Valeria Maftei[1]

Broadcast Dialogue in Reality TV Genre

Abstract: *This paper aims to emphasize some of the characteristics of the dialogue in reality programmes, starting from the analysis of two different transcripts of Romanian TV productions. The study focuses on criteria such as dialogic behaviour, pragmatic cooperation and politeness. What we noticed is that the participants at the dialogue deliberately ignore cooperation principles (especially the relevance and manner maxims) and fail to follow the dialogic behaviour, making use of impoliteness acts. Due to the type of show, there is a role play involved in the verbal interaction, but it is limited to the extent of speaker's face threat.*

Key words: *pragmatic cooperation, dialogical behaviour, politeness, impoliteness, language.*

The aim of this paper is to emphasize some features of the dialogue within reality TV type[2], based on a brief analysis of two fragments of dialogue[3]. This work follows two major guidelines: pragmatic politeness and the dialogic cooperation. We chose to approach an analysis of the dialogue within reality programmes, due to the proliferation of this type on Romanian channels, in the last decade. In Jonathan Bignell's and Jeremy Orlebar's view, reality genre has a large success due to the fact that it 'emphasizes intimacy, it mirrors aspects of the lives of some of its viewers'.(Bignell and Orlebar 81) In terms of definition, we chose Bignell's concise view on this type of programme 'where the unscripted behaviour of 'ordinary people' is the focus of interest' (Bignell 313).

The paradox of this genre of shows and, largely, the cause of its huge success, is the claim that the show *has the opportunity to put the viewer in the presence of displayed reality, perfectly similar to ontological reality - unmediated* (Zeca-Buzura 74 - our translation), however, like any other media, the television is a tool which refigures reality. This simulation of reality is possible, first of all, due to the unchained behaviour and freed language of participants. The most recent works on this topic show a common interest in the absence of clear boundaries between fact and fiction. To sustain this point of view, Annette Hill cites from works of scholars such as J.Mittel, I. Bondebjerg or J. Corner : 'reality television is less about genre and more about the treatment of 'realities' in the

---

[1] Ovidius University of Constanța, Romania
[2] Tele-reality shows are programs showing real facts, with ordinary people; most of them involve a competition for a prize or fame.
[3] The fragments were selected from 2 different reality type formats: Bride for my mother (broadcasted on Antena 1) and Exchange of mothers (Prima TV).

'border crossing' between fact and fiction' (Corner in Hill 48). Being a rather non-homogenous genre, its continuous changes prevent from establishing a clear classification of the subgenres. 'In the early stages of the genre, reality TV was associated with on-scene footage of law and order or emergency services. More recently, "reality TV is associated with anything and everything' (Hill 41). While some authors established some stages of evolution (J. Corner), others provided a concise taxonomy: *the docu-soap, the reality magazine and the reality show* (I. Bondebjerg). For our paper we focused on the last type: the *reality show* - 'a serialized form of game show where ordinary people are put in extraordinary situations in order to cooperate and compete against one another.'(Bondebjerg in Hill 48).

For text analysis, the main reference papers we used for this study are the works of Sacks about dialogue structure, Grice's article on cooperation and Brown & Levinson face theory, and Lakoff's article on impoliteness.

a) Theoretical frame

Compared to other televisual genres, tele-reality is quite heterogeneous in terms of structure, being surpassed only by the entertainment shows. In this respect, we mention a journalistic mixture of species such as interviewing, discussion, portrait, investigation. Despite this aspect, the show has an established format, bringing in front of the cameras a relatively large number of participants (6-12) who acknowledge the presence of the cameras. Interaction with the public varies: from the indirect contribution of viewers (via phone or internet messaging) to direct intervention, via calls taken live, during the show. Daniela Zeca-Buzura (80) names 4 main types of reality TV shows which presently coexist on the major channels in Romania: tele-casting (*Romania's Voice*), tele-experiment (*Exchange of mothers*), tele-seduction (*Bride for My Mother*), tele-counseling (*9595, Dr. Cristian Andrei*).

Starting from the above mentioned classification, this paper aims to show some features of the dialogue from two different shows: *Exchange of mothers* (tele-experiment) and *Bride for my mother* (tele-seduction). The transcript of the texts was done with a minimum of paralinguistic and phonetic information, in order to make the fragments more accessible.

b) Particularities of the communication situation

Reality programs take place both indoors (studio / house) and outdoors. They present facts, issues and real people in dramatic or humorous situations. Participants are filmed during all their activities. There is a pre-established regulation and participants must obey it. The evaluation of participants' performance / skills is made by a jury and / or by the viewers. The shows have a serial character.

c)   **Particularities of communication network**

The dialogue is either direct or mediated (especially via telephone). Communication networks[4] vary in complexity depending on the purpose of communication, most interaction situations are 'wheel' type (in which the most important part is assumed by the host / leader of the communication situation, the other participants only address him). In the situation when neither of the participants is privileged or there is no 'leader', the communication is free, everyone can talk to anyone - no restrictions imposed – this implies a multiple flow channel. Although most dialogue units are not clearly organized in a pre-established form, there are sequences in the show where we recognize the use of the interview format (dialogue between the host and one of the competitors) or debate (the decisive moment in the competition).

d)   **Balance of power**[5]

Regarding the distribution of power, it varies depending on the type of verbal interaction: controlled or free. Unstructured dialogical units, where none of the participants plays a pre-allocated role, are fewer (such is the case of free discussions in the 'house' in tele-seduction shows). Most of the structured dialogues have a formal leader (the host) or informal (one of the participants) who usually has the legitimate[6] power or the coercive[7] one.

e)   **Particularities of the dialogical behaviour**

The cooperative behaviour between competitors rarely manifests, usually among those who agree on a particular issue, their speech is typically consensual, with positive reinforcement (appreciative adverbs, expressions of approval and encouragement – 'Well done / Good for you!') as well as supportive behaviour (by appealing to phatic markers, stimulating the interlocutor – 'Interesting !'). For example, in *tele-seduction* shows, most

---

[4] The communication networks were identified based on some experimental studies on group communication, and they differ in the degree of centralization / decentralization of the decisions taken in the group. (Bavelas, A.,1950, Communication Patterns in Task-oriented Groups. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 22, 723-730).

[5] The 5 basis of power are: expert's, referential, coercive, legitimate, rewarding. (French, J. R. P., Raven, B., 1959). 'The Bases of Social Power', in D. Cartwright and A. Zander, Group Dynamics. New York: Harper & Row).

[6] Legitimate power is based on the understanding of the fact that someone has the right to pretend obedience from the others (McQuail).

[7] Type of power attributed to the one who can punish for disobedience.

such discussions are carried out between 2 or 3 people, the association being made by common interests: between mothers, between girls/ boys, but seldom between girls and mothers. In these free associations we notice the use of unstrained language, free conversation, underlining both the self-centred communicational behaviour (from the speaker's part) and the supportive one (from the hearer):

'For me, the situation at present is so distorted and so confusing [If I'd say 'yes' I would lie'

'[I know how it is'

'Understand?'

'I know how it is, I know this stuff'

The particularity of the situation is the cooperative behaviour shown by the hearer, as evidenced by positive reinforcement, forms of empathy ('I know how it is') and support of the social face of the other, by generalizing the situation described, by extending and prevaricating the referent of the situation ('this stuff').

We recognize in the reality TV genre almost all typologies of communicative behaviour[8], especially heuristic (which implies the type of communication where the speaker builds his speech on interrogations), reinforcement (as a positive or negative reaction to what the speaker says), but also the self-centred behaviour (which involves valuing the ego of the speaker and this might have confessional character). For this purpose we have chosen to illustrate two fragments of dialogue, on different structures: the first is a mediated dialogue via telephone, the communication network used was the 'wheel'[9] and the second is a direct dialogue on the network of type 'X'[10]. The major difference between the two cases is the dialogic behaviour: in the first case, all the hearers from the studio censor more or less their replies; in the second situation, the hearers (children) are not inclined to a dialogic cooperation. This difference in attitude derived from an unequal balance of power: in the first case (A), the leader of the conversation is the viewer who went live via telephone intervention; what is more, she has the rewarding power (the participants in the studio know that depending on what they say the public will vote them or not). In the second case (B), the 'mother' has, in theory, the coercive power, but it is obvious that the role of mother is not accepted by the children.

---

[8]- there are 8 types of comunicative behaviour detailed in GALR: heuristic, reinforcement, supportive, reflexive, explanatory, self- centered, ludic, silence (794-797) .

[9]- the leader of the dialogue is the one who calls on the other participants, and they do not communicate among themselves, only with the leader.

[10] -the leader communicates directly with other participants, and they can either communicate back to him or among themselves.

f)   Communication context

A.   Tele--seduction

Date and place: the studio of the show *Bride for my son*, 11/07/2011

Participants: Ionut, Diana, Andreea, Alexandra, Edina - competitors, Gabi, mother of a competitor, Victoria, who is live in the studio via phone.

The purpose of the dialogue: the show is intended to be interactive, and, for this reason, it regularly invites viewers to go live by telephone and to discuss with the participants in the competition. The viewer, Victoria, is willing to make some observations and to learn the motives behind the competitors' behaviour.

Observations: the dialogue takes about 5 minutes and involves only part of those in the studio.

S1 **Victoria:** 'Alexandra! If you were out, would you have made a couple with a boy like Victor?

Alexandra: Yes!

((PAUSE of 4 SECONDS))

Victoria: Yes?!

Alexandra: Yes I would have because … As I said uhh I give people chances and [we have started on a path, it remains to be seen whether our way ... the end of this competition will be a happy ending or not. Do you understand?

Victoria: [hm

Victoria: [aha Yes, I understand, but ... not really. But, anyhow, it's your business. If you believe that you will make a good couple, it's your business!'

S2 **Victoria:** 'Edina, you're nice, Edina dear, but I would like to ask you: why, if you think so much about the house and the friend that you had, why did you come here?

Edina: Because I want to start a new life.

Victoria: Well then, leave your past; Dragos is a very good boy. He knows how to speak and when to speak [...] I like you Dragos! [...] But learn this Edina: no boy with the graces that you make, will ever accept them! You are too …. You are always complaining about everything ... no ... no one can please you. Dragos is a vEry good boy!

319

Edina: Well then, I want to disappoint you because Dragos does accept them.'

S3 **Victoria:**' Ionut you are an educated boy, but you made a bad shot with Diana. It's your business! If you think you'll do a good job with her, I stay out of it, but you kind of missed that. Think about it!

Ionut: time will solve everything.

Victoria: Ionut Yes, you're right! Diana likes to talk tall ... [but

Diana: [I'm the tallest!

Victoria: [but where you've been, you didn't show good manners

Diana: Why are you saying this, lady?

Victoria: because I don't like the way you talk, more than this, I have nothing to say to you [...]'

S4 **Victoria**: 'Andreea, you are at the top of the tree, I like you

Andreea: Thank you very much. [...]

Victoria: Catalin is a smart boy.

Catalin: Thank you kindly!'

During her intervention, the viewer adopts both heuristic behaviour and positive reinforcement (2, 3,4), but negative reinforcement as well (1,2,3,4). Reactions of those affected differ: there are some competitors who do not attack speaker's positive face, even if they themselves were attacked; for example, the sequence 1, the question addressed to Alexandra ('If you were out, would you have made a couple with a boy like Victor?') doubted her choice, implying that she had made a bad choice, constrained by the circumstances. Alexandra's answer ('Yes!') vexes the speaker who is silenced, her interjections outlining the implication of distrust, scepticism, being as Magda Manu writes (91), an expression of 'offensive shock augmentation'. Yet, as the girl's response contains no reason of the made statement, (violation of the maxim quantity), the viewer addresses a new interrogation ("Yes?!"), designed to determine the hearer to provide the details expected from the previous intervention.

In sequences 2 and 3 are illustrated hearers' different reactions, both of them defending their positive face by attacking viewer's self-esteem. Edina uses irony, one of the forms of impoliteness ('I want to disappoint you because Dragos does accept them.') and Diana uses

expressions of mobilization[11] by interrogation ('Why are you saying this, lady?") - in response to the act of discourtesy committed by Victoria (offense: 'where you've been, you didn't show good manners'). Victoria's answer is unsatisfactory in terms of quantity maxim, involving deliberate offense, ignoring the desire of the other (an act of positive impoliteness): 'more than this, I have nothing to say to you.'

In the final part of her telephonic intervention (S4), the viewer adopts another type of communicational behaviour: positive reinforcement by expressions of augmentation of polite opinion (Leech's sympathy maxim): 'Andreea, you are at the top of the tree, I like you!' ". In turn, those receiving these compliments respond with a polite act, thanking and even augmenting the gratitude by a reverential phrase: 'Thank you kindly!'

As a general observation, it is noticed that all participants from the studio use deference forms (using the second person plural) - negative politeness. On the other hand, the initiator of the dialogue makes use of positive politeness (although familiarity is unjustified) and forms of direct mobilization or interrogative: 'Edina [...] why did you come here?, You are too …. are always complaining about everything ... no ... no one can please you.' The explanation of this tolerant behaviour from the part of those in question, is, as we mentioned previously, the existence of unequal balance of power: as an exponent of the public, the viewer can equally punish or reward the participants. Thus, despite some ironies and evasive answers ('I am the tallest' - Diana, S3, "time will solve everything" - Ionut, S3.), the competitors' replies show a manipulation of the conversational maxims, within the boundaries of conversational politeness. None of them comes to commit impolite acts such as offense and admonishment as Victoria does. The viewer relies on her privileged position in this dialogue and tries to impose her own beliefs, making use of acts of impoliteness: 'why, if you think so much about the house and the friend that you had, why you did come here?' (direct mobilization by interrogation and invasion of personal territory); 'where you've been, you didn't show good manners' (offense, face attack). Therefore, the sequence is illustrative for the effects of coercive power (owned by Victoria) and for the way in which each participant adapts his dialogical behaviour according to it.

As a conclusion of those analysed above, we notice the use of different strategies in achieving the goal. On the one hand, Victoria aims to express her views and preferences ('Dragos is a vEry good boy. He knows what to speak and when to speak; Ionut you are an educated boy, but you made a bad shot with Diana.') by engaging in a reinforcement communicative behaviour, sometimes veiled by the appearance of heuristic behaviour: 'If you were out, will you have make a couple with a boy like Victor? [...]. If you believe that you will make a good couple, it's your business!'. To achieve her goal, Victoria makes use mostly of positive politeness strategies, behaving as if she were "in house": she addresses the others as if they knew each other; she uses the second person singular; she uses the space deixis 'here' ('why are you here?'), referring to the "house" of participants, although she communicates by phone and, obviously, she does not share the same space. In addition, Victoria relies on background knowledge (she watched the show and knows many things about the participants); she gives the impression she knows what the participants think and wish (' If you were out, would you have made a couple with a boy like Victor?'); she

---

[11] A speaker's request to contribute to the verbal interaction is, according to Manu, Magda M. (2003), an act of mobilization which can be achieved by interrogative or imperative sentences. Imperative mobilization can be achieved directly by appointment or by use of interjections.

avoids expressing disagreement ('If you believe that you will make a good couple, it's your business!') and expresses admiration ('Andreea, you are at the top of the tree, I like you!'). However, as mentioned previously, sometimes Victoria makes use of impolite acts to express disapproval of the behaviour of some competitors.

On the other hand, the aim of the participants in the verbal interaction, present in the television studio, is to make a favourable impression to viewers in general and to Victoria in particular. Therefore, they adopt a defensive attitude when they are being questioned, but they have different strategies: Alexandra vexes the viewer's expectations, but opts for remedial actions by negative politeness: she uses the second person plural, finds justifications, explanations for her behaviour ('Yes, I would have, because ...') and seeks the approval of the interlocutor ('Understand?'). Edina, however, is not willing to spare Victoria's face and she answers the critics, but in an indirect manner, making use of irony ('I want to disappoint you'). It is clear that the role played in the 'house' that of good, educated girls, eager to please both boys and their mothers, take precedence over the urge to respond with equal impoliteness. However, some participants did not fully comply with this role, reacting to Victoria's criticism. Relevant for this point of view are Diana's answers to the repeated offenses committed by Victoria, the young girl asking for the motivation of this attitude ('Victoria: but where you've been, you didn't show good manners - Diana: Why are you saying this, lady?'). We conclude therefore that the dialogical sequence illustrates the fact that the role can be assumed or abandoned – if the speaker's face / self-esteem is threatened, subjected to offensive acts. The overall picture, however, indicates submission to the assigned roles, Victoria making use of both positive and negative reinforcement, whereas the responses were also different.

B. Tele-experiment

The second fragment we chose to analyse is selected from a *tele-experiment* reality programme: *Exchange of mothers*. In this show, the dialogue is the main way to learn / find out more about the participants (the family of exchange), thus heuristic behaviour prevails, especially for 'mothers'. Unlike in the reality show *Bride for my son,* the relationship between participants to dialogue is based on equal powers, none of the participants being given an advantage. However, sometimes the 'mother' is spared, the other members showing obedience due to the fact that she is a guest, who is going to stay only a week in their house. From this point of view, there are two types of dialogue:

a. the dialogue in which the collocutors are adults respects to a greater extent the communication principles and one can notice that there is an effort from the participants (usually between 'mother' and father from the host family) to reach a consensus.

b. the dialogue between an adult and a child, when , often, the communication fails.

A communication situation that illustrates a different reaction of the child in contrast with the adult's reaction is when the exchange mother tries to impose new rules in the house, in which case, theoretically, she has the coercive power:

Communication context

Date and place: Militaru's house, village of Găujani, 30/10/2011

Participants: Exchange mother, Elena from Zalau, girls of the Militaru family: Marinela (18)

Alice (12 years) and their father, Viorel (34).

The purpose of dialogue: The rule of the show states that starting with the fourth day of her stay in the new family, the exchange mother has to impose her regulation. Elena, the 'mother', wants to make some changes in the host family, to optimize the relationship between family members and appropriate the education of the girls.

Mother: Marinela and Alice have to clean up together

Marinela: I can't do it with her! She makes it faster, I make it slower…

Mother: If I said that together, we do toGETHER! From NOW ON, Marinela -no smoking in the room and no vulgar talking and no answering back

Marinela: I don't think so!

Her father: That I will talk to her

Mother: If repeated, she'll be [punished.

Marinela: [PFU

Mother: Because girls are plumper, [must do exercise and sport at least once a day

Alexia: [No! that I won't respect, I don't want to!

Marinela: [Uh, ((laughs))

Alexia: [I do it in school, with my teacher

Mother: we shall do, we shall do sports. Father must always intervene when girls are naughty or refuse to do something.

Father: Yes. ((Sigh))

Mother: So, now, what do you think of the new rules?

Alexia: I don't like it!

323

Mother: what you don't like?

Alexia: the regulation.

Father: WHEN I was telling YOU that no one is like your mother! You do miss your mother now, don't you? She never said anything, never argued! Now you'll see too how hard it is!

((The girls laugh and gesture))

The communication situation presented above illustrates a conflictual dialogue, generated by mother's intention to change the behaviour of the family members. Given the context, the mother only uses directive acts, formulating explicit requests. Elena's lines are circumscribed to the deontic modality, by using the verb 'have to/ must': 'Marinela and Alice **have to** clean up together; **must** do exercise and sport; father **must** always intervene'. The communicative behaviour of the mother is negative reinforcement ('From NOW ON, Marinela -no smoking in the room and no vulgar talking and no answering back'). Because the regulation is read in the presence of all family members, Elena does not address exclusively to the girl and that is why she uses the third person singular. Selecting this grammatical person, could also indicate the fact that the regulation is addressed primarily to the father, who has to take note of mother's decisions and, if needed, to impose them. Thus, mother transfers the decision-making role to the father, tacitly acknowledging that he is the one who has the coercive power.

On the other hand, the girls adopt an undisguised hostility. Their responses are almost entirely indirect acts involving girls' denial to grant requests: 'She makes it faster, I make it slower… '. Girls's lack of cooperation is marked by repeated use of negation ('I can't, don't believe, don't respect, don't want, don't like it'). There is a difference between the attitude of the older girl (Marinela, 18 years) and the way the younger one talks (Alice, 12 years). Marilena's answers are always indirect acts, containing conversational implicature: 'I can't do it with her! She makes it faster, I make it slower…'- the girl doesn't refuse the idea to clean, but that of doing it together with her sister. The second reply, 'I don't think so!' is an indirect act as well, Marinela using the epistemic verb ('I don't think so') with its volitional value, showing she refused to meet mother's demand. But Elena does not want to negotiate the rules and warns that she will make use of coercive power: 'If repeated, she will be punished.' Moreover, the 'mother' ignores Marinela's reactions and continues to point out other rules, concerning both girls. Alice responds with vehemence, using explicit, direct acts: 'No! that I won't respect, I don't want to!' Afterwards, the girl tries to reduce the act of discourtesy committed by adding an explanation: 'I do it in school, with my teacher'. Alice does not spare the interlocutor's face and, unlike her elder sister, she uses almost exclusively direct speech acts: `I don't like it.'

The structure of the dialogue is built on the adjacent pair of request-denial, in the exchange of words between mother and daughters, but the negative response of the girls is corrected each time by father's intervention. It is noticed that the father does not verbally punish girls' impoliteness, but his statements build some implications: such as a promise (commissure act) when he says: 'That I'll talk to her ' or when he gives an affirmative answer to mother's request to interfere when girls do not listen. Although, theoretically,

father's role involves cooperation with the 'exchange' mother in order to achieve the objective (the proper education of girls), he does not seem willing to do so. His interventions are minimal, intended to dilute girls' impoliteness and to remind them that they must obey 'mother'. Father's final intervention underlines his wife's merits and, in the same time, consists of an indirect reproach at the address of his daughters' lack of appreciation; the multiple negations: 'She never said anything, never argued' implies he is unpleased with 'mother's observations. Therefore, we can say that this exchange of dialogue, although it was completed, does not meet the criterion of perlocutionary efficiency, since none of the family members reacts as the 'mother' expected. Thus, the role of 'mother' failed, children denying her authority, seeing Elena as a stranger who may not impose any change. Father, however, is aware that he agreed to this 'game', and that is why he makes the necessary corrections, preventing the blockage of the communication because of the categorical refusal of girls.

Referring to both passages quoted, what we remark is both unintentional and intentional violation of the principle of cooperation and specific maxims of Grice (1975). For example, saying that 'Andreea is at the top of the tree', Victoria violates the manner maxim because she relies on the dialogic cooperation principle that the speakers share a common background of knowledge (in this case, the language code). Yet, even if she violates the manner maxim, and, implicitly the quantity maxim, by choosing this expression Victoria displays a polite behaviour according to Leech's rules (1983), showing generosity in appreciation.

Another example of violation of the maxims of cooperation but keeping the polite verbal conduct provides Ionut: 'Time will solve everything.' His answer violates the relevance and quantity maxims, but diminishes the impoliteness and the offensive shock, by choosing an evasive reply implying a favourable solution to both parties. The same situation is found in Marinela's reply: 'I don't think so!' - the offensive shock is diminished by violation of relevance and quantity maxim. On the other hand, we can notice some situations of unintentional violations of the manner maxim due to hesitation and reiterations: 'You are too …. are always complaining about everything ... no ... no one can please you'(Victoria to Edina –S2); 'As I said uhh I give people chances and we have started on a path, it remains to be seen whether our way ... the end of this competition will be a happy ending or not.'(Alexandra to Victoria –S1)

Conclusions

The communicative behaviour of participants in the 'reality' programmes differs depending on circumstantial[12] context, and the presuppositional[13] context as well. Due to the fact that in the *tele-seduction* type the situational context is a television studio, arranged as a "house", participants are subjected to the same rules and none of theme is privileged.

---

[12] The circumstantial context refers to the phisical environment, place, time and participants' identities.
[13] This type of context refers to interlocutors' assumptions, expectations, beliefs.

However, their evolution in the 'house' is influenced by the way they act ant interact with each other. The selected dialogue from the show *Bride for my son* highlights how competitors are individualized and 'evaluated' by what they say. In the telephonic dialogue the participants' competitive spirit is diluted by the report they initiate with the viewer. Everyone is concerned about his / her self-image, but they react differently to Victoria's challenges. Yet, no matter the type of reaction, they all rely either on conversational implicatures or on expression attenuators in order to reach their goal.

In the programme "Exchange of mothers' the circumstantial context is important because it compels the participants to adopt certain roles: the 'exchange' mother has to act as if it were her house and her children, and the host family members must accept the role play. However, the children will not assume this role and, unlike adults, are unwilling to cooperate. "Mother" expects that her status as leader will be recognized and accepted by virtue of the role play. This presuppositional context is not shared by the young ones, which creates a conflictual dialogue. Thus, the two situations presented are different when it comes to the purpose achieved While Victoria managed to attain her goal, expressing opinions and getting answers to certain questions, Elena did not succeed to impose her role, failing to enforce new rules. Yet, while in the first case the competitors, all being adults, acknowledge the role play, in the second situation only the grown-ups assume the roles agreed.

In conclusion, we notice that regardless of the role undertaken by the participants in 'tele-reality' programmes, this can be abandoned, if the face / the image of the self is threatened or subjected to constraints. The type of communicative behaviour and the conversational implicatures that they make use of are the logical consequence of the relationship real role - undertaken role. Cooperation and linguistic politeness exist only to the extent to which speakers can preserve their self-image and free will. Constraint or even admonition will trigger a reaction from interlocutor's part.

Note:

Rules for the transcription of the texts:

Use capitalization for proper names but also to note emphasis.
[Text start overlapping of successive interventions.
(()) Stage indications (e.g. coughing, clear one's throat etc.).
[...] Sequence removed.

References

Bignell, J. *An Introduction to Television studies*. London: Routledge, 2004.
Bignell, J. and J. Orlebar. *The Television Handbook*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Brown, P. and S. Levinson. *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Culpeper, J., "Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness." *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 349-367, 1996.

Grice P. *Logic and Conversation*. 1975. http://www.ifbl.tudresden.de/die_tu_dresden/fakultaeten/philosophische_fakultaet/iph/thph/braeuer/lehre/grice_ss_2009/LogicAndConversation.pdf .

Hill, A. *Reality TV: Audiences and Popular Factual Television*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Ionescu-Ruxãndoiu, L., *Limbaj si comunicare. Elemente de pragmaticã lingvisticã.* Bucureşti: Editura All, 2003.

Leech, G.N. *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York and London: Longman, 1983.

Manu-Magda, "Expresii ale mobilizarii si demobilizarii in dialogul social romanesc." *Dialogul în româna vorbitã*. L. Dascãlu-Jinga, L. Pop. Bucureşti: OscarPress, 2003.

McQuail, D. *Communication*. London: Longman, 1984.

Zeca-Buzura, D. *Totul la vedere:Televiziunea dupã Big Brother*. Iaşi: Polirom, 2007.

*** *Gramatica limbii române*, vol II, *Enunţul*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române, 2005.