

News from the Interview Society

Mats Ekström, Åsa Kroon & Mats Nylund (eds.)

NORDICOM

Contents

Preface 7

News from the Interview Society

Mats Ekström, Åsa Kroon & Mats Nylund (eds.)

Chapter 1
Mats Ekström, Åsa Kroon & Mats Nylund
Introduction 9

I. Historical Shifts and the Role of the Journalistic Interview in Modern Media

Chapter 2
Mats Ekström
Interviewing, Quoting and the Development of Modern News Journalism. A Study of the Swedish Press 1915-1995 21

Chapter 3
Steven E. Clayman & John Heritage
Questioning Presidents. Journalistic Deference and Adversarialness in the Press Conference of U.S. Presidents Eisenhower and Reagan 49

Chapter 4
Martin Eide
Power on the Threshold of the Interview Society. Journalism, Politics, Popularization 79

II. The Interview as Institutional Practices and Interaction

Chapter 5
Mie Femø Nielsen
'Doing' Interviewer Roles in TV Interviews 95

Chapter 6
Konstantin Economou & Christian Svendsen Limsjö
Hidden Camera Speaks Louder than Words 121

© Editorial matters and selections, the editors; articles, individual contributors (with three exceptions see p. 49, p. 147 and p. 239); Nordicom

ISBN 91-89471-37-7

Published by:
Nordicom
Göteborg University
Box 713
SE 405 30 GÖTEBORG
Sweden

Cover by: Roger Palmqvist
Printed by: Livréna AB, Kungälv, Sweden, 2006
Environmental certification according to ISO 14001

Arenas of Interaction in the New Media Era*

Steven E. Clayman

says in this volume, a means "to take the pulse of the public with regard to specific issues and, more generally, to keep in touch with the concerns of ordinary people". It is naturally not possible to draw any conclusions from these observations, but perhaps journalists have realized that the public discussion might be enriched and appear more trustworthy when many different voices are heard – not only those of the professional journalists and politicians.

References

- Bakhtin, M. (1986) *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Ed. by Emerson, C. and Holquist, M. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.
- Barber, B. (1999) 'En plats för kommers eller en plats för oss? – IT i demokratiskt ljus', In Anna, Erik (ed.) *IT i demokratins tjänst*, SOU 1999:117, Stockholm: Fakta info direkt, pp. 13-30.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity in association with Basil Blackwell.
- Cameron, D. (2003) 'Globalizing 'Communication'', In Aitchinson and Lewis (eds.) *New Media Language*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 27-35.
- Clayman, S. and Heritage, J. (2002) *The News Interview. Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dickerson, P. (2001) 'Disputing with Care: Analysing Interviewees' Treatment of Interviewees' Prior Turn in Televised Political Interviews', *Discourse Studies*. Vol. 3 (2). SAGE, pp. 203-220.
- Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hutchby, I. (1996) *Confrontation Talk. Arguments, Asymmetries, and Power on Talk Radio*. New Jersey: Lea.
- Hutchby, I. (2001) *Conversation and Technology. From the Telephone to the Internet*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Montgomery, M. (2001) 'Authenticity, Talk and Mediated Experience', *Discourse Studies*, pp. 398-405.
- Thornborrow, J. (2002) *Power Talk. Language and Interaction in Institutional Discourse*. London: Longman.

Transcription conventions:

- word extended sound
 wordf overlap begins
 wordj overlap ends
 yes! latching, indicates absolute contiguity between utterances
 word=word audible inbreath
 hh audible outbreath
 hh quiet speech
 *word^o the talk is slower than surrounding talk
 <word> micropause
 () rising intonation
 question mark ? loud talk
 WORD a smiling voice
 word description of an event
 (SWALLOWING)

Since the late 1970s, broadcast news in the United States has undergone a fundamental and multifaceted transformation. Some of these developments have been a central focus of scholarly discussion – ie., that news has become more interpretive, more negative, more preoccupied with political strategy than policy substance, and more focused on "soft" subjects (crime, entertainment, health) to the exclusion of "hard" political news (eg., Baum 2003, Cohen 2004, Hallin 1997, Patterson 1993). Other changes, while no less important, have received less attention. Consider the discursive form in which news now appears. The traditional way of packaging and presenting news – in the form of a narrative or story, which dominated public affairs programming for many decades – has steadily declined in prominence. It now coexists alongside a plethora of communicative forms organized around human interaction – news interviews, news conferences, panel discussions, formal and informal debates, town meetings, and talk shows of various kinds. Some of these forms are fully institutionalized within broadcasting where they function as programming formats; others are *ad hoc* events occurring independently but then broadcast to the public. This diverse collection of media events shares a common property: each is comprised of relatively unscripted encounters involving some combination of public figures, media professionals, and ordinary people.

Numerous conditions in the U.S. have contributed to the growth of interaction as a vehicle for presenting broadcast news and information. Technological and legal changes have been enabling factors. The advent of cable greatly increased the number of channels and news outlets, while satellite feeds and more portable news gathering equipment now permit live encounters with newsmakers from virtually anywhere in the world. Correspondingly, the demise of the Fairness Doctrine (an FCC regulation mandating that broadcasters offer a range of views on controversial issues of public importance) reduced inhibitions stemming from government oversight of program content. All of this has yielded expanded opportunities for the development of new interaction-based forms of informational programming.

At the same time, economic conditions have encouraged broadcasters to exploit these opportunities. In the deregulatory environment of the 1980s, the three major commercial television networks in the U.S. – ABC, NBC, and CBS, which had long been stable corporate entities devoted primarily to communications – were each bought out by conglomerates that assumed substantial debt and were much less willing to allow their news divisions to remain insulated from the pressures of the bottom line (Auletta 1991, Hallin 1997). That changing of the guard occurred during a period of tremendous volatility in the media marketplace, with the networks facing a succession of new competitors starting with cable and the VCR and culminating in the personal computer and the internet. All of this has had a substantial impact on the ethos of broadcasting. Producers have become much more concerned about production costs and audience ratings and more willing to experiment with new formats for news and public affairs programming.

Moreover, such experimentation has taken place in an occupational culture that places a high value on “live” programming – the presentation of raw events that are, or appear to be, unfolding “in the present tense” (Timberg 2002: 4) – as the distinctive province of broadcasting. As former NBC president Reuven Frank put it in a famous staff memo, “the highest power of television journalism is not in the transmission of information, but in the transmission of experience” (quoted in Epstein, 1973: 39). Not only do many producers believe that relaying events-as-they-happen is what television does best, but such programming is also believed to have substantial audience appeal.

Against this backdrop, formats based on spoken interaction have been particularly attractive. Such formats are inexpensive to produce, and they embody qualities of “eventfulness”, “spontaneity”, and “liveliness” that are regarded as intrinsically televisual and popular with audiences.

Interactional formats have thus proliferated in recent years, transforming the public sphere as it is constituted through the news media. And yet to a significant extent social science research has failed to keep pace with this development. The discipline of communication studies continues to be dichotomized between “interpersonal” and “mass” communication subfields (e.g. both American and International Communication Associations maintain separate “interpersonal” and “mass” divisions), a split that seems increasingly archaic in light of the developments outlined above. More generally, studies of journalism across the social sciences remain preoccupied with the traditional story form of news. This preoccupation is apparent both in studies of news production that focus on the backstage work routines through which raw information is gathered, sifted, and assembled into finished news stories,¹ and in studies of news content that focus on the themes and perspectives that predominate within such stories.²

Neither production nor content studies have devoted much attention to newer interaction-based forms of news, which transcend the distinction

between news production and news content and thus require new modes of analysis. Recently, however, a small but growing body of work on the subject has begun to emerge. While studies of presidential news conferences have a comparatively well-established pedigree (Clayman and Heritage 2002b, Clayman et. al. 2006, Cornwell 1965, French 1982, Smith 1990), work has recently appeared on broadcast news interviews (Bull and Mayer 1988, Burger 2002, Burger and Filiattaz 2002, Clayman and Heritage 2002a, Croteau and Hoynes 1994, Ekstrom 2001, Greatbatch 1992, Laverbach 2004, Myers, 2000, Roth 1998, 2002, 2005, Schudson 1994), daytime television talk shows (Carbaugh 1988, Ganson 1998, Grindstaff 2002, Livingstone and Lunt 1994, Munson 1993, Shattuc 1997, Tolson 2001), talk radio (Davis and Curtice 2000, Hutchby 1996, 1999, Owen 1997, Thornborrow 2001), and broadcast talk more generally (Davis and Owens 1988, Herbst 1995, Hutchby 2005, Martinez 2003, Pan and Kosicki 1997, Scannell 1991, Timberg 2002).

This paper surveys a number of such communicative forms, with an emphasis on news interviews, news conferences, and various modes of audience participation (radio call-in shows, TV talk shows, and town meetings). These are analyzed as distinct arenas within the public sphere (Habermas 1989) – that aspect of civil society in which persons from various backgrounds meet to confer on matters of public importance. Contrary to some of the more abstract theoretical accounts of this subject, the public sphere is best understood not as a singular entity but as encompassing a variety of communicative arenas (Jacobs, 2000). The arenas of interest here are constituted not by media technologies (c.f., Meyrowitz 1985) or structures of ownership or journalistic organizations, but by specific modes of interaction, each with its own conditions of access and modes of conduct. Accordingly, each interactional arena will be examined from the standpoint of its historical development, constraints on who may participate, and for the more well-established arenas (news interviews and news conferences) the evolving norms and practices that organize actual conduct. The conclusion of the paper will address the broader ramifications that broadcast interaction has had for journalism, politics, and the public sphere more broadly conceived. Throughout, the analysis will focus primarily on the U.S. context, and it will be guided by a concern with how these arenas mediate relations between political elites and ordinary citizens.

News interviews

The *news interview* is a familiar and readily recognizable genre of broadcast interaction. It differs from other interaction-based genres 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. Interview-

ees are public officials, experts, or others whose actions or opinions are newsworthy. The discussion normally focuses on matters related to current events, is highly formal in character, and is managed primarily through questions and answers. In the U.S., prototypical news interviews are featured on daily shows such as *Nightline* (ABC) and *The NewsHour* (PBS), and Sunday shows such as *Meet the Press* (NBC), *Face the Nation* (CBS), *This Week* (ABC), and *Late Edition* (CNN).

Notwithstanding these clear cases, the genre has fuzzy boundaries, with shows that share many of the features sketched above while differing in other important ways. Thus, cable news channels have numerous quasi-interview shows (e.g., *Hardball*, *The O'Reilly Factor*) hosted by partisan advocates of various stripes, who are less bound by norms of impartiality and are much more overtly opinionated in their dealings with public figures. Farther afield, *Larry King Live* is hosted by a former radio personality rather than a professional journalist, and although he questions his guests, he also takes telephone calls from the home audience. The result is a hybrid of the news interview and radio call-in formats.

Origins and institutionalization

The news interview prototypically involves the confluence of representatives of two key societal institutions – journalism and politics. Accordingly, the history of the news interview is thoroughly 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 U.S., 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 to the Senate, verbatim quotations were normally 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 more than factual reportage (Schudson 1978).

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 broadly devoted to the task of newsgathering. But published interviews with public figures did not become common journalistic practice until quite late in the 19th century. This new form of journalism first expanded rapidly in the U.S. 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 was frequently 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 20th century. This development roughly coincides with the growing stature and professionalization of journalism (Schudson 1978, 1988) and the shift within government from backstage intragovernmental negotiations to public relations as tools of governance (Kernell 1986, Tulis 1987). The normalization of the news interview reflected these twin institutional changes, and it furthered their development. The advent of television subsequently increased the prominence of news interviews, first with weekly interview-based programs, and then nightly programs that began on the broadcast networks and later expanded onto cable news channels.³

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 officials are subject to criticism if they fail to make themselves sufficiently accessible to journalistic interrogations.

Patterns of participation

The news interview, as a journalistic form, is responsive to journalistic ideals of balance and fairness. However, these ideals are not interpreted to mean that any and all viewpoints should be equally represented. News interview programs do not provide "equal time" for terrorists, violent criminals, or political extremists on the left or right. Producers of such programs appear to distinguish between areas of legitimate controversy – where diverse perspectives are given their place – versus persons and viewpoints regarded as fundamentally illegitimate and hence undeserving of airtime (cf., Hallin 1994).

Beyond the wholesale marginalization of those regarded as "beyond the pale", there is a general tendency for the major news interview shows to favor broadly mainstream and establishment guests. In a study of ABC's *Nightline* and PBS's *NewsHour* – the two main nightly news interview programs in the U.S. – Croteau and Hoynes (1994) demonstrate that guest lists are dominated by current and former government officials and other establishment elites, while leaders of labor, public interest, and racial/ethnic groups appear relatively infrequently. This emphasis, which is consistent with general patterns of news coverage (e.g., Fishman 1980, Gans 1979), reflects in part an understanding by program producers that the ideal guests are newsmakers who play a central role in shaping the events under discussion. Granting this justification, the emphasis on newsmakers plainly constrains the range of perspectives that are given voice in interview-based discussions of public affairs.

In addition to these general patterns of participation characteristic of news interviews as a group, there is also internal variation between particular programs. The most significant line of distinction is between those

airing weekly on Sunday – *Meet the Press* (NBC), *Face the Nation* (CBS), *This Week* (ABC), and *Late Edition* (CNN) – and those airing on a nightly basis – *Nightline* (ABC) and *NewsHour* (PBS). The Sunday shows have the greatest visibility, routinely generating subsequent news coverage in the form of stories for the Monday newspapers. Correspondingly, they attract the most prominent guests, a high proportion of which are senior Administration officials and Congressional leaders. In contrast, the nightly shows “make news” far less often, and their guests include fewer “heavyweight” newsmakers and more rank-and-file legislators, former officials, and expert commentators of various kinds.

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 conventions.

The most fundamental and pervasive characteristic of news interview interaction is that it unfolds as a series of questions and answers. This is, in one sense, an empirical regularity that typifies news interview talk (Heritage and Roth 1995) but it is also a social norm that participants are obliged to uphold (Clayman and Heritage 2002a: Chapter 4). 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. 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*) that are absolutely pervasive in ordinary conversation but become redundant and 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 are usually 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 of self-defense.

In building questions, interviewers are sensitive to two further journalistic norms that are difficult to reconcile. On the one hand, consistent with the overarching ideal of objectivity, they are supposed to be impartial or neutral in their questioning. While absolute neutrality is an unattainable ideal, interviewers do strive to maintain a formally neutral or “neutralistic” posture by restricting themselves to questions *per se* – avoiding all tokens of acknowledgement (e.g., *mbm*, *yeah*) that might be taken to indicate agreement with the interviewee’s prior remarks, and also avoiding un-

varnished assertions that express a point of view (Clayman and Heritage 2002a: Chapter 5). For instance, although the interviewer below attacks the crackdown on civil liberties by the apartheid regime in South Africa as an effort to “suppress political dissent” (lines 1-5), that assertion is not done as an action in its own right. He attributes the assertion to “critics” (arrowed), thereby disaffiliating himself from the viewpoint it embodies. He also goes on to produce an interrogative (line 6), thereby retrospectively casting the prior assertion as mere “background information” leading up to a question soliciting the interviewee’s point of view.

(1) [PBS NewsHour 22 July 1985: South African Ambassador to the U.S.]

- 1 IR: Finally Mister Ambassador as you know the
- 2 critics say that the purpose of the state of emergency
- 3 the real purpose of the state of emergency is to
- 4 suppress political dissent, those who are opposed
- 5 to the apartheid government in South Africa.
- 6 Is that so,

In general, while it is not uncommon for interviewers to make assertions, they often use practices like these to maintain a neutralistic posture.

On the other hand, consistent with the ideal of political independence and the “watchdog” role of the press, journalists are also supposed to be *adversarial* in their questioning and should not allow guests unfettered access to the airwaves to say whatever suits their interests. Interviewers pursue the ideal of adversarialness in part through the content of their questions, raising matters that run contrary to public figures’ interests and agendas (as in example 1 above) and subjecting their previous responses to challenge. Adversarialness is also implemented through the underlying form of such questions (Clayman and Heritage 2002a: Chapter 6, 2002b) – 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 accountable as providing “background information” necessary to render the question intelligible to the audience, but as the previous example demonstrates they can be mobilized in ways that allow the interviewer to assert 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 resistant or 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 resistant responses in such a way as to minimize these undesirable consequences (Clayman and Heritage 2002a: Chapter 7). They may choose to sidestep the question in an overt or explicit manner, which allows for equally explicit forms of "damage control." For instance, in a discussion of health care reform, the interviewee (an insurance industry executive and reform opponent) briefly responds to a question (lines 4-8), and then shifts the agenda to counter remarks made earlier by a pro-reform interviewee. Notice that before shifting the agenda, the interviewee first asks permission to do so (line 9, arrowed), thereby continuing to honor the principle that the interviewer is in charge of the discussion agenda. In the course of asking permission, she also provides a rationale for her shift (she is seeking "equal time" on an issue raised by her discussion opponent), and minimizes the magnitude of what she is about to do ("just make one comment").

(2) [PBS NewsHour 21 October 1993: Health Care Reform]

- 1 IR: .hhh Well Jenckes he raises an interesting question.=
 2 =Again just as a matter of strategy your ad doesn't say:
 3 that it's sponsored by the health (.) insurance companies
 4 IE: [Margaret that's
 5 absolutely incorrect .hh Our ads (.) whether they're
 6 on TV, .h our print a- advertisements, that appear in
 7 newspapers .hh even radio spots indicate that we have
 8 paid for it.=
 9 -> Let me may- just make one comment in terms of what Ron says.
 10 IR: [hhh [wh- [lh-
 11 All right.]
 12 IE: [h h] Of course. Any coalition, I don't care
 13 Whether it's Save: the What:es...

All of these practices can be understood as "damage control" aimed at portraying what might otherwise seem merely evasive in the best possible light.

Alternatively, when evading the question covertly, interviewees may take steps to obscure what is transpiring by giving it the surface form of an

answer. For instance, notice how the repetition of specific words from the question ("the difference") obscures the fact that the response falls short of a straightforward answer.

(3) [BBC Radio World at One 13 March 1979: Arthur Scargill]

- 1 IR: .hhh er What's the difference between your Marxism and
 2 Mister McGabey's communism?
 3 IE: er The difference is that it's the press that constantly
 4 Call me a Marxist when I do not, (.) and never have
 5 (.) er given that description of myself...

By these various means, interviewees gain a measure of control over the discussion agenda and can to some degree "stay on message" even in the face of highly adversarial lines of questioning.

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 (Clayman and Heritage 2002a: Chapter 8, Greatbatch 1992 Olsher forthcoming), 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.

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 television. In general, journalists' questions to public figures have become less deferential and more adversarial during this period.

However, this trend has developed somewhat differently in America and Britain (Clayman and Heritage 2002a: Chapter 2). In Britain, a robust tradition of government regulation of broadcast journalism, coupled with the absence of competition prior to 1958, fostered 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 comparatively minimal and where competitive pressures have been present from the outset, adversarial questioning has grown more modestly from a higher baseline. Indeed, the shift is far less apparent in routine news interviews than it is in presidential news conferences (see below).

To the extent that questioning has become more aggressive, the news interview (and its cousin the news conference) has been transformed into a

more formidable instrument of public accountability. It is now more difficult for officials to make purely self-serving statements in this invigorated journalistic arena. However, this revolution has stimulated a counter-revolution by politicians and public officials – increasingly sophisticated strategies of resistance, aided by a burgeoning cottage industry of media advisors and consultants (Jones 1992). There are broader ramifications for both journalism and government, and these will be explored in the conclusion.

News conferences

Closely related to the news interview is what was once known as the press briefing or conference, but is now perhaps more accurately termed the *news conference*. News conferences differ from interviews in a variety of important ways. They are independently-occurring events held at the behest of the public figure rather than the news media. They typically involve a much larger number of participating journalists from a variety of media outlets. And rather than consisting entirely of questions and answers, news conferences often begin with the public figure delivering an uninterrupted statement or speech and then fielding questions from participating journalists. This basic format not only characterizes news conferences *per se*, but it has also been exported to other public events. Thus presidential debates in recent years have often followed a quasi-news conference format, with each candidate answering questions from a panel of journalists.

Origins and institutionalization

Little is known about the early history of news conferences in the U.S., with the exception of those prominent encounters involving the president (e.g., Cornwell 1965, French 1982, Smith 1990, Tebbel and Watts 1985). The following historical account is thus limited to the presidential context and draws heavily on these sources. The institutionalization of the presidential news conference closely parallels that of the news interview, and it provides a useful exemplar of how the emergence of an interactional arena is tied to changes in both journalistic and political institutions.

In the nineteenth century, presidents occasionally had informal conversations with journalists, but they rarely participated in either formal on-the-record interviews or news conferences. Presidents did not, as a rule, instigate such encounters, and journalists do not appear to have been particularly enterprising in seeking them out. One journalist of the era recounts how, as late as the 1890s, reporters congregating outside the White House would approach cabinet officers for impromptu interviews, but they would refrain from speaking to the president as he passed by.

It is part of the unwritten law of the White House that newspaper men shall never approach the President as he passes to and fro near their alcove or crosses the portico to his carriage, unless he himself stops and talks to them. (Tarbell 1898: 214; quoted in Kernell 1986: 59)

This kind of self-restraint is of course unthinkable today. It is indicative of a vastly different president-press relationship, one in which the president is relatively inaccessible to direct journalistic engagements.

The only prominent exception during this period involves Andrew Johnson, who participated in at least a dozen formal interviews. Johnson's accessibility was extraordinary, but then so were the circumstances. Johnson oversaw the divisive post-Civil War reconstruction following Lincoln's assassination, and his conciliatory approach to the Southern states stimulated outrage in his own party in Congress. When impeachment seemed imminent, he fought back by using the bully pulpit, long before that term was coined, and doing newspaper interviews was part of this strategy (Tebbel and Watts 1985: 212-213). Thus, Johnson is truly the exception that proves the rule – the only nineteenth century president to be interviewed recurrently did so in a crisis situation, when his political survival was at stake.

Conferences involving groups of reporters did not emerge until the early decades of the twentieth century. As noted earlier, this was a time when journalism was becoming professionalized (Schudson 1978, 1988) and when presidents began to rely less on backstage negotiations with Congress and more on courting public opinion as a resource for governance (Kernell 1986, Tulis 1987). It is not coincidence that the presidents most responsible for developing and institutionalizing the news conference – Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt – were each progressive reformers with ambitious political agendas, and each sought to use such conferences to build popular support for their respective programs. Teddy Roosevelt began the practice of meeting regularly but informally with a select group of reporters, importing a practice from his prior experience as governor of New York. Woodrow Wilson made these meetings more open, more formal, and more interrogative in character, consciously or not following the British model of the Prime Minister's appearance before Parliament. After a period of retrenchment following the suspension of press conferences during World War I, Franklin Roosevelt held such meetings frequently and continuously through periods of both war and peace.

With FDR, the era of the journalistically accessible presidency was fully established. While the frequency of news conferences would subsequently decline, for more than four decades after FDR no president would avoid meeting openly with the press on a regular basis.

Patterns of participation

In order to understand who participates in news conferences, it is important to register that, from the public figure's vantage point, they provide what is in many ways a more attractive platform relative to the news interview. Consider first the sociopolitical environment of the news conference. Because news conferences are held at public figures' initiative, the timing and context of the encounter is more fully under their control. Recent presidents have exploited this to advantage, most notably by avoiding conferences during times of uncertainty, controversy, or scandal (cf., Lammers 1981). Thus, in the wake of the Iran-Contra scandal, Ronald Reagan suspended news conferences for almost a full year, and Bill Clinton held only a single conference in the year following the Monica Lewinski scandal. Conditions of interaction *within* the news conference are also favorable to the public figure. This theme will be explored further in the next section, but for now it may be noted that, relative to news interviews, public figures here are less constrained by journalists' questions and are thus able to exert greater influence on the discussion agenda. Finally, because numerous journalists are often present, the public figure gains access to a wide range of media outlets and can in principle reach a larger and more diverse audience. In summary, compared to news interviews, news conferences allow the public figure greater control over the context of the encounter, greater control over the discussion agenda, and the potential for superior public exposure.

This platform, while advantageous, is not equally available to all who might seek it. One must be sufficiently newsworthy to attract reporters in significant numbers, and there is a clear hierarchy in the capacity of officials to do this. The president is, of course, the ultimate newsmaker, and presidential news conferences are widely attended and are usually broadcast live on cable news channels. While presidents since FDR have held such conferences with declining frequency (Grossman and Kumar 1981: 245), the slack has been taken up by the White House press secretary who holds briefings on a daily basis. Within the administration, daily briefings are also held at the Departments of State and Defense, but most other administrative departments and agencies do not meet regularly with reporters (Hess 1984: 61-62).

Legislators, who are obviously more numerous and less powerful than the president, have a more difficult time attracting journalistic attention. The vast majority receive little or no attention from the national media, which tends to focus on those few legislators who occupy leadership positions and, in election years, those who are running for president (Cook 1989, Hess 1986). Thus, while the Senate majority and minority leaders hold daily conferences with reporters, rank-and-file Senators hold conferences much less frequently, and these are concentrated among committee chairs (Hess 1991). Moreover, these events tend to be poorly attended, leading some rank-and-file Senators to actively promote their conferences – via personal

invitations and offers of free food – in an effort to attract reporters in greater numbers (Hess 1991: 10).

Norms and practices

Conditions of interaction within the news conference in many ways resemble those of the news interview. Both involve questions and answers which are responsive to a similar set of institutional norms and pressures. However, compared to news interviews, news conferences entail a substantial shift in the interactional balance of power that favors the public figure over the journalist.

This tilt toward the public figure is embodied in a variety of features, the most obvious of which is the opportunity to make a preliminary and uninterrupted speech. This can in principle set the agenda for subsequent questioning, although this happens to a lesser extent than might be assumed. In a quantitative study of Eisenhower and Reagan news conferences (the main findings of which are reported in Clayman and Heritage 2002b), the president's opening remarks were found to have relatively little agenda-setting impact, so that more than 80% of journalists' questions concerned other matters. Nevertheless, opening remarks are commonplace and the propensity to make them has increased significantly – from roughly half of Eisenhower's conferences to more than 90% of Reagan's conferences – suggesting that even though it only minimally constrains journalists, the opportunity for unfettered communication with the audience is too attractive to ignore.

The public figure also benefits from the presence of numerous journalists, which fundamentally alters the conditions of exchange – necessitating special turn taking arrangements that typically give the public figure some capacity to determine who gets to ask each next question. In presidential news conferences, there has been periodic experimentation with different methods for selecting questioners. Early in the 20th century, Warren Harding instituted a rule that written questions be submitted in advance, apparently because he wanted to avoid the negative inferences that can follow when the president momentarily hesitates or overtly declines to answer a given question. Concerning this arrangement, which persisted through the subsequent Coolidge and Hoover administrations, Cornwell (1965: 67) has observed that "silence can be at times as pregnant with meaning as a specific answer, or at least can be so interpreted." Written questions eliminate this problem, allowing presidents to pick and choose their questions without being accountable for the questions they pass over. In a different vein, the Reagan administration experimented briefly with a prearranged order for the questioners, supposedly in an effort to bring greater decorum to encounters that were then being broadcast live. This arrangement had an unintended consequence – without the din of journalists clamoring for the president's

attention after each response, follow-up questions became easier to request and harder to avoid (Schegloff 1987: 223-225). Given this, the arrangement was subsequently abandoned.⁴

Notwithstanding these experiments, by far the most commonplace turn-taking arrangement, not only in presidential news conferences but in news conferences more generally, is for journalists to "bid" for each next question (by raising their hands and/or calling out the public figure's name) and for the public figure to select among the bidders. This of course facilitates the avoidance of journalists regarded as unfriendly or unduly aggressive.

Not only is journalists' access to the floor relatively limited, but this has the effect of diminishing their power as interrogators. In this context, the capacity to ask probing follow-up questions is contingent on the discretion of the public figure, and follow-ups are in general much less common here than in news interviews. Journalists adapt to this constraint by asking more complex questions – often two or three questions within a single turn at talk – and their questions may become more elaborate in conferences that allow fewer follow-ups. Nevertheless, journalists are much less able to pursue resistant or evasive answers, and this in turn licenses politicians to exert greater initiative in their responses. Indeed, some particularly blatant forms of resistance, which are virtually nonexistent in news interviews, are more commonplace in news conferences (Clayman 1993). The journalistic role is thus fragmented in this context, making it rather easier for public figures to "stay on message" and pursue their own agendas.

Dynamics of questioning: The case of the presidential news conference

Among news conferences, those involving the president are of course the most prominent and consequential. When designing questions for the president, journalists can choose to be relatively polite and deferential, or they can take up a more aggressive stance. The manner of questioning is thus an important contingency affecting presidential communication with the public, as well as an index of the president-press relationship as it evolves over time and under different sociopolitical circumstances. A large-scale quantitative study of presidential news conferences from Eisenhower through Clinton (1953-2000) explores the circumstances under which journalists gravitate toward these different postures (Clayman and Heritage 2002b, Clayman, et al. 2006). The study examines various aspects of aggressiveness in question design, including (1) *initiative*, whether the question is enterprising rather than passive in its objectives, (2) *directness*, whether the question is delivered bluntly rather than cautiously or indirectly, (3) *assertiveness*, whether the question displays a preference for a particular answer and is thus opinionated rather than neutral, and (4) *adversarialness*, whether the question pursues an agenda in opposition to the administration.

The results reveal significant historical trends toward greater journalistic aggressiveness on all dimensions. However, this generalization glosses over various complexities. The increase in directness stands out as more gradual, continuous, and unidirectional than the other dimensions. Thus, while journalists in the 1950s were exceedingly cautious and indirect in their questioning (e.g., often asking questions in the form "Would you care to tell us...," "Can I ask whether..."), they have gradually become more straightforward in putting issues before the president. Since this trend has steadily advanced across more than three decades, directness in question design appears to be a secular trend, one that is not driven by local sociopolitical events or conditions. Indeed, it may not be a journalistic trend *per se*, so much as one manifestation of broader societal developments such as the decline of formality in social relations.

By contrast, the other dimensions – initiative, assertiveness, and adversarialness – are more contextually sensitive, rising in a concentrated manner in certain historical periods and falling in others. These dimensions remained at a relatively low level from Eisenhower through Johnson (1953-1968), and then began an upward trend with Nixon that continued (with some perturbations) through Reagan's first term (1969-1984). The dimensions subsequently declined from Reagan's second term through Bush (1985-1992), only to rise again during Clinton's time in office (1993-2000). Because most of the main historical shifts in aggressiveness extend across multiple presidents, the characteristics of individual presidents (e.g., their party affiliation, political skills, general popularity) do not adequately explain such trends. It seems more likely that certain historical events and conditions (i.e., declining trust in the president stemming from the deceptions of Vietnam and Watergate, levels of political dissent, and economic decline) prompted journalists to exercise their watchdog role much more vigorously from the late 1960s through the mid-1980s, although they subsequently retreated to a somewhat less adversarial posture.

Multivariate research aimed at teasing out these explanatory factors demonstrates that there are robust predictors of aggressive questioning. Consider the question content – journalists behave differently depending on whether the question concerns domestic affairs as opposed to foreign and military affairs. Consistent with the "rally 'round the flag" syndrome and the maxim that "politics stops at the water's edge", journalists are significantly less aggressive when raising foreign and military matters. This tendency toward deference on foreign/military matters is remarkably robust – its magnitude has remained essentially stable for nearly a half-century.

Aggressiveness in questioning is also contingent on the identity of the questioner. Contrary to stereotypical notions of femininity and masculinity, female journalists tend to be more aggressive than their male counterparts, just as broadcasters tend to be more aggressive than those in print. Given that the White House press corps was originally dominated by male print reporters, it appears that "the new kids on the block" – women and those

working for radio and television news outlets – have tended to take up a more vigorous posture.

The broader context also matters. Journalists are not swayed by public perceptions of how well the president is doing (the president's job approval rating is not an independent predictor of aggressiveness), but they are attentive to the real state of the nation, growing more aggressive when economic conditions are poor. When either the unemployment rate or the prime interest rate is rising, journalists become significantly more aggressive in their questioning, although unemployment appears to have a stronger effect. Journalists thus exercise their watchdog role more vigorously during economic hard times, and they are attuned to conditions on both "Main Street" and "Wall Street".

Arenas involving audience participation

In contrast to the arenas examined thus far, which involve journalists and public figures exclusively, various arenas incorporate ordinary members of the public as active participants. These include radio call-in shows, TV talk shows that feature contributions from the studio audience and/or telephone calls from home viewers, and – in a somewhat different vein – town meetings.

The rise of the participatory audience

Audience participation is by no means a recent invention, even in the context of the mediated public sphere. Radio call-in shows have been around since at least the 1950s. But the participatory audience has become increasingly prominent in recent years, as measured by the growing number of programs organized around such participation and by the expansion of these programs beyond their humble origins in radio entertainment.

The audience participation show was pioneered on radio and became an institutionalized programming format by the 1960s (Munson 1993: 37ff). Although a few television programs in that period experimented with audience involvement in various forms, it did not come into its own as a prominent TV format until the 1980s. Not coincidentally, that was when the television marketplace was becoming increasingly competitive, and when the remote control and the practice of "channel grazing" sent TV producers in search of formats that would be "grazer-resistant" (Munson, 1993: 72). They turned to radio for inspiration, because radio channel grazing had been a fact of life for decades via the in-car pushbutton tuner. The participatory format seemed to have the kind of liveliness that could hold the home viewer's attention, while also capturing those who were just "grazing by."

Consider two major signposts of the rise of the participatory audience. Phil Donahue began his career on local talk radio and moved to local television in 1967. Although his daytime TV show was not initially conceived as involving the audience, he soon began to field questions and comments from those in the studio. Subsequent nationwide syndication of the popular program spawned nearly a dozen imitators, all built around the Donahue format and including a substantial dose of audience participation (Timberg 2002: 68-71, 93-95). Following a similar trajectory, Larry King created the late-night call-in show that bears his name on the medium of radio in the late 1970s, but he moved to television's CNN in 1985, and by the mid-1990s he was reaching an audience spanning more than 150 countries worldwide (Timberg 2002: 161-169).

Audience participation shows have not only expanded, but they have also become increasingly important in the realm of national politics. While political candidates once avoided these programs in favor of more "serious" news outlets, they have increasingly sought them out as part of a diversified campaign strategy in an increasingly segmented media market (Baum and Kernell 1999). The 1992 election season was a key turning point. In 1988, despite overtures from program producers, the major presidential candidates all refused to appear on both the *Donahue* show and *Larry King Live*, although Michael Dukakis reluctantly changed his mind and allowed a King appearance in an effort to counteract his weak performance in the debates. Four years later, in a dramatic turnaround, Ross Perot appeared on King's show and offered to toss his hat in the ring if "drafted" by the people, and tens of thousands later phoned his Dallas headquarters. Subsequently, George Bush and Bill Clinton each made three separate appearances on King's show, and a range of primary and general election presidential candidates appeared on *Donahue* (Kurtz 1996: 56-57, 90-92).

The town meeting, a forum that predates the broadcast media and continues to be held independently, has also shown signs of new life at the level of national politics. While it has long been used by political candidates as a way of connecting with potential voters and attracting news coverage, this forum has recently expanded beyond the domain of campaign strategy. Once again, 1992 appears to have been a turning point. That election season was the first in which a general election debate at the presidential level was conducted in accordance with a town meeting format, replacing the more common news conference format and thus placing ordinary citizens rather than journalists in the role of questioner. The format was used again in the presidential debates of 2000. Outside of elections, the town meeting forum has become a recurrent tool of presidential governance. Although it was rarely used in this way before 1992, Bill Clinton held a large number of town meetings on subjects ranging from health care to race relations, and George W. Bush has continued the practice albeit at a slower pace. Finally, the town meeting has also been taken up by broadcast news producers at ABC and CNN, who have recurrently exploited the format in recent years for special programs focused on pressing issues of the day.

Patterns of participation

The rise of the participatory audience gives ordinary people a greater voice in public deliberations, and it thus introduces a degree of "democratization" into the mediated public sphere. Indeed, one reason that politicians are drawn to audience-participatory arenas is that they are believed to yield insight into the prevailing climate of opinion. Such arenas enable politicians not only to gain publicity but also to take the pulse of the public with regard to specific issues and, more generally, to keep in touch with the concerns of ordinary people.

However, far from being a straightforward barometer of public opinion, audience members' contributions are not necessarily representative of the general public. A sequence of gatekeeping processes determine which members of the public come to participate actively in such programs, and these have the potential to introduce nonrandom factors into the selection process. The first level of selection bears on the composition of the audience – only some members of the public actually listen to or watch such programs, and even fewer attend the live event to become part of the studio audience. Among audience members, only some nominate themselves to make a contribution (e.g., by calling in or, in the case of the studio audience, by raising their hands). Finally, among those who bid to contribute, only some are chosen by call screeners or the host.

Audience research, while limited, provides evidence that these selection processes do indeed operate in a nonrandom manner. Consider the composition of the audience. The audience for daytime TV talk shows diverges from the general public on a range of demographic factors, with viewers disproportionately female, younger, less educated, and concentrated in lower income brackets (Davis and Owen, 1998: 149). There is also variation among programs, with the "classier" shows (e.g., *Oprah*) attracting more female, white, and middle class viewers than the "trashier" shows (e.g., *Ricki Lake* and *Jerry Springer*). The studio audience is even more distinctive, with a high proportion of tourists, school/church groups, college students, the unemployed, and the elderly (Grindstaff 2002: 61-64).

Correspondingly, the audience for talk radio is also demographically unlike the general population, with listeners wealthier, better educated, disproportionately male, and concentrated in the 30-49 age group (Davis and Owen 1998: 146). The talk radio audience is also politically distinctive, with listeners more likely to be affiliated with the Republican party and less likely to self-identify as "liberal" than the public at large (Davis and Owen 1998: 168-169, Herbst 1995). Not surprisingly, the audience for specific ideologically oriented programs like Rush Limbaugh's is even more distinctly partisan and ideological (Pan and Kosicki 1997).

Nonrandom factors also condition the processes by which some audience members come to contribute to the discussion. In a study of a BBC program broadcast on both radio and television, Davis and Curtise (2000) examined

the composition of callers to the program, as well the selection decisions made by call screeners. In terms of demographics, callers tended to be more male, middle class, and middle aged than the general electorate. Call screeners tended to reproduce the first two biases via their selection decisions, but they resisted the age bias by favoring somewhat younger callers. In terms of partisanship, callers were not much different from the electorate – both were disproportionately affiliated with the Labour party – but call screeners tended to favor Conservative and Liberal Democratic callers. This presumably reflected not a bias against the Labour party *per se*, but rather an effort to maintain a greater balance of perspectives on the program.

Norms and practices

Audience-participatory arenas may consist exclusively of exchanges between the host and audience members, but the majority also involve public figures or other noteworthy guests as participants. Although the host moderates the discussion, nominating topics and at times asking questions of the guest, at other times audience members take a prominent role by making comments and asking questions to which the guest is obliged to respond.

How do audience members – most of whom are laypersons with no particular expertise in broadcasting or politics – compare to journalists or other media professionals in their conduct toward public figures? Comparative research along these lines remains underdeveloped, and what such research might yield is by no means obvious. Audience members are subject to many cross-cutting forces which are quite unlike those bearing on journalists, and which could propel them in different directions. On the one hand, audience members are in general relatively inexperienced at public speaking and have little background in dealing with either public figures or the mass media. Consequently, relative to journalists, they tend to be less skilled at political interrogation and debate, and are apt to feel less of an entitlement to confront prominent public figures on the issues of the day. This should in turn encourage a more deferential posture.

Preliminary research on town meetings held by Bill Clinton after his election suggests that audience members do indeed differ from their journalistic counterparts in ways that bear the imprint of their status as ordinary citizens rather than journalistic professionals. For instance, audience members tend to raise an issue only after making it clear that they have some immediate connection to the issue and hence that it is a matter of personal interest or concern. To illustrate, notice how this audience member prefaces a question about the appointment of anti-abortion federal court judges (arrowed) – the speaker repeatedly indicates that this is of particular concern to her.

(4) [Clinton Town Meeting 3 Oct 1993]

- 1 C: → Mister president, my concern is that I've heard that
 2 you're considering the appointment of federal court
 3 judges who are anti-choice.
 4 → That concerns me very much, because I'm one of those
 5 people who elected you, and one of the issues that
 6 → I elected you was on being a pro-choice president.
 7 → I'm concerned about that. I'm concerned about your position.
 8 Is it changing? And if it is, why sit, and how would
 9 you explain it to us?
 10 BC: Well the answer to your question is no, it hasn't changed....
 11 ((several lines omitted))
 12 So you don't have to worry about that....

Correspondingly, as Clinton avows his continued commitment to abortion rights in response, he concludes by registering the questioner's personal stake in the issue (line 12). Moreover, when audience members make claims to knowledge of public affairs, such claims may be epistemically marked in ways that not only display the grounds of knowledge but also portray it as having been acquired in a "casual" or unmotivated manner (e.g., "I've heard that...," "I noticed that..."). In the preceding example, the possibility that Clinton might appoint anti-choice judges is framed as something that the questioner has "heard" about (line 1), rather than something she understands or has been monitoring closely or simply knows as a matter of course. Thus, while audience members' interest in specific issues is presented as personally motivated, their knowledge of public affairs is cast as unmotivated. Neither of these features appear in professional journalists' questions, and in combination they both reflect and reinforce the questioner's status as an "ordinary citizen." Moreover, such features may be indicative of a modicum of cautiousness on the part of audience members regarding the issues they can raise and the knowledge they can claim in doing so (see also Moberg this volume; Myers, 2000; Thornborrow, 2001).

On the other hand, precisely because lay audience members are peripheral to the worlds of media and politics, they lack the relational baggage that might otherwise inhibit their participation. Members of the Washington press corps, for example, regularly encounter and come to know government officials, and they must act in the context of developing relationships and in anticipation of future encounters. Lay audience members, in contrast, stand in a detached and anonymous relationship to officials – a relationship in which direct contact normally does not extend beyond a single question-answer exchange. This could in principle facilitate greater levels of adversarialness. For instance, at Clinton's town hall meetings, it was rather common for audience members to ask the president to explain and justify his policies, thereby in effect holding the president accountable for his ac-

tions. For instance, in example 4 above, after asking the president to confirm that his position is indeed changing, the questioner goes on to ask him to explain why (lines 8-9). Professional journalists do not ask explicit accountability questions of the president very often, although the frequency of such questions has increased in recent years in tandem with other manifestations of aggressiveness in question design (Clayman and Heritage 2002b; Clayman, et. al. 2006). Accordingly, this is one way in which ordinary people do indeed withhold deference and act with some vigorosity toward the president. Whether lay aggressiveness toward public figures is manifest in other ways, and the circumstances that condition its expression, remain to be determined.

Implications

Given important differences between genres of broadcast talk – differences in historical development, conditions of access, and modes of conduct – theorizing about the broader sociopolitical significance of broadcast talk should proceed with caution. Sweeping generalizations must be disciplined by reference to specific interactional arenas and supported by empirical observations about how those arenas actually operate. With this cautionary note in mind, the following is offered as a set of grounded but as yet preliminary hypotheses that might guide future research.

Consider first the implications for politicians and political communication. The increasing prominence of interaction places new demands on public officials and political candidates, thus altering the communicative skills and practices that facilitate success in politics. Indeed, new technologies of communication have often had this effect. The rise of broadcasting fundamentally changed the nature of political speechmaking, fostering a more restrained, personal, and intimate style of oratory (Jamieson 1988). Correspondingly, the rise of interactional formats *within* broadcasting has reshaped the landscape of political communication once again. The new environment places a premium on the ability to speak without a script, deal with unforeseen contingencies, and manage the delicate balancing act of being properly responsive to others while continuing to "stay on message". Just as Ronald Reagan was supremely suited to the communicative demands of the classic television era, Bill Clinton was particularly suited to the new interaction-based media age. Of course, older communicative skills are far from obsolete (Atkinson, 1986), but new skills have come to the fore as the communication environment has expanded and diversified.

This kind of communication environment has also reduced the social distance separating government officials and other elites from the public at large. Where a certain aloofness attends the act of delivering an unfettered speech, communication in the interactional arena requires direct engage-

ment with, and attentiveness to, both journalists and ordinary people. For U.S. presidents, the growing prominence of interaction thus continues a trend that began a century ago, when presidents first started to supplement backstage intragovernmental negotiations with public relations as tools of governance. Just as the practice of actively courting public opinion brought presidents closer to "the people", the current practice of directly engaging ordinary people and their journalistic surrogates marks a new phase in this process.⁵ Moreover, if the sheer fact of interaction has a leveling effect on elite-public relations, this effect will be modulated by how elites are actually treated within interaction. Thus, while highly deferential patterns of conduct mark government officials as having elevated status, the withholding of deference and the willingness to act aggressively toward officials plainly "brings them down a notch".

The increased prominence of interaction has had a corresponding impact on the institution of journalism. Broadcast interaction has substantially changed journalistic work routines, redefined professional skills, and altered the conditions of professional success. If journalists previously gained professional status and popular renown mainly by virtue of their investigative and literary abilities, their ranks have been joined by journalists known mainly for their skills at questioning and interrogation (e.g., Sam Donaldson and Ted Koppel in the U.S., Robin Day and Jeremy Paxman in the U.K.).

Moreover, as the obverse of the leveling effect noted above, interaction has placed journalists on the same public playing field as government officials from the president on down, although here again the specific consequences will be contingent on the level of deference journalists choose to display when dealing with their prominent guests. Through vigorous, nondeferential questioning (of the sort documented in presidential press conferences from the 1970s on) journalists enhance their own relative status, and they also present themselves as autonomous professionals who are willing to hold even the most elite agents of power accountable before the public.

Finally, the rise of interaction has introduced a degree of democratization into the public sphere, or at least that component of the public sphere constituted by the mass media (Carpignano et al., 1990, Livingstone and Lunt 1994). Insofar as broadcast talk incorporates audience participation, ordinary people gain a voice in a highly prominent deliberative domain previously dominated by media professionals and public figures. On the other hand, this development does not alter the ways in which the contemporary public sphere may fall short of democratic ideals (cf., Habermas 1989). The deliberative promise of audience-participatory broadcast talk must be tempered with a realistic assessment of how conditions of access and norms of conduct impose constraints on participation.

Notes

1. Prominent news production studies include Altheide (1974), Epstein (1973), Fishman (1980), Gans (1979), Hess (1981), Kaniss (1991), Molotch and Lester (1974), Pedely (1995), and Tuchman (1978).
2. See Entman and Rojecki (2001), Gitlin (1980), Hallin (1986), Jamieson and Waldman (2003), Kerbel (1994), Patterson (1994), and Robinson and Sheehan (1980).
3. For an historical account of the later development of news interviews on television, see Clayman and Heritage (2002a: Chapter 2).
4. The prearranged-questioner system has recently been resurrected in the current Bush Administration, but its fate remains uncertain.
5. The leveling effect of interaction dovetails with, but operates independently of, the leveling effects of electronic media discussed by Meyrowitz (1985).

* Note

The chapter is as revised and reprinted version from *Poetics*, Vol 32, Clayman, S.: 'Arenas of Interaction in the Mediated Public Sphere', pages 29-49, with permission from Elsevier.

References

- Altheide, D.L. (1974) *Creating Reality: How TV News Distorts Events*. Beverly Hills: Age.
- Atkinson, J.M. (1986) 'The 1983 Election and the Demise of Live Oratory', in I. Crewe, M. Harrop (eds.) *Political Communications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 38-55.
- Auletta, K. (1991) *Three Blind Mice: How the TV Networks Lost Their Way*. New York: Random House.
- Baum, Matthew A. (2003) *Soft News Goes to War: Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy in the New Media Age*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Baum, M.A., and Kernell, S. (1999) 'Has Cable Ended the Golden Age of Television?', *American Political Science Review* 93: 99-114.
- Bull, P., and Mayer, K. (1988) 'Interruptions in Political Interviews', *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 7: 35-45.
- Burger, M. (2002) 'Identities at Stake in Social Interaction: The Case of Media Interviews', *Studies in Communication Sciences* 2(2): 1-20.
- Burger, M., and Fillicetaz, L. (2002) 'Media Interviews: An Intersection of Multiple Social Practices', in C. Candlin (ed.) *Research and Practice in Professional Discourse*, pp. 567-588. Hong Kong: City University Press.
- Carbaugh, D. (1988) *Talking American: Cultural Discourses on Donabue*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Carpignano, P., Andersen, R., Aronowitz, S. and DiFazio, W. (1990) 'Chatter in the Age of Electronic Reproduction: Talk, Television, and the 'Public Mind', *Social Text* 25/26, pp. 33-55.
- Clayman, S.E. (1990) 'From Talk to Text: Newspaper Accounts of Reporter-Source Interactions', *Media, Culture and Society* 12(1): 79-104.
- Clayman, S.E. (1993) 'Reformulating the Question: A Device for Answering/Not Answering Questions in News Interviews and Press Conferences', *Text* 13: 159-188.
- Clayman, S.E. and Heritage, J. (2002a) *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures On the Air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clayman, S.E. and Heritage, J. (2002b) 'Questioning Presidents: Journalistic Deference and Adversarialness in the Press Conferences of U.S. Presidents Eisenhower and Reagan', *Journal of Communication* 52: 749-775.
- Clayman, S.E., Elliott, M.N., Heritage, J., and McDonald, L.L. (2006) 'Historical Trends in Questioning Presidents 1953-2000', *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, in press.

- Cohen, J.E. (2004) 'If the News Is So Bad, Why Are Polls So High? Presidents, the News Media, and the Mass Public in an Era of New Media', *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 34(3): 493-515.
- Cook, T. (1989) *Making Laws and Making News*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Cornewell, E. (1965) *Presidential Leadership of Public Opinion*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Croteau, D. and Hoynes, W. (1994) *By Invitation Only: How the Media Limit Political Debate*. Common Courage, Monroe, ME.
- Davis, Richard and John Curtice (2000) 'Speaking for the Public: Representation and Audience Participation During the 1997 British General Election Campaign', *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 5: 62-77.
- Davis, Richard and Diana Owen (1998) *New Media and American Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ekstrom, M. 2001 'Politicians Interviewed on Television News', *Discourse and Society* 12(5): 563-584.
- Entman, R.M. and Rojecki, A. (2001) *The Black Image in the White Mind: Media and Race in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Epstein, E.J. (1973) *News From Nowhere*. New York: Random House.
- Fishman, M. (1980) *Manufacturing the News*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- French, B.A. (1982) *The Presidential Press Conference*. Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- Gansorn, J. (1998) *Freaks Talk Back*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gans, H. (1979) *Deciding What's News*. New York: Vintage.
- Gitlin, T. (1980) *The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Greatbatch, D. (1992) 'On the Management of Disagreement between News Interviewees', in P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds.) *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 268-301.
- Grindstaff, L. (2002) *The Money Shot: Trash, Class, and the Making of TV Talk Shows*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Grossman, M.B. and Kumar, M.J. (1981) *Portraying the President: The White House and the News Media*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1989) *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hallin, D. (1994) *The 'Uncensored War': The Media and Vietnam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hallin, D. (1997) *We Keep America on Top of the World*. London: Routledge.
- Herbst, S. (1995) 'On Electronic Public Space: Talk Shows in Theoretical Perspective', *Political Communication* 12, 263-274.
- Heritage, J. and Roth, A. (1995) 'Grammar and Institution: Questions and Questioning in the Broadcast News Interview', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28(1), 1-60.
- Hess, S. (1981) *The Washington Reporters*. The Brookings Institution, Washington, DC.
- Hess, S. (1984) *The Government/Press Connection: Press Officers and Their Offices*. The Brookings Institution, Washington, DC.
- Hess, S. (1986) *The Ultimate Insiders: U.S. Senators and the Media*. The Brookings Institution, Washington, DC.
- Hess, S. (1991) *Live From Capitol Hill: Studies of Congress and the Media*. The Brookings Institution, Washington, DC.
- Hutchby, I. (1996) *Confrontation Talk: Arguments, Asymmetries, and Power in Talk Radio*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hutchby, I. (1999) 'Frame Attenuation and Footing in the Organization of Talk Radio', *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3, 41-63.
- Hutchby, I. (2005) *Media Talk: Conversation Analysis and the Study of Broadcasting*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Jacobs, R.N. (2000) *Race, Media, and the Crisis of Civil Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jamieson, K.H. (1988) *Eloquence in an Electronic Age: The Transformation of Political Speech-making*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K.H. and Waldman, P. (2003) *The Press Effect*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, B. (1992) 'Broadcasters, Politicians, and the Political Interview', in B. Jones, L. Robins (eds.), *Two Decades in British Politics*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, pp. 53-77.
- Kaniss, P. (1991) *Making Local News*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kerbel, M. R. (1994) *Edited For Television: CNN, ABC, and the 1992 Presidential Campaign*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Kernell, S. (1986) *Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadership*. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Kurtz, H. (1996) *Hot Air: All Talk, All the Time*. New York: Random House.
- Lammers, W.W. (1981) 'Presidential Press-conference Schedules: Who Hides, and When?' *Political Science Quarterly* 96: 261-278.
- Laverbach, G. (2004) 'Political Interviews as hybrid Genre', *Text* 24(3): 353-397.
- Leonard, T.C. (1986) *The Power of the Press*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Livingstone, S. and Lunt, P. (1994) *Talk on Television: Audience Participation in Public Debate*. New York: Routledge.
- Martinez, E.R. (2003) *Talk on Television: The Interactional Organization of Three Broadcast Genres*. Vigo: Universidade de Vigo.
- Meyrowitz, J. (1985) *No Sense of Place*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Molotch, H. and Lester, M. (1974) 'News as Purposive Behavior: On the Strategic Use of Routine Events, Accidents, and Scandals', *American Sociological Review* 39: 101-112.
- Munson, W. (1993) *All Talk: The Talk Show in Media Culture*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Myers, G. (2000) 'Entitlement and Sincerity in Broadcast News Interviews about Princess Diana', *Media, Culture, and Society* 22: 167-185.
- Olsher, D. (forthcoming) 'Inviting Interplay in Panel Format News Interviews'.
- Owen, Diana (1997) 'Talk Radio and Evaluations of President Clinton', *Political Communication* 14: 333-353.
- Pan, Z. and Kosicki, G.M. (1997) 'Talk Show Exposure as an Opinion Activity', *Political Communication* 14, 371-388.
- Patterson, T.E. (1994) *Out of Order*. New York: Random House.
- Pedely, M. (1995) *War Stories: The Culture of the Foreign Correspondent*. London: Routledge.
- Robinson, M.J. and Sheehan, M.A. (1980) *Over-the-Wire and On TV: CBS and UPJ in Campaign '80*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Roth, A. (1998) 'Who Makes News', *Media, Culture, and Society* 20, 79-107.
- Roth, A. (2002) 'Social Epistemology in Broadcast News Interviews', *Language in Society* 31: 355-381.
- Roth, A. (2005) 'Pop Quizzes' on the Campaign Trail: Journalists, Candidates, and the Limits of Questioning', *Press/Politics* 10(2): 28-46.
- Scannell, P. (ed.) (1991) *Broadcast Talk*. London: Sage.
- Shattuck, J. (1997) *The Talking Cure*. New York: Routledge.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1987) 'Between Macro and Micro', in J. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Munch, N. Smelser (eds.), *The Micro-Macro Link*. Berkeley: University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, pp. 207-234.
- Schudson, M. (1978) *Discovering the News*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schudson, M. (1988) 'The Profession of Journalism in the United States', in N.O. Hatch (ed.), *The Professions in American History*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, pp. 145-161.

- Schudson, M. (1994) 'Question authority'. *Media, Culture and Society* 16, 565-587.
- Smith, C. (1990) *Presidential Press Conferences*. New York: Praeger.
- Tarbell, I. (1898) 'President McKinley in War Times', *McClure's Magazine* XI: 209-224.
- Tebbel, J. W. and Wats, S. M. (1985) *The Press and the Presidency*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thornborrow, J. (2001) 'Authenticating Talk: Building Public Identities in Audience Participation Broadcasting', *Discourse Studies* 3(4): 459-79.
- Timberg, B. M. (2002) *Television Talk*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Tolson, A. (ed.) (2001) *Television Talk Shows*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tuchman, G. (1978) *Making News*. New York: Free Press.
- Tulis, J. (1987) *The Rhetorical Presidency*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

The Authors

Steven E. Clayman received his Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of California, Santa Barbara. He is currently Professor of Sociology and is affiliated with the Communication Studies Program at UCLA. His research lies at the intersection of talk, interaction, and mass communication. Much of his work concerns various forms of broadcast journalism, with an emphasis on news interviews and presidential press conferences. He has also examined journalistic gatekeeping processes, the dynamics of quotations and soundbites, and collective audience behavior in political speeches and debates. He is the author (with John Heritage) of *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures On the Air* (Cambridge University Press 2002).

Konstantin Economou received his Ph.D. in Communication at the Tema Institute at Linköping University. He is senior lecturer in Culture and media-production at Norrköping campus of Linköping University. His research interests have ranged from institutional interaction in popular culture settings to critical discourse analysis of journalist and political talk. Among his publications are *Making Music Work: Culturing Youth in an Institutional Setting*. (Linköping studies in art and science no 100), and "Representing politics – politizizing journalism: Exploring communicative dilemmas in the collegial relationship between Swedish journalists and politicians" *Javmost – The Public; Journal of the European Institute for Communication and Culture*, 4(2) 1997.

Martin Eide is Professor of Journalism and Media Studies at the University of Bergen, Norway. He has done research within the fields of political communication, the sociology of journalism and media history. Among his publications are *Nybetens interesse. Nyhetsjournalistikk mellom tekst og koniekt* (News Interest. News Journalism Between Text and Context) (Scandinavian University Press 1991/1995), *Den redigerende makt. Redaktørrollens norske historie* (The Power of Editing. The Norwegian History of the Role of the Editor) (Norwegian Academic Press 2000). He has published articles in journals such as *European Journal of Communication and Media, Culture & Society*.

Mats Ekström is Professor of Sociology and of Media and Communication Studies at Örebro University. He has published a number of books and articles on methodology, journalism, television, and the mediation of politics (e.g. *The Ethical Problem of Journalism*, Rabén 1996; *Explaining Society*, Routledge 2002; "Epistemologies of TV-Journalism" in *Journalism: Theory, Practice and Criticism*, 3(3) 2002, "Information, storytelling and at-