live performance (*how did you find the song*-[POL]?). This invitation for G2 to assess the live performance expands on the assessment sequence opened by the host. G2 responds with another positive assessment in line 13 (*It really permeates into me*-[POL]), skillfully incorporating the song title to describe her emotional reaction using the polite style ending. Subsequently, the host responds with excitement to this astute assessment, exclaiming *Wo::w, you prepared this (comment)*-[INT]. *You prepared*-[INT]. *You prepared*-[INT], in lines 14 and 15. By referring to G2's remark as prepared, the host expresses that G2's earlier assessment is highly impressive. The host delivers this assessment in an expressive and exaggerated manner, employing an exclamation token and repeating the same remark three times. Additionally, she utilizes the non-polite, intimate speech style three times at the end of each repeated sentence. This noteworthy use of the non-polite, intimate speech style by the host, contrary to the usual expectation of employing either the polite speech style or the deferential style in a public talk show, accentuates the personally affective quality of her assessment. In summary, the participants utilize the polite and intimate speech styles as tools to infuse their assessments with a deeply personal and affective tone, distinguishing them from the host's initial assessment that opened the assessment sequence in a more task-oriented way through the use of the deferential style. In response to this light-hearted and affective talk, the participants react with laughter in line 16. The host then concludes the entire activity of presenting the live performance by making an announcement, *We came back from Ms. Se Yeyan's live, Permeate*-[DEF:DC], in the deferential style. Once again, this demonstrates the host's inclination towards her institutional role and the associated institutional task at hand. Essentially, Excerpt (5) exemplifies how the participants establish moments of heightened institutionality at the beginning and the end of the activity, while characterizing the middle portion as a non-institutional, playful conversation through the shifting of speech styles. It vividly illustrates how the participants dynamically construct social activities and their roles in intricate ways through various linguistic resources in this semi-institutional discourse.

In addition to the deferential speech style, another type of linguistic resource that contributes to the establishment of institutional moments in entertainment talk shows is the use of overt interrogative suffixes, *-na*, *-nka*, and *-lkka*. When combined with the polite speech style, *-yo*, especially by the hosts, these suffixes play a significant role. As highlighted in Section 4, these suffixes are used much more frequently than in ordinary conversation, and the frequent employment of these suffixes is associated with the higher level of institutionality observed in talk show discourse compared to everyday conversation. Excerpt (6) provides an insight into how the polite speech style with overt interrogative markings functions to indicate institutional tasks and roles expected in the given context. This segment from a TV show exemplifies how the host, a female in her 30s, and the male guest in his 20s engage in an activity involving audience participation.

(6) [Chocolate-Activity of Engaging Audience]

- 1 H: *cikum i pangsong-i naka-nun nalcca*
now this broadcasting-NOM go.out-ATTR date
2 *-ka kwu wel sipkwu il-i-eyyo.*
-NOM nine month nineteen date-COP-POL
3 *kulayse ipeynthu-lul hay cwu-si-keyss-takwu?*
so event-ACC do AUX-HON-INCT-QUOT
4 ((hand gesture of inviting G to talk))
'The date when this episode is broadcast is
September 19th--[POL]. So you said you would
throw an event? ((hand gesture of inviting G to
talk))'
5 G: *ney. e: icy cinaka-n salang-malkwu, onul icy*
yes DM now pass-ATTR love-not today now
6 *sayngil mac-usi-n pwun-kkey;*
birthday have-HON-ATTR person:HON-to
7 *cikcep ku nolay-ey ((chuckle)) silcey ku*
directly DM song-in real DM
8 *nolay-uy cwuinkong-i tway cwu*
song-POSS main.character-NOM become AUX
9 *-sy-ess-umyen ha-nun palaymey; ipeynthu-lul*
-HON-PST-if do-ATTR because event-ACC
10 *cwunpihay-ss-supnita.*
prepare-PST-DEF:DC
'Yes. U::h not the love I had in my past, but for
someone whose birthday is today:, I prepared an
event in the hope that she would feel like an
actual ((chuckle)) main character of the
song-[DEF:DC].'
11 H: *ney:: ((standing up, looking around, and raising*
and
yes
12 *waiving hand)) ce kwu wel sipkwu il*
DM nine month nineteen date
13 *sayngil-i-si-n pwu::n hoksi*
birthday-COP-HON-ATTR person by.any.chance
14 *kyeysi-nka-yo?*
exist:HON-Q-POL
'OK::, ((standing up, looking around, and raising
and waiving hand)) Uhm do we have someone
whose birthday is September 19th by any
chance-[Q-POL]?'
15 *e! ney. ceki: phalcci ha-si-n pwun.*
DM yes DM bracelet wear-HON-ATTR
person:HON
'Oh! Yes. The one with a bracelet over there.'
16 ((pointing at an audience member))
- Initiating an announcement
- Inviting G to complete the announcement
- Competing the announcement
- Asking eligible audience members
- Selecting a member

In lines 1 and 2, the host begins by providing the background information about the date of the show's broadcast, in relation to the upcoming announcement (*The date when this episode is broadcast is September 19th-[POL]*). Then, she proceeds to initiate an announcement regarding an event that is relevant to the broadcast date (*So you said you would throw an event?*, line 3). Instead of completing the announcement herself, she invites the guest to contribute through a hand gesture in line 4. The guest collaborates with the invitation and completes the announcement in the deferential style (*Yes. U::h not the love I had in my past, but for someone whose birthday is today:, I prepared an event in the hope that she would feel like an actual ((chuckle)) main character of the song-[DEF:DC]*, lines 5 through 10), displaying his alignment with the institutional task at hand. Given that the announcement involves

someone whose birthday falls on the broadcast date, the subsequent task is to identify the right person from the audience. Consequently, the host stands up and asks the audience if there is anyone in that particular category. This question is formulated using the polite style, accompanied by an overt interrogative suffix *-nka*, which fulfills the institutional task assigned to the host's institutional role. This aligns with a finding of Chang (2014), who notes that the overt interrogative markings indicate the epistemic stance or professional identity, which is akin to the deferential speech style.

Similarly, Excerpt (7) showcases the use of the polite style with an overt interrogative marking by the host to initiate a new task, reflecting his institutional orientation. Excerpt (7) is a later portion of *Radio Show* presented in Excerpt (4) that features a male host and a guest in their 40s. The guest is a singer, known for his biggest hit song titled *Don't Give Up* released in the mid-1990s. One of the main tasks in talk shows with singers is to inquire about their songs, allowing the guests to share relevant stories. In line with this, the host poses such a question in lines 2 and 3, utilizing the polite style with an overt interrogative suffix. In addition to this linguistic resource, the host formulates his preceding remark to this question in a way that showcases his orientation towards his institutional identity and the professional task at hand. He first states, *besides the fact that we are friends, I will honestly ask you*-[DEF:DC], conveying that the upcoming question is not merely personal but an official matter to be addressed within this setting. The deferential speech style at the end further contributes to constructing this statement as formal, thus establishing a formal tone for the impending question. In this regard, the combination of an overt interrogative suffix, *-na*, and the polite speech style in the subsequent question serves as a continuation of the effort to set a professional context for the task.

Simultaneously, the host skillfully infuses an affective, personable quality into this new question-answer sequence. In the greeting activity of Excerpt (4), the host was observed to create a playful and conversational atmosphere through teasing. He maintains this bantering stance in Excerpt (7) as well, which is evident in his question (*Other than Don't Give Up, what songs do you have*-[Q-POL]?, lines 2 and 3). Although the framing of this question appears formal, the underlying message suggests that the guest's songs, apart from his one notable hit, *Don't Give Up*, were not successful, resulting in a teasing effect. The host punctuates this question with a laugh token immediately afterwards, displaying his joking, bantering stance. In fact, he employs the previous turn design to deliver this teasing question in a dramatic manner. By initially setting the tone of the upcoming question as a formal business, he creates a contrast that highlights the subsequent teasing question as a surprising comedic element.

(7) [Radio Show-Activity of Bantering]

- | | | | |
|---|----|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | H: | <i>mwe chinkwu-i-ki cen-ey solcikahey han</i>
DM friend-COP-NML before-in honestly one | |
| 2 | | <i>pen mwul-e po-keyss-supnita. Phokihacima</i>
time ask-AUX-INCT-DEF:DC SONG.TITLE | → Announcement |
| 3 | | <i>malko-nun mwe-ka iss-na-yo?</i> ((laugh))
not-TC what-NOM exist-Q-POL
'Uhm besides the fact that we are friends, I will
honestly ask you-[DEF:DC]. Other than <i>Don't</i>
<i>Give Up</i> , what songs do you have-[Q-POL]?
((laugh))' | → Question/Banter |
| 4 | G: | ((laugh)) | |
| 5 | H: | ((laugh)) <i>a coysongha-pnita i-ke. nolay-nun</i>
DM sorry-DEF:DC this-BN song-TC | |
| 6 | | <i>mahni iss-nuntay Phokihacima malko-nun mwe-ka</i>
a.lot exist-CIR SONG.TITLE not-TC what-NOM | → Re-issuing
question/
Banter |

- 7 *iss-nun ci.*
 exist-ATTR BN
 ‘((laugh)) Oh I am sorry-[DEF:DC]. You have
 many songs, but (I wonder) what (hit songs)
 you have other than *Don’t Give Up*.’
- 8 G ((listing his songs other than *Don’t Give Up*))
- 9 G: *Pak Myengswu ssi-to ku Pata-uy Wangca.*
 NAME Mr-also DM SONG.TITLE
 mwae iss-eyo? ku-malko?
 what exist-POL that-not
 ‘As for you, Mr. Pak Myengswu, do you have
 something else-[POL]? Other than *Prince of the*
 Sea?’
- 11 H: *ce-n ku oyey-to ce: khollabo-lo hay*
 I-TC DM besides-also DM collaboration-with do
 -ss-te-n nolay-tul-i
 -PST-RT-ATTR song-PL-NOM
 ‘As for me, other than that, u:h songs I had
 through collaboration’
- 13 G: *ku-ke-n icey nwukwu ep-ese*
 that-BN-ATTR DM someone piggyback-and
 ha-n ke
 do-ATTR BN
 ‘They were what you got by piggybacking
 others’
- 15 H: ((laugh)) *ep-ese. ep-ese caymiiss-ney.*⁵
 piggyback piggyback-and funny-REAL
- 16 *ep-ese. ep-ese caymiiss-ney.* (see note 5)
 piggyback piggyback-and funny-REAL
 ‘((laugh)) Piggyback. Piggyback, it’s
 funny-[INT]. (see note 5)
 Piggyback. Piggyback, it’s funny-[INT]. (see
 note 5)
- Question/
Counter-banter
- Answer
- Banter
- Assessment

The guest aligns with the host’s bantering stance by responding with a laugh in line 4. The host continues his dual orientations in the subsequent turns. First, he maintains his teasing stance through another laugh token and by reiterating the same bantering message in lines 5 to 7. At the same time, he demonstrates his institutional orientation by repeating the question and demanding an answer, characterizing it as a serious task to fulfill. The remark preceding the question, formulated with the deferential style ending (*Oh I am sorry*-[DEF:DC], line 5), further contributes to establishing an official tone. The guest first cooperates with the task and provides the requested information by listing his songs in line 8. Subsequently, he aligns with the bantering atmosphere by asking a counter-teasing question to the host. The question points out that the host himself has had multiple songs, but only one has achieved success (*As for you, Mr. Pak Myengswu, do you have something else? Other than Prince of the Sea*-[POL]?, lines 9 and 10). In formulating this question, the guest employs a similar tactic to the host, both in terms of content and linguistic structure. One notable difference is that he utilizes the polite speech style ending without an overt interrogative suffix, reflecting his orientation as a guest who does not hold the institutional duty of asking questions. Nonetheless, he fulfills his expected role in this setting as an entertaining show guest by engaging in playful bantering with the host, and the use of the polite style without an interrogative suffix contributes to the bantering, affective nature of their interaction.

In response to the guest's question, the host begins to provide and answer (*As for me, other than that, u:h songs I had through collaboration*, in lines 11 and 12), but the guest interrupts and delivers another teasing remark (*They were what you got by piggybacking others*, lines 13 and 14) by downplaying the host's contributions to his songs. The host reacts with laughter, and states *Piggyback. Piggyback, it's funny*-[INT]. *Piggyback. Piggyback, it's funny*-[INT], in lines 15 and 16. This serves as an assessment of the guest's choice of words, particularly the term *piggyback* being deemed funny. It showcases the host's strong inclination towards the bantering mode of the ongoing interaction. The use of the non-polite, intimate style ending confirms his alignment with the playful aspect of the conversation at the moment. In summary, the participants successfully fulfill the institutional task of asking and answering questions about the singer's songs, while simultaneously achieving another goal of the show, which is to provide the audience with entertaining interviews filled with personable and affective interactions.

7. Conclusions

The analysis undertaken in this study sheds light on the semi-institutional characteristics observed in the discourse of Korean entertainment talk shows. Specifically, examining questioning practices reveals a departure from everyday conversation, marked by a significant increase in overt interrogative endings. This heightened usage suggests a stronger inclination towards institutionality, particularly emphasized by the deferential style interrogative ending, *-(su)pnikka*, which is absent in ordinary conversation. The reduced use of the non-honorific endings *-nya* and *-ni* further highlights the contrast in institutionality, while the frequent use of *-lkka* with *-yo* reflects a deliberate effort to engage interviewees, indicating a collaborative and institutional approach. Despite the crucial role of overt interrogative endings, 57.5% of questions maintain implicit forms, akin to everyday conversation, positioning entertainment talk shows as a form of semi-institutional discourse.

A more in-depth analysis of questioning practices and speech style shifting across various show activities unveils the linguistic resources serving as navigation tools for participants to fulfill expected roles and tasks within the media setting. The deferential style strategically comes into play at the outset and conclusion of activities, contributing to role establishment and goal achievement in task-oriented moments such as opening or closing the show, introducing the guest, greeting each other, asking a task-oriented question, announcing a new activity, etc. In contrast, the use of the polite style during conversational segments in the middle fosters a non-institutional, friendly atmosphere, indicating a shift towards affective social relationships. This infusion of personal qualities makes the discourse inviting, friendly, and entertaining, aligning with the show's entertainment purpose. The dynamic shift between speech styles illustrates a nuanced mechanism where participants construct institutionality at one moment and create an affective, inviting, and entertaining atmosphere at another throughout the talk show discourse. The ongoing deliberate linguistic choices made in questioning practices and speech style shifts underscore participants' engaged efforts in negotiating and constructing identities and relationships throughout the conversation. The continual shaping and fulfillment of participants' identities and tasks within the ongoing interactions contribute to the moment-by-moment construction of institutionality in the talk show setting, showcasing the intricate and multifaceted dynamics at play in Korean entertainment talk shows. This aligns with Ochs' argument (Ochs 1993) that verbal performances of social acts and the display of certain stances play a crucial role in establishing social identities within a given context.

While this article contributes to our understanding of the questioning practices and speech style shifting in Korean entertainment talk shows, there remains room for further research. Future studies may delve deeper into the potential diverse meanings and functions of questions as well as their various formats. Subsequent research could also explore the interplay of various speech styles and sentence types, focusing on their specific pragmatic and interactional implications in the context of media shows. Additionally, investigating speech style choices and their pragmatic and interactional implications in

various contexts such as political debates, news interviews, online communication, and advertisement text would offer valuable insights into the broader sociolinguistic landscape. Comparative studies across different cultural contexts and discourse genres would also enrich our understanding of the role of institutionality and speech style shifting in diverse communicative settings.

In summary, this study highlights the complex relationship between speech style shifting, questioning practices, and the semi-institutional nature of Korean entertainment talk shows. By extending our investigations to other linguistic forms and various discourse types, our understanding of the sociolinguistic dynamics and pragmatic implications at play can be deepened. Further research in these directions will contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of talk-in-interaction across various communicative contexts, shedding light on the intricate nature of language use in social settings.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Ethical review and approval were waived for this study because the data collection methodology was based on the observation of public behavior.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Abbreviations of Interlinear Glosses

ACC	Accusative
ATTR	Attributive
AUX	Auxiliary
BN	Bound noun
CIR	Circumstantial
COP	Copula
DC	Declarative
DEF	Deferential
DM	Discourse marker
EXC	Exclamatory
HON	Honorific
INCT	Incertive
INT	Intimate
INTENT	Intentive
LOC	Locative
NML	Nominalizer
NOM	Nominative
PL	Plural
POL	Polite
POSS	Possessive
PROJ	Projective
PST	Past
Q	Interrogative
QUOT	Quotative
REAL	Realization
RT	Retrospective
TC	Topic/Contrast

Notes

- ¹ These 44 remarks are drawn from three TV shows, five radio shows, and two YouTube shows.
- ² Concerning the remaining two shows, both of which are TV shows, it is not that they avoid using the deferential style in the opening and closing sequences. Rather, these particular videos lack these sequences altogether, making it impossible to determine the speech style utilized in those shows. It is highly likely that they also employ the deferential style, similar to the other shows.
- ³ For the romanization of the Korean text, the Samuel E. Martin (1992) Yale romanization system is used.
- ⁴ The abbreviations of the interlinear glosses are listed in the Abbreviations Interlinear Glosses.
- ⁵ When the sentence ending *-ney* is used without the polite style ending *-yo*, it indicates a non-polite, intimate speech style. Since this intimate style is marked though a zero-morpheme, the abbreviation [INT] is used only in the English translation.

References

- Ahn, Joohoh. 2015. A study of the endings ‘-nka’ type and ‘-na’ type based on spoken Korean corpus. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal* 23: 133–56.
- Atkinson, John Maxwell, and Paul Drew. 1979. *Order in Court: The Organization of Verbal Interaction in Judicial Settings*. London: Macmillan.
- Brown, Lucien. 2015. Revisiting “polite” *-yo* and “deferential” *-supnita* speech style shifting in Korean from the viewpoint of indexicality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 79: 43–59. [CrossRef]
- Chang, Sumi. 2014. Korean Honorific Speech Style Shift: Intra-Speaker Variables and Context. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii, Manoa, HI, USA.
- Clayman, Steven, and John Heritage. 2002. *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, Paul, and John Heritage. 1992. Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In *Talk at Work*. Edited by Paul Drew and John Heritage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3–65.
- Enfield, Nick J., Tanya Stivers, and Stephen C. Levinson. 2010. Question-response sequences in conversation across ten languages: An introduction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 2615–19. [CrossRef]
- Eun, Hyun Ho, Jung-Chull Lee, Dukjoong Na, and Heather Hyejin Shin. 2022. The Media and Entertainment Law Review: South Korea. *The Law Reviews*. Available online: <https://thelawreviews.co.uk/title/the-media-and-entertainment-law-review/south-korea> (accessed on 5 July 2023).
- Eun, Jong-oh, and Suan Strauss. 2004. The primacy of information status in the alternation between deferential and polite forms in Korean public discourse. *Language Sciences* 26: 251–72. [CrossRef]
- Heritage, John. 2005. Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*. Edited by Kristen Fitch and Robert Sanders. Mahwah: Erlbaum, pp. 103–46.
- Heritage, John. 2013. Language and social institutions: The conversation analytic view. *Journal of Foreign Language* 36: 2–27.
- Hester, Stephen, and Peter Eglin. 1997. *Culture in Action: Studies in Membership Categorization Analysis*. Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.
- Ilie, Cornelia. 1999. Question-response argumentation in talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31: 975–99. [CrossRef]
- Ilie, Cornelia. 2001. Semi-institutional discourse: The case of talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 209–54. [CrossRef]
- Jeong, Seunggon, and Eun Young Bae. 2021. Grammar and stance: The use of Korean interrogative suffixes *-nya* and *-ni* as alignment markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 183: 210–24. [CrossRef]
- Kim, Haeyeon. 1999. The formal and function of questions in Korean conversation. *Discourse and Cognition* 6: 211–48.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun, and Kyung-Hee Suh. 2004. An analysis of Korean sentence-ending suffixes in caregiver-child interaction. *Language Research* 40: 923–50.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun, and Kyung-Hee Suh. 2007. Style shift in Korean pedagogical discourse. *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 15: 1–29.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun, and Kyung-Hee Suh. 2021. Formulation questions and responses in Korean TV talk show interactions. In *Questioning and Answering Practices across contexts and Cultures*. Edited by Cornelia Ilie. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 193–226.
- Kim, Mary Shin. 2015. A distinct declarative question design in Korean conversation: An examination of turn-final *ko* questions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 79: 60–78. [CrossRef]
- Lukoff, Fred. 1982. *An Introductory Course in Korean*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press.
- Martin, Samuel E. 1992. *A Reference Grammar of Korean*. Rutland and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company.
- Mehan, Hugh. 1985. The structure of classroom discourse. In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Edited by Teun Adrianus Van Dijk. 3 vols. New York: Academic Press, pp. 120–31.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1993. Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective. *Research on Languages and Social Interaction* 26: 287–306. [CrossRef]
- Pak, Miok. 2008. Types of clauses and sentence end particles in Korean. *Korean Linguistics* 14: 113–55. [CrossRef]
- Park, Mi Yung. 2014. A study of the Korean sentence-ender *-(u)psita*: Implementing activity transitions in the KFL classroom. *Journal of Pragmatics* 68: 25–39. [CrossRef]
- Park, Yong-Yae. 2007. The Use of questions in EFL writing tutorial discourse. *Discourse and Cognition* 14: 73–98.

- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sohn, Ho-min. 1999. *The Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Song, Jae Jung. 2005. *The Korean Language: Structure, Use, and Context*. London: Routledge.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2010. An overview of the question-response system in American English conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 2772–81. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Strauss, Susan, and Jong-oh Eun. 2005. Indexicality and honorific speech level choice in Korean. *Linguistics* 43: 611–51. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Sung, Ky-chull. 1985. *Hyentay taywupep yenkwu [Research on Contemporary Honorifics]*. Seoul: Kaymunsa.
- Yeon, Jaehoon, and Lucien Brown. 2011. *Korean: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Yoon, Kyung-Eun. 2006. Interrogatives with Question Words as Complaint Utterances in Korean Conversation. In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*. Edited by Timothy J. Vance and Kimberly Jones. 14 vols. Stanford: CSLI, pp. 423–34.
- Yoon, Kyung-Eun. 2010. Questions and responses in Korean conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 2782–98. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Yoon, Sang-Seok. 2014. Difference between the deferential and polite styles: In terms of their indexical meanings and discourse functions. *Language Information* 19: 115–44.
- Yoon, Sang-Seok, Chung-Sook Kim, and Dong-Eun Lee. 2014. Politeness strategies in conversations through mobile messaging applications. *Bilingual Research* 56: 155–81.

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.