SAGE ANNUAL REVIEWS OF COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

Other Books in This Series:

Volume 1: *Current Perspectives in Mass Communication Research*
F. Gerald Kline and Phillip J. Tichenor, Editors

Volume 2: *New Models for Mass Communication Research*
Peter Clarke, Editor

Volume 3: *The Uses of Mass Communications*
Jay G. Blumler and Elihu Katz, Editors

Volume 4: *Political Communication*
Steven H. Chaffee, Editor

Volume 5: *Explorations in Interpersonal Communication*
Gerald R. Miller, Editor

Volume 6: *Strategies for Communication Research*
Paul M. Hirsch, Peter V. Miller, and F. Gerald Kline, Editors

Volume 7: *Children Communicating*
Ellen Wartella, Editor

Volume 8: *Persuasion*
Michael E. Roloff and Gerald R. Miller, Editors

Volume 9: *Advances in Content Analysis*
Karl Erik Rosengren, Editor

Volume 10: *Individuals in Mass Media Organizations*
James S. Ettema and D. Charles Whitney, Editors

Volume 11: *Nonverbal Interaction*
John M. Wiemann and Randall P. Harrison, Editors

Volume 12: *Interpreting Television*
Willard D. Rowland, Jr. and Bruce Watkins, Editors

Volume 13: *Organizational Communication*
Robert D. McPhee and Phillip K. Tompkins, Editors

Volume 14: *Interpersonal Processes*
Michael E. Roloff and Gerald R. Miller, Editors

Volume 15: *Media, Myths, and Narratives*
James W. Carey, Editor

Volume 16: *Advancing Communication Science*

Editors
Robert P. Hawkins ■ John M. Wiemann ■ Suzanne Pingree

Advancing Communication Science: Merging Mass and Interpersonal Processes

Sage Annual Reviews of Communication Research

Volume 16

SAGE PUBLICATIONS
The Publishers of Professional Social Science
Newbury Park Beverly Hills London New Delhi

For information address:

SAGE Publications, Inc.
2111 West Hillcrest Drive
Newbury Park, California 91320

SAGE Publications Inc.
275 South Beverly Drive
Beverly Hills
California 90212

SAGE Publications Ltd.
28 Banner Street
London EC1Y 8QE
England

SAGE PUBLICATIONS India Pvt. Ltd.
M-32 Market
Greater Kailash I
New Delhi 110 048 India

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Advancing communication science : merging mass and interpersonal processes / [edited] by Robert P. Hawkins, John M. Wiemann, Suzanne Pingree.
p. cm. — (Sage annual reviews of communication research ; v. 16)
Bibliography: p.
ISBN 0-8039-3141-7 ISBN 0-8039-3142-5 (pbk.)
1. Communication. I. Hawkins, Robert P., 1931- . II. Wiemann, John M. III. Pingree, Suzanne. IV. Series.
P91.25.A38 1988
001.51—dc19 88-823
CIP

FIRST PRINTING 1988

CONTENTS

Editor's Introduction: Toward Conceptual Synthesis
SUZANNE PINGREE, JOHN M. WIEMANN, and ROBERT P. HAWKINS 7

1. Comparing Mediated and Interpersonal Communication Data
STEVEN H. CHAFFEE and DIANA C. MUTZ 19
2. Emotional Education and Mass Media: A New View of the Global Village
ROSS BUCK 44
3. Discourse and Message Analysis: The Micro-Structure of Mass Media Messages
JOHN C. HERITAGE, STEVEN CLAYMAN, and DON H. ZIMMERMAN 77
4. Interactivity: From New Media to Communication
SHEIZAF RAFAELI 110
5. Monologue, Dialogue, and Telelog: Comparing an Emergent Form of Communication with Traditional Forms
SANDRA J. BALL-ROKEACH and KATHLEEN REARDON 135
6. From Reactivity to Activity and Action: An Evolving Concept and *Weltanschauung* in Mass and Interpersonal Communication
JENNINGS BRYANT and RICHARD L. STREET, Jr. 162
7. Cognition and Communication
ROBERT P. HAWKINS and JOHN DALY 191
8. Developing Communication Skills
BETH HASLETT and ALISON ALEXANDER 224
9. Theories of Family Communication: Toward a Merger of Intersubjectivity and Mutual Influence Processes
JEANNE M. MEADOWCROFT and MARY ANNE FITZPATRICK 253
10. The Caravan of Communication and Its Multiple Histories: A Dialogue
JAMES A. ANDERSON, DOUGLAS BIRKHEAD, DAVID L. EASON, and MARY S. STRINE 276

About the Contributors 309

Russell, B. (1948). *Human knowledge: Its scope and limits.* New York: Simon & Schuster.
Saul, L. J., Rome, H., & Lenser, E. (1946). Desensitization of combat fatigue patients. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 102,* 476-478.
Schwartz, G. E., Fair, P. L., Salt, P., Mandel, M. R., & Klerman, G. L. (1976). Facial expression and imagery in depression: An electromyographic study. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 38,* 337-347.
Schwartz, L. A. (1945). Group psychotherapy in the war neuroses. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 101,* 498-500.
Thomas, M. H., Horton, R. W., Lippencott, E. C., & Drabman, R. S. (1977). Desensitization to portrayals of real-life aggression as a function of exposure to television violence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55,* 450-483.
Tucker, D. M. (1981). Lateral brain function, emotion, and conceptualization. *Psychological Bulletin, 89,* 19-46.
Tucker, D. M. (1986). Neural control of emotional communication. In P. Blanck, R. Buck, & R. Rosenthal (Eds.), *Nonverbal communication in the clinical context.* University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
Vaughan, K. B., & Lanzetta, J. T. (1980). Vicarious instigation and conditioning of facial expressive and autonomic responses to a model's expressive display of pain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38,* 909-923.
Weinberg, P., & Konnert, F.-J. (1984). Emotional facial expressions in advertisements. *Advances in Consumer Research, 11.*
Weiner, M., Devoe, S., Rubinow, S., & Geller, J. (1972). Nonverbal behavior and nonverbal communication. *Psychological Review, 3,* 185-214.
Wilson, B., & Cantor, J. (1984). *Developmental differences in empathy with a television protagonist's fear.* Unpublished paper, University of Wisconsin.
Wilson, E. O. (1975). *Sociobiology: The new synthesis.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap.
Wolpe, J. (1958). *Psychotherapy by reciprocal inhibition.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Zillmann, D. (1983). Transfer of excitation in emotional behavior. In J. T. Cacioppo & R. E. Petty (Eds.), *Social psychophysiology: A sourcebook* (pp. 215-240). New York: Guilford.
Zillmann, D., & Bryant, J. (1982). Pornography, sexual callousness, and the trivialization of rape. *Journal of Communication, 32,* 10-21.
Zillmann, D., & Bryant, J. (1985). *Selective exposure to communication.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Zillmann, D., Hezel, R. T., & Medoff, N. J. (1980). The effect of affective states on selective exposure to televised entertainment fare. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 10,* 323-329.

Chapter 3

DISCOURSE AND MESSAGE ANALYSIS
The Micro-Structure of Mass Media Messages

John C. Heritage, Steven Clayman, and Don H. Zimmerman

STUDENTS OF COMMUNICATION have typically conceptualized mass communication processes as qualitatively distinct from interpersonal communication. This distinction has been associated with a tendency to define *mass communication* as technologically mediated discourse and hence as shaped by the technical constraints on communication that are intrinsic to the print and electronic media. Accordingly, mass communication is distinguished from interpersonal communication in terms of its lack of feedback, with a corresponding separation of message production from its reception by an audience (e.g., McQuail, 1984, pp. 25-35; Schramm, 1973, pp. 113-120).

This orientation has had a significant impact on mass communication research generally and the analysis of message content in particular. The media message has been predominantly treated as a variable within a larger mass communication process: It is a dependent variable within theories of message production and an independent variable in theories that deal with its effect on audiences and society in general (Adams, 1978; McQuail, 1984, pp. 123-126). A significant consequence has been that content research has been largely limited to thematic analyses that attempt to identify systematic content patterns reflecting persistent stereotypes, biases, or underlying presuppositions. The findings of this research are then used to support hypotheses about prior production processes or subsequent functions or effects.

This preoccupation with content has tended to obscure other significant approaches to the study of media messages. In particular, the predominant emphasis on thematic content has generally overshadowed the more general question of how such messages, whatever their content, are organized and assembled. Hence, the formal properties of media messages that underlie the diversity of various "contents" remain largely unexplored. (See Anderson & Sharrock, 1979, and Paletz & Pearson, 1978, for similar criticisms.) This is unfortunate because the underlying structuring of media messages is presumably a fundamental feature of their "production," as well as the basic framework through which whatever "effects" they may have are achieved.

While there have been a few encouraging developments along these lines (e.g., Hallin & Mancini, 1984; Lee, 1984; Schudson, 1982; Trew, 1979a, 1979b; Tuchman, 1972, 1973; van Dijk, 1983; Weaver, 1975), these studies are few in number and they lack a coherent or integrating framework. Some are concerned with describing differences in the narrative structure of media messages as these vary historically (Schudson, 1982), cross-culturally (Hallin & Mancini, 1984), or between different media (such as newspaper news versus television news) (Weaver, 1975). Others are concerned with the selection and arrangement of lexical items (Lee, 1984; Trew, 1979a, 1979b), and procedures for displaying objectivity (Tuchman, 1972, 1973).

In this chapter, we propose to explore a relatively neglected dimension of the production of broadcast news messages, which, we believe, may strongly influence both their structure and their interpretation by audiences. This dimension is the matrix of interpersonal communication through which a substantial proportion of news messages are generated. In the present context, we will restrict our discussion to the role of interpersonal communication in shaping the contours of broadcast news output.

INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION AS A MEDIUM OF NEWS MESSAGE CONSTRUCTION

The significance of interpersonal communication as a factor shaping the content of broadcast news is intuitively apparent from even a cursory inspection of the nightly news. The average news program contains a substantial quantity of interview material with "news

makers" or other persons "in the news." Self-evidently, this material is created through processes of social interaction—primarily by sequences of questions and answers—which may strongly shape its content. Moreover, there are other aspects of news output that are also the product of social interaction—film or video footage of press conferences, addresses and speeches presented in formal or informal settings. These materials are also strongly shaped by interactional conventions and constraints.

The use of news material that incorporates a social interactional dimension has become common in recent years. News producers (and, in some cases, news makers) increasingly prefer to use material displaying the qualities of informality and spontaneity that are characteristic features of other areas of TV output. Interpersonal interaction is perhaps the prime medium through which these qualities can be exhibited. Thus the apparently preferred way of conveying the current state of health of the president of the United States is via a shouted conversation from the window of a hospital room rather than a press statement or interview. The sentiments of released hostages' relatives are depicted through the interactions of family members rather than through statements to the camera regardless of how intrusive the former procedure might be held to be. The recently developed presidential practice of "informal" communication to the press corps in the "off-stage" moments occurring in the interstices of public events has created a situation in which coverage of these interactions can predominate over coverage of the formal business (for example, joint statements with visiting heads of state) on which they are parasitic.

The steady growth in the program makers' preference for the interactive presentation of news is also manifested in the development of studio practices. Increasingly, the older film report to camera employed by foreign correspondents has, facilitated by improvements in world-wide communications technology, given way to immediate on-air interactions in which correspondents are interviewed by anchor personnel. Moreover, inside the studio itself, news presentation, which was once regarded largely as a matter of "reading the printed word aloud" (Whale, 1977), is now developed though quasi-conversational interaction that is facilitated by the ubiquitous "two-anchor" presentational format.

The consistent growth in the use of social interaction as a medium through which the news is presented suggests that it has become increasingly unrealistic to analyze the structure and content of news

messages independent of the interactional medium within which they are generated. For, although the medium may not be the message, the interactional structures through which broadcast news is conveyed must necessarily contribute to the content and appearance of news messages.

In this chapter, we outline some aspects of current research on the structuring of social interaction that sheds light on these phenomena and we suggest some ways in which they may be significant for the analysis of news output. Our material is structured so as to present two distinct areas of news content—the production and reportage of political speeches and news interviews—where an understanding of fundamental aspects of interpersonal communication may be of value in analyzing aspects of news output.

INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION AND NEWS OUTPUT

BACKGROUND

The materials on which this chapter is based derive from a sociological perspective on interpersonal communication that has become known under the generic name of conversation analysis (henceforth, CA).[1] Rather than approaching communication in terms of the psychological or other characteristics of speakers and hearers, CA seeks to determine the underlying structural frameworks that organize fundamental regularities in social interaction. These frameworks structure both the distribution of opportunities for interactional participation and the kinds of options that may be exercised within the opportunities that are created. From the CA perspective, these frameworks are treated as sets of normative rules and practices for whose implementation speakers are held both accountable and sanctionable.

Although CA was originally developed as a means of analyzing ordinary conversation, it can readily be adapted to the analysis of talk in other settings, including talk that is conducted for large overhearing audiences. A number of recent studies have begun to apply CA methods to such material (e.g., Atkinson, 1982, 1984a, 1984b, 1987; Clayman, 1986, 1987; Clayman & Zimmerman, 1987; Heritage, 1985; Greatbatch, 1985, 1986a, 1986b, 1986c, 1988; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986).

Before reviewing this research, however, we will first outline some

basic principles of spoken interaction derived from the analysis of ordinary conversation, beginning with a characterization of the turn-taking systems that are operative in conversational and other interactional contexts. Turn-taking in its various forms constitutes a fundamental dimension of spoken interaction that may structure both its form and its substance. We will then proceed to a discussion of recent research in this area that adopts this approach to analyze processes of communication in news interviews and other mass communication contexts.

TURN-TAKING SYSTEMS IN SOCIAL INTERACTION: SOME PRELIMINARIES

While ordinary conversation is undoubtedly the primary and most fundamental form of human communication, all cultures contain a variety of other forms of spoken interaction. Terms such as *interrogation*, *interview*, *speech*, *debate*, *ceremony*, and the like speak to the fact that a variety of interactional forms can be readily recognized and distinguished from one another in an intuitive way.

It is possible, however, to move beyond these commonsense concepts and to specify more formally the bases upon which these interactional forms differ. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) propose that their differences derive in substantial part from the manner in which turns at talk are constructed and allocated to specific speakers; in other words, one important difference—perhaps the most fundamental one—has to do with the way the taking of turns is organized. In this context, ordinary conversation represents a kind of interactional baseline, such that all other speech exchange systems are systematic transformations of its basic turn-taking system (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974, pp. 729-731).

In general, the opportunity to speak may usefully be thought of as a valued resource that enables the user to exert some influence on interactional coparticipants. Like many other valued goods, however, the opportunity to speak is a scarce resource and requires some form of social organization through which it can be distributed. Turn-taking systems represent institutionalized solutions to this problem.

Many procedures for organizing the social distribution of turns exist. Albert (1964), for example, has described a system used among the Burundi of East Africa in which seniority of rank is used to determine the order in which the participants will speak. In "chaired" meetings in

contemporary Western society, chairpersons may speak after each speaker and use their turns to select the next speaker (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974, p. 729). For a short period during the Reagan presidency, opportunities to put questions at press conferences were determined through a randomly predetermined number system (Schegloff, 1987). While all of these procedures manifestly involve substantial departures from the way in which turn-taking is managed in ordinary conversation, a more familiar kind of departure is evident in a range of contemporary institutional settings such as courtrooms, classrooms, and news interviews. Here interaction is organized through *turn-type* preallocation (Atkinson & Drew, 1979) in which the incumbents of specific social roles are restricted to the production of particular kinds of actions—broadly, the asking and answering of questions. The significance of this form of turn-taking can be best appreciated by setting it against a background of the turn-taking practices that are characteristic of conversation.

TURN-TAKING IN CONVERSATION

In their classic discussion of the turn-taking system for conversation,[2] Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974, pp. 700-701) differentiate between conversation on the one hand and other speech exchange systems such as interviews, debates, and ceremonies on the other. Speech exchange systems, they propose, differ in terms of certain basic parameters that characterize the organization of turns (henceforth, "turn organizational parameters"), and the organization of the speech encounter as a whole unit (henceforth, "global parameters"). In conversation, the turn organizational parameters of turn order, turn length, and turn content are not fixed in advance, but are left free to vary. Similarly, global parameters such as the overall distribution of turns among speakers and the overall length of the conversation are also locally variable. Accordingly, the specific values of these variable parameters are achieved as the outcome of a turn-taking process in which the size, content, allocation, and, in the aggregate, the distribution of turns is interactionally managed on a local turn-by-turn basis.

Sacks et al. propose that conversational turn-taking is managed through procedures that address two core aspects: turn construction and turn allocation. As we have already noted, turn-taking systems represent an institutionalized means of allocating a scarce resource

among participants. In conversation, minimal units of speech—termed *turn constructional units* (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974, pp. 702-703)—are allocated to each speaker. The *turn constructional component* of the turn-taking system specifies that turn constructional units may consist of a single word, phrase, clause, or sentence—the relevant unit being recognizable in the context in which it occurs. Access to the floor entitles each speaker to one such unit, though multiunit turns may nonetheless be created.

Crucially, the terminal boundary of a turn constructional unit is "projectable," that is, a hearer can anticipate when it will reach completion in advance of its actual termination. Thus listeners can monitor a speaker's turn as it is in progress and they are provided with the resources with which they can anticipate when each unit will reach completion. The completion of each unit constitutes a "transition relevance place"—a point at which speakership may change.

It is at this point that the *rules for allocating units of talk* to speakers come into play (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974, pp. 703-704). Turn allocation proceeds through an ordered set of options in which, in summary form, a new speaker's rights to a next turn at talk are gained in the following order of precedence: Option 1—by being selected to speak next by the current speaker; Option 2—if Option 1 is not implemented, by selecting him- or herself to speak next (the earliest starter gaining the turn); or Option 3—failing Options 1 and 2, the current speaker many continue.

What is of particular interest in the present context is the connection between this turn-taking system and the observable parameters that distinguish conversation as a speech exchange system. As presented above, the turn-taking system is a "local management system" in that the transition from one speaker's turn to the next is not prespecified or fixed in advance, but rather is managed through the option cycle outlined above. As a result, both the turn-constructional and the global parameters of conversation are free to vary.

Of course, for any particular conversation, there will be a delimited range of topics, a certain order of speakership, a conclusion at some point, and so on. These are negotiated and worked out locally, however, on the occasion of interaction. Hence conversation, as a system of speech exchange, is characterized by the participants' open-ended expectations as to the tasks and topics that will be accomplished through the talk, and the turn-taking system is flexibly adaptable to whatever concerns might be brought into the interaction.

It is this feature of the turn-taking system that Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974, pp. 699-700) capture by characterizing it as both *context-free* and *context sensitive*. The system is context-free in that it may be employed to manage the construction and allocation of turns on any occasion, without regard to the particular identities and purposes of the participants. But, while the mechanism is independent of the particular contexts in which it is employed, its actual use on any occasion will be shaped by the participants' orientation to these and other features of the context at hand. Hence it is also context sensitive.

NONCONVERSATIONAL SPEECH EXCHANGE SYSTEMS

In speech exchange systems other than conversation (e.g., debates, meetings, ceremonies, speeches, and interviews), the turn organizational parameters (turn order, length, and content/type), together with global parameters (turn distribution and overall length of the interaction) are generally less free to vary. Instead, the parties to these occasions orient from the outset to a more specific range of concerns that generally involve constraints on the resulting tasks, topics, and orderings of speakership that subsequently emerge. Accordingly, in the context of nonconversational speech exchange systems, turn-taking is not managed on a wholly local turn-by-turn basis; rather, turns are to some degree preallocated to specific speakers.

Speech exchange systems can therefore be arrayed on a continuum in terms of the turn-taking procedures on which they are based. At one end of the continuum is ordinary conversation with its locally managed turn organization. At the other are ceremonies and rituals where virtually all turn parameters are prespecified. In between these extremes are systems such as interviews, where some turn parameters are to a degree prespecified (e.g., turn order and turn type alternates between interviewers who ask questions and interviewees who answer them) while others are essentially unconstrained and remain to be managed locally (e.g., turn size). These systems operate according to a mixture of preallocational and local allocational methods of turn-taking.

In sum, nonconversational speech exchange systems are systematic transformations of the basic system for conversation. What makes these systems distinct is that they prespecify some or all of the parameters that conversation allows to vary. The investigation of news interviews and political oratory thus involves, in some considerable measure, an analysis of the consequences that arise as a result of these systematic departures from conversational interaction.

STUDIES OF THE NEWS INTERVIEW

BACKGROUND

As noted in the introduction to this chapter, the news interview has become an increasingly significant component of anglophone news broadcasting. In the United States, this has been a comparatively recent development. With the exception of weekly public affairs programs, such as NBC's *Meet the Press* and, later, CBS's *Face the Nation* and ABC's *Issues and Answers*, interviews were used only sporadically in U.S. news coverage prior to the mid-1970s. The growth of the interview as a medium of routine news presentation can be dated from 1976 when PBS first aired *The MacNeil/Lehrer Report* as a nightly half-hour news program. This program was followed in 1979 by ABC's *Nightline*, which developed under the ubiquitous presence of Ted Koppel into a nightly news program organized around live interviews. In the ensuing decade, the regular network news programs have also followed in this trend as they have begun to employ live anchor interviews interspersed within the more traditional format (Weisman, 1986, p. 9). This is a development that some have attributed to the success of *MacNeil/Lehrer* and *Nightline* (Gladstone, 1986, p. 45).

In Britain, the primary development of the news interview also occurred within the medium of television. In the early postwar period, the interview was largely regarded as a means of enabling public figures to express their opinions while avoiding the technical difficulties of speaking directly to camera (Wyndham Goldie, 1977). During this period of the BBC's monopoly in broadcasting, a strongly deferential style of interviewing was employed (Day, 1961; Wedell, 1968). With the emergence of Independent Television in the mid-fifties, a new form of unrehearsed investigative interview emerged. Pioneered by Robin Day, who had originally trained as an attorney, the new style of interview rapidly gained acceptance among politicians and other public figures, who found that it made a greater impact on audiences (Day, 1961, pp. 100 ff.), and the public, who increasingly came to accept the interview as a reliable medium to evaluate the qualities of political leaders (Blumler & McQuail, 1968). Competitive pressures ensured that the new style was

subsequently employed in a wide range of British television and radio news programming.

THE NEWS INTERVIEW: TURN-TAKING

Although news interviewers sometimes like to claim that their task involves engaging public figures "in conversation," even the most cursory examination of their activities reveals dramatic departures from a conversational framework. In contrast to conversation, which may be occasioned in a variety of ways, in which a variety of topics may emerge, and in which any participant may initiate a new conversational departure, the news interview is a considerably more constrained form of interaction. First, the news interview results from the initiative of a news organization that has already judged the interviewee's (henceforth, IE) contribution as potentially interesting or significant. Rather than topics freely emerging in interaction, IEs routinely enter the interview situation with expectations about an agenda of topics that have been largely predetermined beforehand. Moreover, although the interviewer (henceforth, IR) plays an important role in the interaction, this role will not embrace the expression of opinion. The news interview is thus an interactional form that is adapted to the specific task of generating "talk for overhearers" (Heritage, 1985)—the elicitation of information or opinion from public figures, experts, or other persons who are "in the news." This task-oriented character of news interviews is strongly reflected in the turn-taking system through which they are managed. Recent research on turn-taking in news interviews in both the United States and Britain has shown that they operate through a straightforward form of turn-type preallocation such that IRs and IEs primarily restrict themselves to producing turns that are at least minimally recognizable as questions and answers, respectively (Clayman, 1986, 1987; Greatbatch, 1985, 1988). While this finding will come as no surprise to anyone who is at all familiar with broadcast news practices in Britain or the United States, it is associated with a range of identifiable modifications of verbal conduct in the news interview that are considerably less apparent.

(1) Most obviously, both IRs and IEs avoid actions that can be treated as something other than questioning and answering, respectively. Specifically, IRs avoid stating their opinions or evaluations of IEs' actions or responses and only support or challenge IE positions indirectly through the types of questions they ask. Similarly, IEs generally avoid questioning IRs or other IEs or undertaking other unilateral actions that are not made relevant by prior IR questions and whose commission could result in negative inferences and judgments by a viewing audience.

(2) Similarly, both IRs and IEs hold off from a wide range of "backchannel" actions, which, in conversation, play an important role in managing topic, information transmission, and attentiveness. Recent studies (Clayman, 1986, 1987; Greatbatch, 1985, 1988; Heritage, 1985) have shown, for both Britain and the United States, that IRs' and IEs' avoidance of such responses as "mm hm," "yes," "oh," "I see," "really," and the like is virtually complete. This avoidance, moreover, is specifically characteristic of news interviews by contrast with, for example, chat shows or broadcast interactions that are billed as "conversations" (Greatbatch, 1988), and is closely associated with the orientation of both parties to the restrictions on the types of turns they may legitimately produce and to the fact that, while they are engaged in immediate social interaction, they are nonetheless talking for the benefit of the news audience that is only electronically present.

(3) Both parties characteristically produce much longer turns than are usual in mundane conversation. Thus IR turns usually contain more than a simple question. Instead, their questions are commonly prefaced by background information that audiences may require in order to grasp the relevance of the subsequent question. Regardless of how contestable such background information may be, IEs routinely defer any response until after the question has been put. In the case of IEs, even when "yes/no" type questions are asked, extended answers that account for, or elaborate, a response are the "default" expectation (Greatbatch, 1985), unless otherwise indicated, for example, in the closing stages of an interview (Clayman & Zimmerman, 1987).

(4) The turn-taking procedure for news interviews constrains the ways in which individuals are selected to speak. A turn-taking system that allocates initiating questions to IRs and responses to IEs inherently creates an IR/IE/IR/IE pattern of turn ordering. As Greatbatch (1988) has noted, however, this patterning does not allocate turns to specific IRs and IEs in interview situations in which there is more than one interviewer or interviewee. Nevertheless, by contrast with conversation, in which a variety of speaker selection techniques are open to all parties, these techniques are asymmetrically distributed in interviews. Specifically, next speaker selection is achieved through initiatory acts such as

posing a question, and rights to produce such acts are, of course, confined to IRs. Moreover, it is generally the case that while speakers can self-select to initiate questions, they cannot self-select to initiate answers, which must be solicited by a prior question. In multi-IE interviews, therefore, IE opportunities to speak are generally controlled by the IR and, as Greatbatch (1986c) has shown, a large number of IE departures from the provisions of the interview turn-taking system are informed by considerations arising from this constraint.

AGENDA SETTING IN THE NEWS INTERVIEW

These observations strongly suggest that the broadcast news interview is organized so as to furnish the news organization and its representative, the IR, consistently with the primary interactional initiative. A fundamental consequence of the organization of turn-taking is that the IR has a major agenda-setting role. The IR has rights to set the agenda for the interview at three analytically separate levels: (1) in interview openings that introduce the topic of the interview and its participants; (2) in framing specific questions for response by the IE; and (3) in pursuing specific issues that are raised through the character of IE responses.

(1) Interview openings. Given that IRs primarily adopt the role of questioner, the first turn within the interview is allocated to them (Greatbatch, 1987). Accordingly, they have the opportunity to set the overall agenda in the opening segment. In a detailed analysis of interview openings, Clayman (1987, pp. 106-150) has proposed that they are occupied with three standard tasks.

First, there is a news announcement or "agenda projection." This component of the opening formulates the interview topic in general terms and gives some indication of how it will be addressed. Second, background material is presented, either by IR statements or a taped segment, that "sets the scene" for the interview to follow. Third, the IEs are introduced often using an IE's name coupled with additional biographical items selected so as to indicate the capacity in which each IE will be speaking (e.g., as participant, scientific expert, witness, or political advocate). These openings are, of course, designed to provide the audience with a general "frame" in terms of which the subsequent components of the interview can be understood but, as Clayman shows, these "frames" play a considerable part in predefining the roles, interests, and competencies of the participants.

(2) Question design. Because the interview turn-taking system provides that questioning is wholly restricted to IRs, the agenda-setting role of the IR is most obviously manifested in the questions that he or she elects to put to the IE. IE utterances are generally constrained by the terms of such questions and, although they may occasionally fail to respond to the questions put, they will be held accountable for this failure, that is, viewed as "evasive" or as "having something to hide." Indeed, it is the omnipresent potential for this kind of inference that is a major means by which IEs can be brought to address uncomfortable issues. While the agenda-setting role of IR questions may be simply supportive for an inexperienced IE in a narrative or human interest interview, or mildly confusing for an "expert" confronted by a less than fully briefed IR, it is in the area of politically contentious public issues that this role is most complained of and on which current research has focused most closely.

Current approaches to question design have examined questions in terms of two distinct analytic frameworks: the "face" and "politeness" analyses developed from the work of Goffman (1967), Brown and Levinson (1978), and Leech (1983), and the linguistic analysis of presupposition of van Dijk (1977), Levinson (1983), and Sperber and Wilson (1986).

Within the first framework, Jucker (1986) has developed a typology of IR face threatening actions (FTAs) and argues that most news interviews "tend to be either friendly throughout, containing no FTAs at all, or else they are latently hostile more or less throughout the whole interview" (Jucker 1986, p. 97). Jucker's work suggests that politicians are most likely to receive interviews containing a high proportion of FTAs, news correspondents are least likely to be so interviewed with a third category, "experts" occupying an intermediate position.

The second framework has been developed in a useful analysis by Harris (1986). Harris argues that all questions encode propositions, but differ in terms of (a) the numbers of embedded presuppositions they contain; (b) the degree of explicitness with which they are expressed; and (c) the degree to which they are evaluative. She proposes that while "wh" questions offer considerable scope for variation along these three parameters and create an environment in which an interviewee may have to do special work to disavow embedded presuppositions, polar

(yes/no) questions are more explicit but also more restrictive and "conducive" in being structured toward one pole of response rather than others. The two types of questions may thus be used for rather different tasks in the news interview context.

(3) Pursuits. A final way in which the IR's capacity to manage the agenda of the news interview is manifested arises in the context of *pursuits*. This term is used to describe supplementary questions that, rather than accepting the adequacy of the IE's prior answer by moving on to a next issue or using a prior answer as an unchallenged basis for a next question, involve a reissuing or rephrasing of the prior question. The role of these and related types of supplementary questions has been examined by Greatbatch (1988), who has detailed a range of ways in which they are used to highlight evasive or unsatisfactory responses to IR questions and, thereby, to sanction their inadequacies.

INTERVIEWEES' RESISTANCE TO INTERVIEWER AGENDAS

While the above discussion might suggest that the right to question in the news interview gives the IR a dimension of control over its topical agenda that is almost absolute, IEs in fact have resources to exert countervailing pressure. In a recent study, Greatbatch (1988) has examined a range of procedures through which IEs shift interview agendas away from undesired topics and/or toward preferred ones. He proposes that the most successful of these procedures (i.e., those that most consistently escape IR sanction or pursuit) involve an orientation to the question put by the IR and thus avoid threatening the rights or perceived competence of the IR. These shifts may occur prior to, or after, responding to the IR's question.

Preanswer agenda shifts are routinely used to address presuppositions of IR questions or previous points made by cointerviewees. In the case of postanswer agenda shifts, which often involve movement toward prepared IE statements, skill in the management of the transition from an initial response to subsequent, unsolicited matters is crucial to the achievement of the shift in a relatively seamless and unnoticeable fashion. In the case of experienced interviewees (and/or senior political figures), skilled postanswer agenda shifting has become so commonplace that Sir Robin Day recently observed that the serious political interview was now a thing of the past in the United Kingdom.

INTERVIEWER NEUTRALITY AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE "DEBATE AGENDA" INTERVIEW

A striking finding from studies of the news interview on both sides of the Atlantic concerns the ways in which IRs consistently work to sustain a posture of objectivity or neutrality with respect to the topics under discussion. In the United Kingdom, such neutrality is strongly required by the media licensing authorities, which, in an essentially duopolistic media context, oblige the programmers to maintain impartiality and balance in their coverage of controversial topics and to refrain from editorial comment on current affairs or matters of public policy. In the arguably more relaxed framework of FCC regulation in the United States, however, IRs display an equal concern with the maintenance of a neutral posture. Because, as we have seen above, much IR questioning may challenge an IE's public position, we adopt Heritage's (1985) terminology in distinguishing between *cooperative questioning* that avoids challenging an IEs stated position and *uncooperative questioning* that incorporates such challenges. We may now observe that, in the context of uncooperative questioning sequences, IRs nonetheless avoid taking overt positions on public affairs matters that might be held to reflect their own views or those of their employing organizations.

In part, IRs achieve their neutrality by avoiding activities other than questioning (Clayman, 1987, pp. 201-248; Greatbatch, 1985, 1988). By this means, as Heritage (1985, p. 100) and Greatbatch (1988) have observed, IRs avoid producing talk that overtly affiliates with or disaffiliates from an IE's expressed point of view; instead, such activities are systematically packaged within questioning turns. Clayman (1987) has explored a variety of methods by which views challenging an IE's position may be proactively or retroactively formulated as question components, and how such opinions may be attributed to third parties. By these means, IRs can maintain a neutral position and sustain the accountability of their conduct as properly "objective" even during the most hostile and uncooperative interrogation.

Given that a number of observers (e.g., Hall, 1973; Harris, 1986; Jucker, 1986) have noted that uncooperative questioning tends to be reserved for particular types of interviewees, it is possible to read these IR moves as "strategic rituals" in Tuchman's (1972) sense of the term and to conclude that they enable IRs to challenge and discredit IEs at will. Such a conclusion may be difficult to maintain, however, for

challenging or uncooperative questioning, if successfully surmounted by an IE, may be ultimately more beneficial to the public perception of an IE's position.

DEBATE AGENDA INTERVIEWS

In spite of the above resources for displaying neutrality, charges of bias may still be leveled at a challenging IR pursuing uncooperative questioning. One solution to this problem is represented by the development of what Clayman (1987) has termed "debate agenda" interviews. In these interviews, involving two or more interviewees, IRs and IEs are strongly oriented to the elicitation and exhibition of IE/IE disagreement (Greatbatch, 1986c).

The "debate agenda" interview emerged extensively in the United Kingdom during the 1970s in the aftermath of a period in which IR questioning, in an escalating search for controversy (Tracey, 1977), was widely held to have strayed beyond the boundaries of the permissible. In this context, the debate structure enabled lively questioning and the kind of "dialectical" conflict structure that is widely sought after as constituting "good television" (Epstein, 1973) while minimizing the extent to which the IR was required to engage in provocative questioning to achieve this end. In the United States, such programs as *Nightline* and *The MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour* incorporated this structure from their inception.

The success of this interview format arises in part from the fact that debate and disagreement are licensed from the outset of the interview in which the IEs are frequently portrayed as occupying opposed positions (Clayman, 1987). Moreover, as Greatbatch (1986c) and Clayman (1987) have shown, the format permits IEs a wide range of mediated disagreement activities to be undertaken *within* the IE footing and may also allow them to drift into *direct* or *unmediated* disagreement with some security that the IR will ultimately step in to restore the situation.

SUMMARY

Although we have been able only briefly to gloss the range of recent findings about the social organization of the news interview in this short account, it should be apparent that the interview embodies a large and complex network of patterned expectations about communicative conduct that cannot but influence the substance of the news that it generates. Much remains to be learned about the structural organization of the news interview, the historical changes it has undergone, and the manner in which its structure varies across different social, political, and cultural contexts. Moreover, little is presently known about the frequency of particular types of IR and IE behavior nor about how the characteristics of their verbal behavior are evaluated by the overhearing audience and how these evaluations are influenced by televisual (as opposed to radio only) access.

A related issue has to do with the selection of interview segments for insertion into later broadcast and print news. Such excerpts are extremely common, yet beyond the fact that they tend to be brief (Cohen, 1987), little is presently known about their characteristics, and how the structural details of interview conduct might influence the likelihood of selection. Nonetheless, the structural studies reported here may serve as a valuable starting point for research into these and related matters that employs a wide range of research methodologies.

THE ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL SPEECHES

Because public speeches are delivered to an audience that is copresent, oratory has not ordinarily been considered a form of mass communication (Menzel, 1971; Schramm, 1973, pp. 113-120). Notwithstanding the lack of technological mediation between speaker and audience, however, it would be unrealistic to lose sight of the essentially "mass" character of communication in such contexts. As we shall see, many of the fundamental properties of oratory cannot be adequately understood without recognizing that such messages are directed to a mass audience (Atkinson, 1982, 1984a, 1984b; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986). Moreover, the formal properties of speaker-audience interaction are consequential for what is eventually made of such occasions when they are subsequently reported in the news.

MULTIPARTY SETTINGS, AUDIENCE RESPONSE, AND THE PROBLEM OF SHARED ATTENTIVENESS

The fact that oratory is organized so that a small number of parties, usually one, speaks to a large group of hearers generates a specific

problem that Atkinson has identified in a series of publications (see Atkinson, 1979, 1982, 1984b) as "the problem of achieving and sustaining the shared attentiveness of co-present parties to a single sequence of actions" (Atkinson, 1982, p. 97). This problem, he observes, is not confined to political speeches, but is a generic feature of any occasion of interaction involving a large number of potential participants. This problem can be approached by comparing such occasions with the situation obtained in ordinary conversation.

As we have seen, the conversational turn-taking system operates entirely through a set of locally managed operations. As a result, participants can only determine the length, content, and "type" of any turn during the course of its actual production. Sacks et al. (1974, pp. 727-728) propose that this local operation of conversation's turn-taking system creates an "intrinsic motivation for listening." Specifically, paying attention is necessary for participants to be aware of when they have been selected as next speakers, and equally to know what would be an appropriate or relevant response. Similarly, any participant seeking to acquire the floor by self-selection will have to monitor the current turn in detail in order to begin speaking at an appropriate point, for example, early enough to secure the right to speak by being a first starter, but not so early as to interrupt the current speaker. Thus speakers generically need to know when it will be appropriate to speak and also what would be an appropriate contribution. Failures in the character or timing of responses are, of course, sanctionable in the normal run of things. All in all, therefore, the mechanisms of conversational turn-taking provide participants with a strong incentive for continually monitoring talk as it unfolds turn by turn.

This incentive is greatly reduced, however, as additional speakers join the conversation. As Atkinson (1982, p. 99) has noted, in larger gatherings, there is less of an opportunity for any single participant to attain a turn, whether by self-selection or by being selected by the current speaker. Some participants will inevitably tend to remain silent for longer periods, thus attenuating the motive for listening. This attenuation, he notes, is still greater in the context of lectures, sermons, and speeches in which audience members have no opportunities to speak in their own right.

In the context of political speeches, however, there is one way in which audience members may participate in interaction with the speaker and this is through collective actions such as laughter, booing, and applause. Recent research has investigated this aspect of speaker-audience interaction together with its impact on mass media presentations of political speeches (Atkinson, 1983, 1984a, 1984b, 1985, 1987; Brodine, 1986a, 1986b; Bull, 1986; Grady & Potter, 1985; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986) and it to this phenomenon that we now turn.

APPLAUSE AS SOCIALLY ORGANIZED ACTIVITY

Most collective actions that audiences engage in involve some commentary on the speech of the orator and these may be either disaffiliative (e.g., booing) or affiliative (e.g., clapping and cheering) (Atkinson, 1984b, p. 371). Atkinson (1984a) has identified a number of reasons why applause for a political speech might be desirable. First, applause is a "barometer of attention." A speaker whose speech wins regular responses of any kind is one who has managed to gain an audience's continued attention by creating the opportunity and the incentive for active audience participation. Second, in addition to being a barometer of attention, applause is also a "barometer of approval." As a display of affiliation, clapping is hearable as an indicator of an individual's support for the statement to which it is juxtaposed and regular bursts of applause are an undoubted signal of the popularity of a speaker and/or the views being put forward. Finally, since the time of the Greeks when Lycurgus of Sparta used acclamation as an electoral procedure (Duncan, 1984, pp. 1-2), applause has been used as a general indicator of popularity. In modern times, applause is used in a similar way by news commentators (Atkinson, 1984a, pp. 27-31) and there is good evidence that the presence of applause is used in the selection of "sound bites" for prime time television news. Audience applause is thus an activity that can have important consequences for the speaker's perceived popularity, political visibility, and, ultimately, political career.

Although audience approval for a political assertion may generally be a necessary condition for applause, however, it is by no means a sufficient one. This is because applause is a collective action and underlying its production is the basic sociological principle, most explicitly demonstrated by the Asch experiments, that people prefer to express opinions that agree with those around them (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986, p. 111). Thus while individual audience members may wish to show support for an assertion, they also wish to do so in a context in which they are assured that other audience members will do the same. In keeping with this principle, applause initiated by only a few

individuals quickly dies out (Atkinson, 1984a, p. 33), while "bursts" of applause resulting from the simultaneous initiation of numerous individuals ordinarily last for approximately 8 seconds (Atkinson, 1984b, pp. 374-375).

If a "burst" of applause is to occur, the initiation of clapping by many independent individuals must somehow be coordinated so that a substantial number of them do so simultaneously. This coordination problem is a severe one. Most bursts of applause occur within 0.3 seconds of sentence completion and the opportunity to applaud is lost for all practical purposes after approximately 0.5 seconds (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986, p. 112). Given that sentences are completed, on average, once every 8 seconds, each audience member must arrive at a decision to applaud within a relatively short period of time and in a context in which the positive value of each action may turn on the independent decisions of perhaps thousands of others (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986, p. 112).

The frequent occurrence of applause in speeches attests to the fact that such coordination is routinely achieved. Furthermore, the fact that clapping begins so quickly upon sentence completion and, frequently, just prior to completion (Atkinson, 1984b, p. 377) suggests that audience members can recognize and anticipate where an appropriate applause point will arise in advance of its actual occurrence. Recent research has demonstrated that the coordination of applause is dependent on the design of particular "applaudable" assertions that must be made to stand out in a conspicuous way against a set of more backgrounded speech statements. This may be accomplished by the broad structure of the argument of a speech passage, which can be designed to build toward a final, focal utterance, and also by the minutiae of verbal and nonverbal comportment (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986, pp. 112-115). Most of the research conducted thus far, however, has focused on a level of organization falling between these parameters: the verbal design of the applause-eliciting messages themselves.

FORMATS FOR INVITING APPLAUSE

Applaudable messages have been shown to be verbally constructed so as to exhibit two fundamental properties. They are built so as to (a) "*emphasize* and highlight their contents against a surrounding background of speech materials, and (b) to *project a clear completion point*

for the message in question" (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986, p. 116; see Atkinson, 1984b). These requirements of emphasis and projectability are satisfied by an identifiable set of rhetorical formats in which applauded messages are disproportionately packaged. These formats provide audience members with the resources with which to coordinate a collective display of affiliation, and thus constitute, in effect, "invitations" to applaud (Atkinson, 1984a, 1984b).

A total of seven fundamental rhetorical formats of this kind have now been identified (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986) but, in the present context, we will briefly describe three that are of particular importance both in speech making and in the sound-bites that are used in news transmissions.

(1) Contrasts. The contrast is the most fundamental and commonly used rhetorical format. It usually comprises two juxtaposed sentences that are opposed in words, or sense, or both, as in the following examples (see the Appendix for transcribing conventions):[3]

(1) (Atkinson, 1984a, p. 75)

Callaghan: . . . in this election I don't intend
(0.8)
to make the most promises
(0.8)
I intend that the next Labor government
(0.2)
shall ↑ KEEP
(.)
the ↓ most promises
Audience: Hear [hear
Audience: [x-xxXXXX (tape cut after 6.0 seconds)

(2) (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986, p. 123)

Morris: Governments will argue: (0.8) that resources are not available: (0.4) to help disabled people.
(1.3)
The fact is that too much is spent on the munitions of war::,
(0.6)
and too little is spent [(0.2) on the munitions of peace.
Audience: [Applause (9.2 seconds)

Contrasts provide the emphasis that is essential to ensure the prominence of a political point because they effectively make the same point twice, in both "positive" and "negative" form. Further, the relationship between the parts of the contrast can furnish advance cues as to its likely point of completion, thus providing for the projectability of the point at which applause should begin. They achieve this by virtue of the fact that the trajectory of the second part of a contrast can usually be analyzed by reference to the first. In example 2, for example, the parts of the contrast were so closely fit that the audience recognized the forthcoming completion point of the assertion well in advance and began applauding at that recognition point.

(2) Lists. As Jefferson (in press) has shown, lists of items such as adjectives, nouns, or phrases are ordinarily produced in groups of three. Speaker hearers have been shown to exhibit the clear expectation that lists will be complete upon the completion of a third item (Atkinson, 1984b, pp. 385-386; Jefferson, in press). This predictability of the three-part list means that a list-in-progress can project its own completion point well in advance. Furthermore, the repetition of items in a list generally serves to add emphasis to the point being made. Thus in the following example, a list is employed by Margaret Thatcher to underline an attack on the Liberal Party.

(3) (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986, p. 126)

Thatcher: At a ti:me of growing dan ↓ ger (0.7) for all:
who cherish and believe in ↓ freedom (0.8) this
party of the soft center is
no shiel:d
(0.2)
no refu:ge
(.)
and no answer.

Audience: Applause (8.2 seconds)

Lists then, like contrasts, can furnish the necessary elements of emphasis and projectability that enhance the applaudability of a political statement, and they are routinely associated with applause.

(3) Combinations. Contrasts and lists may be combined with one another (and with other formats not described here). Contrasts usually form one component of such combinations and are most commonly combined with lists (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986, pp. 129-131). One form in which contrasts and lists combine is shown as example 4:

(4) (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986, pp. 129-130)

Tebbit: And I have a duty (.) a duty that falls upon
all responsible politicians
(.)
to lead others to f:fi- to face reality.
(0.4)
Not a duty to feed the people a diet of
compromising pap
(0.2)
pie in the sky:
and false hopes.

Audience: Applause (10.7 seconds)

By building multiple formats into the design of a central point, the speaker places additional emphasis on that point while simultaneously retaining a projectable point of completion.

DISCUSSION

A number of studies have clearly confirmed Atkinson's (1983, 1984a, 1984b) original proposals concerning the significance of these and other rhetorical formats in the orchestration of audience responses to political speeches (Brodine, 1986a; Grady & Potter, 1985; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986). In the largest scale study of these phenomena to date, Heritage and Greatbatch (1986) examined some 476 political speeches containing over 20,000 sentences and nearly 1600 instances of full-scale applause. They found that just over two-thirds of the instances of applause occurred in response to seven basic rhetorical formats—a proportion that remained broadly constant regardless of the experience or seniority of the speaker (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986, pp. 137-140).

In the same study, the efficacy of the rhetorically formatted messages in generating applause was calculated relative to applaudable political messages that were not so packaged. The results showed that the rhetorical formats were between two and eight times as likely to elicit applause than unformatted messages. Unformatted messages were also significantly more likely to solicit unsustained clapping by one or a few audience members. Experience in political speaking and party seniority were associated with generally higher rates of applause in response to each type of rhetorical format but only slightly influenced the overall distribution of applause in response to various formats. Finally, the

formats were implicated in broadly the same aggregate proportions of applause, regardless of the type or popularity of the political assertion being advocated. These findings strongly suggest that, while the substantive content of the speaker's remarks may be a necessary condition for audience response, the generation of applause depends fundamentally upon the structuring of content in a manner that will allow coordinated response on the part of the audience. Thus the rhetorical formats play a basic role in orchestrating audience responses that remains fundamental across a speaker types and speech contents.

THE USE OF SPEECH EXCERPTS IN PRIME TIME TELEVISION NEWS

While the foregoing strongly suggests that a speaker who wishes to succeed in gaining the attention and support of a "live" mass audience will inevitably tend to do so—whether wittingly or unwittingly—through the use of rhetorical formats, political, and, more generally, public relations, success has become largely dependent on mass media coverage. And it is clear that, even in the immediate context of political elections, political speeches make up a relatively small proportion of the news "mix" (Atkinson, 1987).

In his discussion of the television coverage of politics, Atkinson (1984a, 1987) comments that while "performing techniques which work effectively in theaters, parliaments and political meetings are used with a large audience in mind, and have the capacity to hold the attention even of those sitting in the back row," they were not designed for the small-scale family context of the television audience and are likely to come over in this context as "overdone," "overacted," "over-prepared," "over-rehearsed," and generally "lacking in spontaneity" (Atkinson, 1987, pp. 40-41). Political speeches, in short, embody many of the qualities with which television, with its growing emphasis on informality, has grown uncomfortable, and, as a result, few speeches are now carried on television in their entirety.

Public speaking nonetheless still exerts an impact on the mass television audience through the medium of the "sound bite"—a short, roughly 20-second segment of film or videotape injected into a news report. Current research (Heritage & Greatbatch, in press) on prime time news reports of party conference proceedings in the United Kingdom suggests that the vast majority of prime time sound-bites depict not only a speaker's assertion but also audience response and

there is substantial, though impressionistic, evidence to suggest that this is a general news practice not only in the United Kingdom but also in the United States and elsewhere. There are a number of reasons why this should be so.

First, the presentation of audience response conveys to the viewer how the point (or the speech) was received in a way that is both succinct and dramatic in both aural and visual terms. Moreover, it may function as an intrinsic justification of the selection of the particular extract shown. Additionally, as Atkinson (1987) has noted, applauded contrasts and lists are themselves short and succinct summaries of speaker arguments and they enable news producers to select a representative few seconds of talk from speeches that are often longer than the entire time available for the news program (Atkinson, 1987, p. 46). Again, contrasts and lists are "quotable" in a way that differently formulated points often are not (Atkinson, 1984a) and, because they often occur at the culmination of a speech passage, they can form the focus for a summary of the speech itself. Finally, the fact that applause occurs at natural completion points within a speech can facilitate tape editing and make tape breaks appear more natural than would otherwise be the case (Atkinson, 1987).

Taken together, these points suggest that mastery of the rhetorical devices outlined earlier in this section is not only essential to successful communication inside the hall where a speech is being made but is also strongly implicated in subsequent prime time mass media exposure. Work by Heritage and Greatbatch (in press) on party conference coverage suggests that only rhetorically formatted political assertions received saturation coverage on all prime time TV news programs, and work by Atkinson (1987) and Grady and Potter (1985) has suggested that, during the 1983 U.K. General Election, the relative lack of applause to poorly structured speeches by Labor Party Leader Michael Foot resulted in extensive paraphrasing of his remarks, while Prime Minister Thatcher's more punchy contrasts and lists were usually excerpted or directly quoted. As Atkinson puts it:

> Margaret Thatcher was regularly seen speaking confidently "without a script", and saying things which her audiences approved of strongly enough to respond with applause. Such excerpts were then frequently followed by ones showing Michael Foot having difficulty reading a prepared text, and saying things which were almost invariably met with total silence. Even viewers who paid no attention whatsoever to what

> either of them was actually saying would thus be likely to be more impressed by Margaret Thatcher than by Michael Foot. And as for those who did listen, they were supplied with many more potentially noticeable, memorable and quotable quotes by Margaret Thatcher than by Michael Foot. (Atkinson, 1987, p. 53)

Taken as a whole, the studies reported in this section provide impressive general support for the view that audience and media responses to political speeches are strongly influenced by the verbal structuring of their component messages. Detailed micro-analysis of these structures has proved highly fruitful in establishing the underlying factors that condition these responses and a number of these factors have important continuities with significant facets of the organization of interpersonal communication in ordinary social interaction (Atkinson, 1984a; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986).

Much, however, remains to be discovered. We need to determine the ways in which larger argument structures, verbal structuring, and nonverbal aspects of political speech making interlock in shaping the character of audience response. It remains an open question, moreover, whether the structures found in political speech making are similarly operative in other forms of public speaking—for example, religious oratory—and how they might be modified to elicit other forms of collective response (e.g., laughter). Additionally, little is known about how these structures are modified in the context of televised transmissions. More needs to be learned about the selection of speech extracts as "sound-bites," the ways in which the availability of particular sound-bites may influence the construction of a news agenda for the nightly news, the kinds of influence that different extracts may have on viewers in different social contexts—especially those of heightened political salience such as an election period. Notwithstanding the unanswered questions, however, we believe that a fertile field of inquiry has been established.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this chapter, we have proposed that it is unrealistic to treat aspects of mass communication in isolation from the micro-structure of communicative competence, which arises in, and has its "home" or base environment in, interpersonal communication, and which forms the medium through which much broadcast news output is generated. Moreover, it should be apparent from the research reviewed here that a focus on the formal properties of interpersonal communication—the pervasive and recurrent interactional practices that undergird and package diverse message contents—generates detailed insights that have general implications for the workings of mass communication.

With respect to the interactional domains we have treated here—the social organization of news interview interaction and the analysis of speaker-audience communication—we believe that significant scope for valuable cross-fertilization between the two fields of inquiry exists. In the evolving context of contemporary mass communication practice, we believe that collaboration between the two fields of inquiry will be a vital source of growing insight into the nature and dynamics of mass communication.

A final point is worth emphasizing. As mass communication technologies and institutions develop, they pose novel issues for the organization of message production. The simple contrast between reading written materials before a camera and interviewing newsworthy individuals imposes different requirements on the activity of speaking, and with that, different opportunities and constraints, for example, how to appear "neutral" and yet "challenging" when questioning an interviewee. A careful examination of the interactional organization of talk as a general resource for responding to different technologies and communicative aims should yield significant increments in our understanding of the dynamics of mass communication as well as of the flexibility of various mechanisms of talk in adapting to issues posed by the developing communicative, institutional, and social requirements of modern mass media.

APPENDIX: TRANSCRIPT NOTATION

The transcript notation has been developed by Gail Jefferson. The transcript conventions most relevant to the present analysis are as follows:[4]

INTERVALS BETWEEN UTTERANCES

When intervals in the stream of talk occur, they are timed in tenths of a second and inserted within parentheses, either within an utterance:

(0.0)

Lil: When I was (0.6) oh nine or ten

or between utterances:

Hal: Step right up

(1.3)

Hal: I said step right up

(0.8)

Joe: Are you talking to me

A very short (probably one-tenth of a second or less) untimed pause within an utterance or between utterances is indicated by a period inserted within parentheses:

(.) Dee: Umm (.) my mother will be right in

CHARACTERISTICS OF SPEECH DELIVERY

In these transcripts, punctuation is used to mark not conventional grammatical units but rather attempts to capture characteristics of speech delivery. For example, a colon indicates an extension of the sound or syllable it follows:

co:lon Ron: What ha:ppened to you

and more colons prolong the stretch:

co::lons Mae: I ju::ss can't come
Tim: I'm so::: sorry re:::ally I am

The other punctuation marks are used as follows:

. A period indicates a stopping fall in tone, not necessarily the end of a sentence.

, A comma indicates a continuing intonation, not necessarily between clauses of sentences.

? A question mark indicates a rising inflection, not necessarily a question.

! An exclamation point indicates an animated tone, not necessarily an exclamation.

- A single dash indicates a halting, abrupt cutoff, or, when multiple dashes hyphenate the syllables of words, the stream of talk so marked has a stammering quality.

A marked rising shift in intonation is indicated by an "up arrow" (↑) immediately prior to the rise:

Sue: I'm having a ↑ mar:vlous time!

A marked shift in intonation is indicated by a "down arrow" (↓).

Emphasis is indicated by underlining:

emphasis Ann: It happens to be mine
Joe: I don't think that iz necessa:rily true

Capital letters are used to indicate an utterance, or part thereof, that is spoken much louder than the surrounding talk:

LOUD Announcer: an the winner iz:s (1.4) Rachel roberts for YANKS

NOTES

1. For introductory accounts of conversation analysis, see Atkinson and Drew (1979, pp. 34-81); Heritage (1984a, pp. 233-292, 1985b); Levinson (1983, pp. 284-370); West and Zimmerman (1982, pp. 506-541); and Zimmerman (1988).

2. There are alternative approaches to the Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) model of turn-taking. Duncan (1972, 1973, 1974) and Duncan and Fiske (1977) identify discrete cues associated with taking and relinquishing turns. Earlier work by Jaffe and Feldstein (1970) using Markov chains treats turn transition as a stochastic process. The latter approaches are compared to the "sequential production model" of Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) in Wilson, Wiemann, and Zimmerman (1984) who provide a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of each. For a quantitative test of the Sacks et al. model, see Wilson and Zimmerman (1986, pp. 375-390).

3. The transcribing conventions employed in the two fragments are intended to preserve some sense of how the utterances were produced, for example, how they were stressed, variations in volume and intonation. It might be thought that because such features are not crucial for present purposes, the transcript should be normalized to standard orthography. We have retained certain of the conventions simply to illustrate the conversation analytic concern with preserving the detail of social interaction down to nuances of utterance production. There are a number of cogent reasons for this practice, which we cannot consider here. See, for example, Jefferson (1985) and Zimmerman (1988).

4. The following section was adapted from *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, pp. ix-xvi).

REFERENCES

Adams, W. C. (1978). Network news research in perspective: A bibliographic essay. In W. C. Adams & F. Schreibman (Eds.), *Television network news: Issues in content research* (pp. 11-46). Washington, DC: George Washington University, School of Public and International Affairs.

Albert, E. (1964). "Rhetoric," "logic" and "poetics" in Burundi: Culture patterning of

speech behavior. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), The ethnography of communication [special issue], *American Anthropologist, 66*(6, part 2), 35-54. (Menasha, WI)

Anderson, D., & Sharrock, W. (1979). Biasing the news: Technical issues in "media studies." *Sociology, 13*(2), 367-385.

Atkinson, J. M. (1979). Sequencing and shared attentiveness to court proceedings. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language* (pp. 257-286). New York: Irvington.

Atkinson, J. M. (1982). Understanding formality: Notes on the categorization and production of "formal" interaction. *British Journal of Sociology, 33*, 86-117.

Atkinson, J. M. (1983). Two devices for generating audience approval: A comparative study of public discourse and texts. In K. Ehlich & H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *Connectedness in sentence, text and discourse* (Tilburg Studies in Language and Literature, no. 4, pp. 199-236). Tilburg, the Netherlands.

Atkinson, J. M. (1984a). *Our masters' voices: The language and body language of politics*. London: Methuen.

Atkinson, J. M. (1984b). Public speaking and audience responses: Some techniques for inviting applause. In J. M. Atkinson & J. C. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 370-409). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Atkinson, J. M. (1985). Refusing invited applause: Preliminary observations from a case study of charismatic oratory. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis: Vol. 3. Discourse and dialogue* (pp. 161-181). New York: Academic Press.

Atkinson, J. M. (1987). The 1983 election and the demise of live oratory. In I. Crewe & M. Harrop (Eds.), *Political communications: The general election campaign of 1983* (pp. 38-55). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Atkinson, J. M., & Drew, P. (1979). *Order in court: The organization of verbal interaction in judicial settings*. London: Macmillan.

Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. C. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blumler, J., & McQuail, D. (1968). *Television in politics: Its uses and influence*. London: Faber and Faber.

Boden, D., & Zimmerman, D. H. (in press). *Talk and social structure*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brodine, R. (1986a). Getting the applause. In R. M. Bollettieri Bosinelli (Ed.), *U.S. presidential election 1984: An interdisciplinary approach to the analysis of political discourse* (pp. 171-211). Bologna: Pitagora.

Brodine, R. (1986b). *Praise the Lord: The elicitation of choral responses in American political discourse*. Unpublished mimeo, University of Ferrara, Italy.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56-310). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bull, P. (1986). The use of hand gesture in political speeches. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 5*, 103-118.

Clayman, S. (1986). *Making news through talk: The organization of turn taking in televised news interviews*. Paper presented at the Conference, Talk and Social Structure, Santa Barbara, CA.

Clayman, S. (1987). *Generating news: The interactional organization of news interviews*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara, Department of Sociology.

Clayman, S., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). *I'm sorry but we're out of time: Coordinating closings in televised news interviews*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Chicago.

Cohen, A. (1987). *The television news interview*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Day, R. (1961). *Television: A personal report*. London: Hutchinson.

Duncan, O. D. (1984). *Notes on social measurement*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Duncan, S. (1972). Some signals and rules for taking turns in conversation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 23*, 283-292.

Duncan, S. (1973). Toward a grammar for dyadic conversation. *Semiotica, 9*, 29-46.

Duncan, S. (1974). On the structure of speaker-auditor interaction during speaking turns. *Language in Society, 2*, 161-180.

Duncan, S., & Fiske, B. W. (1977). *Face-to-face interaction*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Epstein, E. J. (1973). *News from nowhere*. New York: Random House.

Gladstone, V. (1986, May). MacNeil and Lehrer and the art of talking. *Dial*, pp. 16-18, 45.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face to face behavior*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor.

Grady, K., & Potter, J. (1985). Speaking and clapping: A comparison of Foot and Thatcher's oratory. *Language and Communication, 5*, 173-183.

Greatbatch, D. (1985). *The social organization of news interview interaction*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Warwick, England.

Greatbatch, D. (1986a). Aspects of topical organization in news interviews: The use of agenda shifting procedures by interviewees. *Media, Culture and Society, 8*, 441-455.

Greatbatch, D. (1986b). Some standard uses of supplementary questions in news interviews. In J. Wilson & B. Crow (Eds.), *Belfast Working Papers in Language and Linguistics* (Vol. 8, pp. 86-123). Jordanstown, Ireland: University of Ulster.

Greatbatch, D. (1986c). *The management of disagreement between news interviewees*. Paper presented at the Conference, Talk and Social Structure, Santa Barbara, CA.

Greatbatch, D. (1988). A turn taking system for British news interviews. *Language and Society* 17(3), 401-430.

Hall, S. (1973). A world at one with itself. In S. Cohen & J. Young (Eds.), *The manufacture of news: Deviance, social problems and the mass media* (pp. 85-95). London: Constable.

Hallin, D. C., & Mancini, P. (1984). Speaking of the president: Political structure and representational form in U.S. and Italian television news. *Theory and Society, 13*(6), 829-850.

Harris, S. (1986). Interviewers' questions in broadcast interviews. In J. Wilson & B. S. Crow (Eds.), *Belfast Working Papers in Language and Linguistics* (Vol. 8, pp. 50-85). Jordanstown, Ireland: University of Ulster.

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heritage, J. (1985a). Analyzing news interviews: Aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis: Vol. 3. Discourse and dialogue* (pp. 95-119). New York: Academic Press.

Heritage, J. (1985b). Recent developments in conversation analysis. *Sociolinguistics, 15*(1), 1-19.

Heritage, J., & Greatbatch, D. (1986). Generating applause: A study of rhetoric and response at party political conferences. *American Journal of Sociology, 92*, 110-157.

Heritage, J., & Greatbatch, D. (in press). *Figures of speech*. London: Methuen.

Jaffe, J., & Feldstein, S. (1970). *Rhythms of dialogue*. New York: Academic Press.
Jefferson, G. (1985). An exercise in the transcription and analysis of laughter. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis: Vol. 3. Discourse and dialogue* (pp. 25-34). London: Academic Press.
Jefferson, G., & Schenkein, J. (1977). Some sequential negotiations in conversation. *Sociology, 11*, 87-103.
Jucker, A. H. (1986). *News interviews: A pragmalinguistic analysis*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Lee, J. (1984). Innocent victims and evil-doers. *Women's Studies International Forum, 7*(1), 69-73.
Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
McQuail, D. (1984). *Mass communication theory*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
Menzel, H. (1971). Quasi-mass communication: A neglected area. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 35*(3), 406-409.
Paletz, D., & Pearson, R. (1978). "The way you look tonight": A critique of television news criticism. In W. Adams & F. Schreibman (Eds.), *Television network news: Issues in content research* (pp. 65-85). Washington, DC: George Washington University.
Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*, 696-735.
Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Between macro and micro: Contexts and other connections. In J. Alexander et al. (Eds.), *The micro-macro link*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Schramm, W. (1973). *Men, messages, and media: A look at human communication*. New York: Harper & Row.
Schudson, M. (1982). The politics of narrative form: The emergence of news conventions in print and television. *Daedalus, 111*(4), 97-112.
Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance, communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Tracey, M. (1977). *The production of political television*, London: Routledge.
Trew, A. (1979a). Theory and ideology at work. In R. Fowler et al. (Eds.), *Language and control* (pp. 94-116). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Trew, A. (1979b). "What the papers say": Linguistic variation and ideological difference. In R. Fowler et al. (Eds.), *Language and control* (pp. 117-156). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Tuchman, G. (1972). Objectivity as strategic ritual. *American Journal of Sociology, 77*, 660-679.
Tuchman (1973). The technology of objectivity: Doing "objective" TV news film. *Urban Life and Culture, 2*(1), 3-26.
van Dijk, T. (1977). *Text and context: Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. London: Longman.
van Dijk, T. (1983). Discourse analysis: Its development and application to the structure of news. *Journal of Communication, 33*(2), 20-43.
van Dijk, T. (Ed.). (1985). *Handbook of discourse analysis: Vol. 3. Discourse and dialogue*. New York: Academic Press.
Weaver, P. (1975). Newspaper news and television news. In D. Cater & R. Adler (Eds.), *Television as a social force: New approaches to TV criticism* (pp. 81-94). New York: Praeger.

Wedell, E. G. (1968). *Broadcasting and public policy*. London: Michael Joseph.
Weisman, J. (1986, August 23). Are we better informed now—or worse? *TV Guide*, pp. 6-10.
West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1982). Conversation analysis. In K. R. Sherer & P. Ekman (Eds.), *Handbook of methods in nonverbal behavior research* (pp. 506-541). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Whale, J. (1977). *The politics of the media*. London: Fontana/Collins.
Wilson, T. P., Wiemann, J. M., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1984). Models of turn taking in conversational interaction. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 3*, 159-183.
Wilson, T. P., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1986). The structure of silence between turns in two-party conversation. *Discourse Processes, 9*, 375-390.
Wyndham Goldie, G. (1977). *Facing the nation: Television and politics 1936-1976*. London: Bodley Head.
Zimmerman, Don H. (1988). On conversation: The conversation analytic perspective. *Communication yearbook 11*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.