

COMM 497AG - Talk in the Media (38804)

Fall, 2011 M,W,F M W F 1:25PM 2:15PM Machmer Hall room W-22
Instructor: Gonen Dori-Hacohen email: gonen@comm.umass.edu office hours: M 12-1PM @ Machmer 304 or by email appointment

Course description:

This course uses tools from the study of everyday interaction to explore one-on-one interactions in the electronic media. The course focuses on two genres in two different media: television news and call-in radio. Alongside theoretical studies, the course uses data sessions to analyze different television and radio segments.

Objectives and Goals:

Upon successful completion of the course, you will know how real interactions are organized in the media. You will write a research paper about a media phenomenon, and will understand the basic skills of journalists – asking questions and understanding answers, regardless of the interviewee.

Required texts: See reading materials below

Reading marked with a star are secondary readings

Assessment	Due date		%
1. Transcription assignment	10/03 1:25P, moodle	10	
2. Analysis assignment part 1	11/2 1:25, moodle		10
3. Analysis Assignment Part 2	11/04 8:00P, moodle		10
4. Personal progress report	11/23 in person		10*/15
5. Student presentations	last couple of weeks		5*
6. Final paper	12/13 12:00 moodle		40
7. Participation	always		15

1. **The transcription assignment:** you need to transcribe 1 segment of 3-5 minutes from either television or radio interview the best way you know how. The 10% is guaranteed upon timely submission. This segment should be used in your final paper as data. The student should hand in both the transcription and either the audio material or a link with access to the audio-visual material.

2. **Analysis Assignment part 1:** as a preparation for the final paper, you will be given a short segment of interaction to analyze. You will be asked to analyze the segment based on questions asked and on the data sessions that were done in class. The 10% is guaranteed upon timely submission.

3. **Analysis Assignment part 2:** as a follow up to part 1, you will be given an additional question about the same segment. You will need to answer it online, and then read other students' answers, rank them, and comment on them, and then post a revised version of your answer. Grade will be based on quality of answers and participation in the forum, partially based on peer-reviews, meaning on the ranking your comments get from your fellow students.

The goal of both the analysis assignments is to let you have a go at analyzing data and to receive feed-back on this analysis, without the grading pressure, as a preparation for the analysis you will do in the final paper. **No late submission is allowed!**

4. **Personal progress report:** you should meet me to report about the final paper. In this **oral** report the student should present the planned **corpus** – the program chosen for the final paper, the **topics of interest** about this program, the **research questions** rising from these interests, and **two academic materials** in use from the course syllabus and **one source outside** of the course syllabus. Three sections are devoted for the personal meetings, as well as instructor's office hours and arranged meetings. The more prepared the student arrived to the meeting, the better, as grade is based upon meeting these requirements. 20 % of the final grade, unless the presentation option is taken, then 15% of final grade. No written report is needed. Feed-back and guidelines for the final paper will be given in these meetings, so you will have better understanding of your final paper.

5. **Student presentation:** you **can choose** to present your project for the final paper in the last two weeks of the class meetings. You need to present your research question and one piece of data for the class to analyze. The class will analyze your data for a short time – no longer than 8 minutes, followed by a short class discussion – no more than 5 minutes. You need to send me the data before the class meeting. 5 % of

the final grade. **This is an optional assignment**, and if you choose it, the personal report drops down to 15% of your final grade. **Since this is optional, not all students will have the time to present their data, and slots will be given on first come first served bases.**

6. **Final paper** should use the methods and theories studied in class to analyze either a TV or Radio program(s). The paper should have an overarching construction dedicated, in an essay form, to a single issue or a problem regarding the specific program. This problem should be presented based on prior academic research. The paper should use at least 8 articles, and at 4 from the syllabus. Its discussion should be based on the **transcribed data in the transcription assignment and 9 additional segments transcribed from the same program(s), as they should be attached as virtual (meaning sent via email) appendix.** In the paper, the student analyzes segments from the data to answer a research question. For *Grading Criteria* see below.

7. **Participation** during class discussion and especially during data sessions may **contribute or harm** the grade. A positive and **knowledgeable** participation is essential for an outstanding final grade. A negative participation, including demonstration of lack knowledge, will harm the grade.

Late assignments: Other than the analysis assignment, docked 1% for each day late for each assignment, beginning the hour the paper is due; none accepted after 3 days. Students **cannot** receive a passing grade if any of the assignments are not handed in.

Disabilities: Students with disabilities, properly documented, should report it during their first week of participation in class.

Note: students should be familiar with UMass regulations concerning plagiarism.

Lecture outline

09/07 W	We1	1a	Introduction	
09/09 F	We1	1b	Data session: introduction	
09/12 M	We2	2a	Mundane and broadcast talk	
09/14 W	We2	2b	CA and institutional talk	
09/16 F	We2	2b	Cont.	
09/19 M	We3	3a	Footing	
09/21 W	We3	3b	Footing	
09/23 F	We3	3c	DS: Footing	
09/26 M	We4	4a	Radio phone-in intro	
09/28 W	We4	4b	Radio PI: Overall structure	
09/30 F	We4	4c	DS: the radio PI	
10/03 M	We5	5a	RPI: conflict & opposition	Transcription assig. due
05/10 W	We5	5b	DS: the radio PI	
07/10 F	We5	5c	DS: the radio PI	
10/10 M	We6		Happy Columbus Day	
10/11 T	We6	6a	The Journalistic Interview	
10/12 W	We6	6b	Practices in JI	
10/14 F	We6	6c	DS: practices in JI	
10/17 M	We7	7a	Personal meetings	No ordinary meeting
10/19 W	We7	7b	Roles in JI	
10/21 F	We7	7c	DS: Roles in JI	
10/24 M	We8	7b	JI and the News	
10/26 W	We8	8a	Personal meetings	No ordinary meeting
10/28 F	We8	8c	DS: JI and the News	Analysis P1 given
10/31 M	We9	9a	DS: practicing JI	
11/02 W	We9	9b	(No Class)	Analysis P1 Due, P2 given
11/04 F	We9	9b	(No Class)	Analysis P2 due
11/07 M	We10	10a	Analyzing the assignment	
11/09 W	We10	10b	Personal meetings	No ordinary meeting

11/11 F	We10	10c	Veteran day	
11/14 M	We11	11a	"Non" political interviews	
11/16 W	We11	11b	DS: "Non" p. interviews	
11/18 F	We11	11c	Personal virtual meetings	No ordinary meeting
11/21 M	We12	12	DS: "Non" p. interviews	
11/23 W	We12	12	How to write a paper	
11/25 F	We12	12	Happy Thanks Giving	
11/28 M	We13	13	Student's presentations	
11/30 W	We13	13	Student's presentations	
12/02 F	We13	13	Student's presentations	
12/05 M	We14	14a	DS: general data session	
12/07 W	We14	14b	Student's presentations	
12/09 F	We14	14c	Conclusion	

Reading schedule - roughly:

Past courses strongly suggest a correlation between reading and the final grade.

Week 2

- O'Keeffe, A. (2006) *Investigating media discourse*. Routledge. Pp: 1-10, 19-31
Hutchby, I. (2006) *Media Talk*. New York: Open University. Pp: 1-34.
Heritage, J. (1984) *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press. Pp: 233-244.
Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (1992) Analyzing talk at work: an introduction. In Paul Drew & J. Heritage (eds.), *Talk at work: interaction in institutional settings* (Pp: 17-35). Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
Tolson, A. (2006) *Media Talk: spoken discourse on TV and Radio*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh university press. Pp: 5-53.

Week 3

- Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania press. 124-160.
Clayman, S. E. (1992) Footing in the achievement of neutrality: the case of news-interview discourse. In: Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (eds.), *Talk at work: interaction in institutional settings* (Pp: 163-98). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Week 4

- *Barker, D. C. & Knight, K. (2000) Political talk radio and public opinion. *Public opinion quarterly*, 64, 149-170.
*Herbst, S. (1995) On Electronic public Space: Talk Shows in Theoretical Perspective. *Political Communication*, 12, 263-274.
Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania press. Pp: 197-217; 232-278.
Hutchby, I. (1991) The organisation of talk on talk radio. In P. Scannell (ed.), *Broadcast Talk* (Pp: 119-137). London: Sage, 1991
Hutchby, I. (2001). 'Witnessing': the use of first-hand knowledge in legitimating lay opinions on talk radio. *Discourse studies*, 3(4) 481-497.

Week 5

- Hutchby, I. (1996). *Confrontation Talk: Arguments, Asymmetries, and Power on Talk Radio*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum. Pp: 20-59.
Liddicoat, A., S. Döpke, K. Love, & Brown, A. (1995) Presenting a point of view: Callers' contributions to talkback radio in Australia. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 22, 139-156.

Week 6

- *McNair, Brian. 2000. *Journalism and Democracy. An Evaluation of the Political Public Sphere*. London: Routledge. pp: 84-110.
*Schudson, M. 1995. The power of news. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Pp: 72-94.
Heritage, J. C. (2003) Designing Questions and Setting Agendas in the News Interview. In: Glenn, P., C.D. LeBaron, & Mandelbaum, J. (eds.), *Studies in Language and Social Interaction: In honor of Robert Hopper* (Pp. 57-90). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum. (electronic resource)
Heritage, J. (2002) The limits of questioning: negative interrogatives and hostile question content. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 1427-46.

Clayman, S.E. (2001) Answers and evasions. *Language in Society* 30, 403-31.
Clayman, S. E. (1991) News interview openings: aspects of sequential organization. In: Scannell, P. (ed.), *Broadcast Talk: A Reader*. Beverly Hills: Sage: 48-75.

Week 7

Weizman, E. (2003) News Interviews on Israeli Television: Normative expectations and discourse norms. In: Stati, S. & Bondi, M. (eds.), *Dialogue Analysis 2000* (Pp. 383-394). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
Femø Nielsen, M. (2006) Doing Interviewer Roles in TV Interviews. In Ekström, M., Å. Kroon & M. Nylund (eds.) *News from the Interview Society* (Pp. 95-120). Sweden: Nordicom.
Schegloff, E.A. (1989) From interview to confrontation: observations on the Bush/Rather encounter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 22, 215-40.

Week 8

Ekström, M. (2001) Politicians Interviewed on Television News. *Discourse & Society*, 12(5), 563-584.
Clayman, S. E. (1995) Defining moments, presidential debates, and the dynamics of quotability. *Journal of Communication* 45(3), 118-146.

Week 11

Tolson, A. (2006) *Media Talk: spoken discourse on TV and Radio*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh university press. Pp: 130-167.
Lundell, Å sa (2010) Dialogues between journalists on the news: the intraprofessional 'interview' as a communicative genre. *Media, Culture and Society*, 32(3) (2010): 429-450
Hamo, M., Kampf, Z. & Shifman, L. (2010) Surviving the "Mock Interview": Challenges to Political Communicative Competence in Contemporary Televised Discourse. *Media, Culture and Society*, 32, 247-266.
Montgomery, M. (2008) The Discourse of the Broadcast News Interview. *Journalism Studies*, 9(2), 260-277.
Norricks, Neal R. (2010). Listening practices in television celebrity interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 525-543.

Background readings:

Baym G. (2005) The Daily Show: Discursive Integration and the Reinvention of Political Journalism. *Political Communication*, 22, 259-76.
Barker, D.C. (1998) The Talk Radio Community: Nontraditional social networks and political participation. *Social science quarterly*, 79(2), 261-86
Warner, J. 2007. Political Culture Jamming: The Dissident Humor of The Daily Show With Jon Stewart. *Popular Communication*, 5(1), 17-36.

Grading Letter (%)-- the final take home and grade will be based on a scale of:

A 93-100: Work that demonstrates not only a full grasp of all course materials but unique personal insight into those materials, individually and in total, with substantial evidence of cogent, imaginative efforts to apply them to questions raised in class and beyond and exceptional participation in class.

A- 90-93: a lesser degree thereof.

B+ 87-90: Work that demonstrates a full grasp of all course materials and an authentic full-on effort at analyzing and synthesizing those materials.

B 83-87: a lesser degree thereof.

B- 80-83 : Work that demonstrates a working familiarity with most course materials and an effort at a comprehensive analysis of those materials.

C+ 77-80: a lesser degree thereof

C 73-77: Work that demonstrates a familiarity with the majority of course materials and consistent effort at an analysis of those materials.

C- 70-73: Work that demonstrates a passing acquaintance with the majority of the course materials and efforts at some analysis of those materials. Some assigned work tardy.

D+ 69-70 : Work that demonstrates intermittent attempts to engage with some of the course materials.

D 67-60: lesser degree there of.

F 59-0 or failure to complete any required work results in F.

Disability Statement: Umass Amherst is committed to providing an equal educational opportunity for all students. If you have a documented physical, psychological, or learning disability of file with Disability

Services (DS), Learning Disabilities Support Services (LDSS), or Psychological Disablement Services (PDS), you may be eligible for reasonable academic accommodation, please notify me within course. If you have a documented disability that requires an accommodation, please notify me within the first 2 weeks of the semester so that we may make appropriate arrangements.

Grading Letter (%)-- the final take home and grade will be based on a scale of:

A 93-100: Work that demonstrates not only a full grasp of all course materials but unique personal insight into those materials, individually and in total, with substantial evidence of cogent, imaginative efforts to apply them to questions raised in class and beyond and exceptional participation in class.

A- 90-93: a lesser degree thereof.

B+ 87-90: Work that demonstrates a full grasp of all course materials and an authentic full-on effort at analyzing and synthesizing those materials.

B 83-87: a lesser degree thereof.

B- 80-83 : Work that demonstrates a working familiarity with most course materials and an effort at a comprehensive analysis of those materials.

C+ 77-80: a lesser degree thereof

C 73-77: Work that demonstrates a familiarity with the majority of course materials and consistent effort at an analysis of those materials.

C- 70-73: Work that demonstrates a passing acquaintance with the majority of the course materials and efforts at some analysis of those materials. Some assigned work tardy.

D+ 69-70 : Work that demonstrates intermittent attempts to engage with some of the course materials.

D 67-60: lesser degree there of.

F 59-0 or failure to complete any required work results in F.

Disability Statement: Umass Amherst is committed to providing an equal educational opportunity for all students. If you have a documented physical, psychological, or learning disability of file with Disability Services (DS), Learning Disabilities Support Services (LDSS), or Psychological Disablement Services (PDS), you may be eligible for reasonable academic accommodation, please notify me within course. If you have a documented disability that requires an accommodation, please notify me within the first 2 weeks of the semester so that we may make appropriate arrangements.

Since the integrity of the academic enterprise of any institution of higher education requires honesty in scholarship and research, academic honesty is required of all students at the University of Massachusetts Amherst

Academic dishonesty statement: Academic dishonesty is prohibited in all programs of the University. Academic dishonesty includes but is not limited to: cheating, fabrication, plagiarism, and facilitating dishonesty. Appropriate sanctions may be imposed on any student who has committed an act of academic dishonesty. Instructors should take reasonable steps to address academic misconduct. Any person who has reason to believe that a student has committed academic dishonesty should bring such information to the attention of the appropriate course instructor as soon as possible. Instances of academic dishonesty not related to a specific course should be brought to the attention of the appropriate department Head or Chair. The procedures outlined below are intended to provide an efficient and orderly process by which action may be taken if it appears that academic dishonesty has occurred and by which students may appeal such actions.

Since students are expected to be familiar with this policy and the commonly accepted standards of academic integrity, ignorance of such standards is not normally sufficient evidence of lack of intent.
http://www.umass.edu/dean_students/codeofconduct/acadhonesty/

As any social activity, course order is not preordained and may be subject to change.