reporters, as contrasted to the 'Romance' moderators who provide lengthy transitions between stories and subjective comments in the style of an editorial writer (Heinderyckx 1993).

The Internet promises a lower threshold of access to the distribution of news and views for the regular public in the industrialized world. But to be effective as a news channel it seems that the Internet so far must rely on existing networks of people with special interests. The news sites serve as points of convergence both for a like-minded public internationally and for all sorts of changing information and images within specific topic areas (see *Information Society*). Within finance and some scientific disciplines, the Internet already serves as a major publishing channel or as a marketplace for news. But for the moment it lacks the ability to reach the broader audience during a regular news cycle. For the Internet to become a general news channel, its use must expand considerably above its present level of penetration.

See also: Agenda-setting; Alternative Media; Broadcasting: General; Celebrity; Entertainment; International Communication: History; Journalism; Mass Communication: Normative Frameworks; Mass Communication: Technology; Mass Media: Introduction and Schools of Thought; Mass Media, Political Economy of; Mass Media, Representations in; News Interview; Printing as a Medium; Public Relations in Media; Rhetorical Analysis

Bibliography

Barnhurst K G, Mutz D 1997 American journalism and the decline in event-centered reporting. *Journal of Communication* **47**(4)

Chalaby J 1996 Journalism as an Anglo-American invention. A comparison of the development of French and Anglo-American journalism 1830s–1930s. *European Journal of Communication* **11**(3)

Dicken-Garcia H 1989 *Journalistic Standards in Nineteenth-century America*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, WI

Esser F 1998 Editorial structures and work principles in British and German newsrooms. *European Journal of Communication* **13**(4)

Gans H J 1979 *Deciding What's News. A Study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek & Time*. Pantheon Books, New York

Golding P, Elliot P 1977 *Making the News*. London, Longman

Harro H 2000 Changing journalistic conventions in the press. Empirical studies on daily newspapers under different political conditions in 20th century Estonia. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oslo

Heinderyckx F 1993 Television news programs in Western Europe: A comparative study. *European Journal of Communication* **8**(4)

Høyer S 1995 *Pressen mellom teknologi og samfunn* (The press between technology and society). Universitetsforlaget, Oslo

Høyer S, Lauk E 2000 The paradoxes of the journalistic profession. An historical perspective. In: Björk U J, Nordenstreng K (eds.) *A Hundred Years of the International Journalist*. University of Luton Press, Luton, UK

Huntzicker W E 1999 *The Popular Press, 1833–1865*. Greenwood Press, Westport, CT

Johnson O V 1999 The roots of journalism in Central and Eastern Europe. In: Aumente J, Gross P, Hiebert R, Johnson O V, Mills D (eds.) *Eastern European Journalism. Before, During and After Communism*. Hampton Press, Cresskill, NJ

Kaplan R 1997 The American press and political community: Reporting in Detroit 1865–1920. *Media Culture & Society* **19**(3)

Köcher R 1986 Bloodhounds or missionaries: Role definitions of German and British journalists. *European Journal of Communication* **1**(1)

McNair B 1998 *The Sociology of Journalism*. Arnold, London

Michell S 1997 *A History of News*. Harcourt Brace, Fort Worth, TX

Nonseid J, Høyer S 1998 Diffusion of the news paradigm in Norway 1908–1930. Paper for International Association for Mass Communication Research, Glasgow, July

Read D 1999 *The Power of News. The History of Reuters*, 2nd edn. Oxford University Press, Oxford

Schlesinger P 1978 *Putting 'Reality' Together. BBC News*. Constable, London

Schudson M 1978 *Discovering the News. A Social History of American Newspapers*. Basic Books, New York

Schudson M 1991 Historical approaches to communication studies. In: Bruhn Jensen K, Janowski J W (eds.) *A Handbook of Qualitative Methodologies for Mass Communication Research*. Routledge, London

Schudson M 1994 Question authority: A history of the news interview. *Media, Culture & Society* **16**(4)

Schudson M 1995 *The Power of News*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA

Schudson M 1999 The sociology of news production revisited (again). In: Curran J (ed.)

Shaw D L 1967 News bias and the telegraph: A study of historical change. *Journalism Quarterly* **44**(1)

Thomsen N 1972 *Dagbladskonkurrencen 1870–1970* (The Competition between Daily Newspapers 1870–1970). Gads, Copenhagen

Tichenor P J, Donohue G A, Olien C N 1980 *Community Conflict & The Press*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA

Tomilla P 1988 *Suomen lehdistön historia* (The history of the Finnish Press). Kustannuskiila, Kuopio, Finland

Tuchman G 1978 *Making News. A Study in the Construction of Reality*. Free Press, New York

Wilke J 1984 The changing world of media reality. *Gazette* **39**(3)

Wilke J 1987 Foreign news coverage and international news flow over three centuries. *Gazette* **39**(2)

S. Høyer

News Interview

The news interview is a central means by which journalists gather information that will later be worked up into finished news stories. It is also employed as a finished news product in its own right,

a basic form in which news is packaged for public consumption. The latter usage is particularly important within contemporary broadcasting, as a substantial proportion of news and public affairs programming now takes the form of a journalist interviewing one or more public figures before the media audience.

1. The News Interview as a Genre

The news interview is a familiar and readily recognizable genre of broadcast programming. Its basis in comparatively spontaneous interaction distinguishes it from the fully scripted narratives that comprise most traditional news programs. The news interview also differs from other interaction-based genres of broadcast talk (e.g., talk shows, panel discussions, etc.) by its distinctive constellation of participants, subject matter, and interactional form. In a prototypical news interview, the interviewer is known as a professional journalist rather than a partisan advocate or celebrity entertainer. Interviewees are public officials, experts, or others whose actions or opinions are newsworthy. The discussion normally focuses on matters related to recent news events, is highly formal in character, and is managed primarily through questions and answers. The closest relative of the news interview is the press conference, which shares all of these features, but involves a large number of participating journalists and is held at the behest of the public figure rather than the news media (see *Talk Show in Media*; *Television: Genres*).

2. Origins and Institutionalization

The news interview prototypically involves the confluence of representatives of two important societal institutions—journalism and politics. Accordingly, the history of the news interview is deeply intertwined with the co-evolution of these institutions.

Although it now seems quite natural for journalists to interview elected officials and other prominent public figures, it has not always been so. In the US, interviewing was virtually nonexistent for the first half-century of the nation's existence. Institutions of national government only gradually became publicly accessible, and even as journalists were granted access first to the House of Representatives and later the Senate, verbatim quotations normally were prohibited (Leonard 1986). The aloofness of government officials was matched by the disinterest of most journalists. Newspapers during this period were financed by political parties and were vehicles for editorial opinion rather than reportage in the contemporary sense.

The practice of interviewing can be traced to the rise of the American penny press in the 1830s; the first papers to devote themselves primarily to 'news rather than views' and to employ reporters devoted to the task of newsgathering. But published interviews with public figures did not become common journalistic practice until the late nineteenth century. This new form of journalism first expanded rapidly in the US, and then more slowly in England and other European countries in part at the prompting of American journalists in Europe. This expansion did not occur without controversy—interviewing frequently was attacked as an artificial and unduly intrusive journalistic practice (Schudson 1994).

Although these criticisms would not disappear entirely, the news interview became increasingly accepted as normal journalistic practice in the early decades of the twentieth century. This development roughly coincides with the growing stature and professionalization of journalism, and the shift within government from backstage intragovernmental negotiations to public relations as tools of governance. Accordingly, the three US presidents most responsible for institutionalizing the presidential press conference—Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt—were each progressive reformers with ambitious political agendas who used such conferences to build public support for their policies. The advent of television further increased the prominence of news interviews and press conferences, as weekly and eventually nightly news programs were devoted to journalistic questioning of public figures.

In short, what used to be regarded as extraordinary has become standard practice across the political spectrum. Just as journalists were once criticized for questioning public officials, now public officials are subject to criticism if they fail to make themselves sufficiently accessible to journalistic interrogations.

3. Contemporary Norms and Practices

The news interview is not merely a reflection of journalistic and political institutions; it is also a social institution in its own right. Conduct within the news interview is organized around the roles of interviewer and interviewee and is governed by a complex matrix of social norms and conventional practices.

The most fundamental and pervasive characteristic of news interview interaction is that it unfolds as a series of questions and answers. This is both an empirical regularity that typifies news interview talk (Heritage and Roth 1995), and a social norm that the participants are obliged to uphold (Greatbatch 1988). The question–answer framework may seem obvious, but its very obviousness makes it constitutive of the news interview as a recognizably distinct form of interaction. Moreover, underlying this normative framework is a far less obvious substrate of practices that are necessary to produce interaction in manifest compliance with the question–answer norm (Heritage and Greatbatch 1991). These practices include the

systematic avoidance of a wide range of acknowledgement tokens and other responsive behaviors (e.g., uh huh, yeah, right, oh, really) which are absolutely pervasive in ordinary conversation but which become incongruous in a context where the parties are supposed to restrict themselves to the actions of questioning and answering. Both the question–answer norm and the practices that underlie it usually are taken for granted by interview participants, but they may become more fully conscious of the ground rules at problematic or contentious moments, when those rules may be appealed to explicitly as a means or complaint or self-defense.

In building questions, interviewers are sensitive to two further journalistic norms which are difficult to reconcile. On the one hand, they are supposed to remain formally neutral in their conduct. While absolute neutrality is an unattainable ideal, interviewers do strive to maintain a 'neutralistic' posture by restricting themselves to just asking questions, avoiding all forms of acknowledgement, and avoiding flat assertions except as prefaces to a question (Clayman 1988) or as attributed to a third party (Clayman 1992). On the other hand, interviewers are supposed to be adversarial in their treatment of public figures and should not allow the latter to use the interview as a personal soapbox. Interviewers pursue the ideal of adversarialness in part through the content of their questions, raising matters that cut against public figures' own interests, and subjecting their previous responses to challenge. Adversarialness is also pursued through the underlying form of such questions (Clayman and Heritage in press b)—for example, by designing questions in ways that narrow the parameters of an acceptable response, by 'tilting' questions in favor of one particular response over others, and by encoding presuppositions that are difficult for the interviewee to counter or refute. An important resource for these various forms of adversarialness are the preliminary statements that interviewers often make when leading up to a question. Such statements are justifiable as providing 'background information' necessary to render the question intelligible to the audience, but they can be mobilized in ways that allow the interviewer to maximize control over the discussion agenda and exert pressure on recalcitrant interviewees. The balance that is struck between the ideals of neutrality and adversarialness is a signature that distinguishes individual interviewers, the news programs on which they appear, and historical periods characterized by dominant styles of interviewing.

Interviewees, in responding, face a different set of cross-cutting pressures. Adversarial questions create an incentive for evasive responses, encouraging interviewees to be less than forthcoming or to shift the discussion agenda in a more desirable direction. However, the normative question–answer framework obliges interviewees to answer straightforwardly, so that failure to do so can be costly. Interviewers often counter such maneuvers with probing follow-up questions and negative sanctions; audience members may infer that the interviewee has some ulterior motive for avoiding the question; and acts of evasion are often singled out in subsequent news coverage (Clayman 1990). Accordingly, interviewees almost always design their evasive responses in such a way as to minimize these undesirable consequences (Clayman and Heritage in press b). They may choose to sidestep the question in an overt or explicit manner, which allows for equally explicit forms of 'damage control'—for example, justificatory accounts and displays of deference to the interviewer. Alternatively, when evading the question covertly, they may take steps to obscure what is transpiring—for example, by giving it the surface form of an answer.

Many contemporary interviews involve multiple interviewees who represent diverse and frequently opposing viewpoints. The panel interview format is attractive to broadcasters, not only because it promotes varying degrees of dramatic conflict (Olsher in press), but also because it creates a division of labor that helps to reconcile the divergent ideals of neutrality and adversarialness. With partisan interviewees playing the role of adversary vis à vis one another, the interviewer is left free to act as an impartial catalyst.

4. *Evolving Styles of Questioning*

Comparative research on the news interview remains underdeveloped, but styles of questioning appear to have changed substantially since the advent of broadcasting. Journalists' questions to public figures have become less deferential and more adversarial during this period. In US presidential press conferences, this shift is apparent not only in the substantive issues raised within questions, but also the manner in which such questions are designed (Clayman and Heritage in press a). Simple one-sentence questions have given way to increasingly complex questions with extended prefatory remarks. Questions have also become narrower in focus, more blunt or direct, and more 'tilted' in favor of a particular answer. If this pattern reflects a more general trend in interviewing, then journalists have come to exert increasing pressure on interviewees to address inconvenient, unflattering, or incriminating topics.

The rise of adversarial questioning appears to have developed somewhat differently in America and Britain. In Britain, a robust tradition of government regulation of broadcast journalism, coupled the absence of competition prior to 1958, combined to foster a highly deferential style of questioning in BBC interviews of the 1950s. When the BBC monopoly was replaced by a duopoly in 1958, the resulting competition fueled a sudden and dramatic increase in adversarial questioning. In America, where government regulation of broadcasting has been compara-

tively minimal and where competitive pressures have been present from the outset, adversarial questioning has grown more steadily from a higher baseline. However, at least for the case of questions to the president, a sharp rise in adversarialness followed the revelations of the Watergate affair and continued to affect presidents in the post-Nixon era.

Whatever its causes, the rise of adversarial questioning has transformed the news interview into a formidable instrument of public accountability. It is now much more difficult for officials to make purely self-serving statements in the context of a news interview. However, this revolution has stimulated a counter-revolution by politicians and public officials—increasingly sophisticated strategies of evasion, aided by a burgeoning cottage industry of media advisors and consultants. Moreover, because adversarialness in news interviews is expressed to officials directly and in public, it may be contributing to a much broader development in Anglo-American culture: namely, a reduction in the social status accorded to agents of government and other institutional authorities, and a reduction in the social distance separating such elites from ordinary citizens (see *Broadcasting: General*; *Journalism*; *News: General*; *Political Communication*).

Bibliography

Clayman S E 1988 Displaying neutrality in television news interviews. *Social Problems* **35**(4): 474–92

Clayman S E 1990 From talk to text: Newspaper accounts of reporter-source interactions. *Media, Culture and Society* **12**(1): 79–103

Clayman S E 1992 Footing in the achievement of neutrality: The case of news interview discourse. In: Drew P, Heritage J (eds.) *Talk at Work*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 163–98

Clayman S E, Heritage J in press a Questioning presidents: Journalistic deference and adversarialness in the press conferences of Eisenhower and Reagan. *Journal of Communication*

Clayman S E, Heritage J in press b The news interview: *Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Greatbatch D 1988 A turn-taking system or British news interviews. *Language in Society* **17**(3): 401–30

Heritage J, Greatbatch D 1991 On the institutional character of institutional talk: The case of news interviews. In: Boden D, Zimmerman D H (eds.) *Talk and Social Structure*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, pp. 93–137

Heritage J C, Roth A L 1995 Grammar and institution: Questions and questioning in the broadcast news interview. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* **28**(1): 1–60

Leonard T C 1986 *The Power of the Press*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK

Olsher D in press Inviting interplay in panel format news interviews.

Schudson M 1994 Question authority: A history of the news interview in American journalism, 1830s–1930s. *Media, Culture and Society* **16**: 565–87

S. E. Clayman

Neyman, Jerzy (1894–1981)

1. Life

Jerzy Neyman was born of Polish parentage in Bendery, Russia, on April 16, 1894. He entered the University of Kharkov in 1912, studying mathematics and statistics. His instructors included the famous Russian probabilistic S. N. Bernstein, and his earliest papers were in the then relatively new subject of measure theory. Neyman also pursued teaching graduate studies in mathematics in Kharkov from 1917 to 1921, interrupted very briefly by an arrest as an enemy alien by the Russian government. In 1921, Neyman left Kharkov for Warsaw and obtained (with the help of Sierpinski) a position there that permitted him to continue his studies, culminating in his doctoral dissertation in 1923 on statistical problems in agricultural experimentation.

After teaching in Warsaw and Cracow, Neyman obtained a postdoctoral fellowship to study under Karl Pearson at University College, London in 1925, where he first met some of the leading statisticians of his day, including W. S. Gosset ('Student'), R. A. Fisher, and Egon S. Pearson (the son of Karl Pearson, and an important statistician in his own right). The next year Neyman then obtained a fellowship from the Rockefeller Foundation and studied in Paris, attending mathematical lectures by Borel, Lebesque, and Hadamard. During the summer of 1927 Neyman returned to Poland, and resumed teaching at the Universities of Warsaw and Cracow.

From 1928 to 1934 Neyman remained in Poland, working in both applied and mathematical statistics. He pursued a broad range of applied statistical interests in agriculture, biology, chemistry, and socioeconomics, ultimately leading to his appointment as head of the Statistical Laboratory of the Nencki Institute of Experimental Biology. But at the same time Neyman also continued to collaborate with Egon Pearson, work that was to result in some of their most important papers on the theory of statistical tests.

In 1933 Karl Pearson retired as Professor of Statistics from University College. Although Fisher was Pearson's obvious choice as successor, the two had for more than a decade been bitter enemies and, in Solomon fashion, it was decided to divide the Department in two: a Department of Genetics to be headed by Fisher (as Professor of Genetics), and a Department of Applied Statistics to be headed by Egon Pearson. Not unnaturally, Egon Pearson immediately invited his collaborator and friend Neyman

Copyright © 2001 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.
International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences ISBN: 0-08-043076-7