5

Language Studies and Journalism

The examination of the languages of journalism has been a relatively novel phenomenon in the world of inquiry into journalism. Although language is at the heart of journalism, only over the past 30 years or so have scholars shown a sustained interest in investigating its languages. The combination of formal features of language—such as grammar, syntax, and word choice—and less formal ones—such as storytelling frames, textual patterns, and formulaic narratives—creates a multilayered system of information relay, which has grown in complexity as journalism has embraced not only the printed press but also radio, television, cable, and new media. Today, sound, still photographs, moving visuals, and patterns of interactivity have become part of the languages by which journalists provide information. As journalism has progressed toward increasingly complex systems of information relay, the notion of what constitutes a journalistic language has grown as well.

Language studies are an outgrowth of the idea that the messages of journalism are not transparent or simplistic but encode larger messages about the shape of life beyond the sequencing of actions that comprise a news event. A simple reading of a text can be found nowhere obvious; instead, reading a text is always the product of a socially contingent and negotiated process of meaning construction. Reading necessarily involves a nuanced examination of a text's fit with a larger cognitive, social, cultural, political, and/or economic context. In moving away from a somewhat empiricist bias on the world—the stance of "what you see is what you get" that is readily touted by journalists as part of their self-presentation as arbiters of reality—language studies provide a wide-ranging rubric in which to examine language in

different, often competing contexts. Key to this rubric, which connects the microanalytic and macroanalytic dimensions of news work, has been an a priori acceptance of the premise that journalism involves construction.

The Study of Language

Inquiry of the languages of journalism has taken shape alongside broader developments in the academy around the world, primarily after scholars in communication, sociology, anthropology, and linguistics independently began to broaden their level of analysis concerning language during the late 1960s and early 1970s. According to Teun van Dijk (1987), four major historical developments paved the way for more creative and integrated interdisciplinary investigations of language. In linguistics, the primary unit of grammatical analysis moved from the "sentence" to the "text" or "discourse." Anthropologists developed an interest in the ethnography of speaking, which promoted investigations of language use in its socio-cultural context (e.g., Hymes 1972). Sociologists became interested in microsociology, an interest that gravitated in two directions: (1) toward the tradition of political sociology, where primarily British sociologists began to examine issues of class and other power distributions through Marxist leanings that geared them toward language (e.g., Lukes 1975) and (2) toward the examination of the rules and methods of everyday interac-tion, commonly known in the United States as conversation analysis and ethnomethodology (e.g., Sacks 1972). Finally, developments in cognitive psychology brought scholars closer to social psychology: they moved from largely experimental studies of text comprehension focusing on the formal grammatical rules by which reading and learning took shape to studies that examined the strategies of context-dependent practices associated with information processing. In the United Kingdom, a parallel move was made via Freudian and Lacanian theorizations of the centrality of language to human subjectivity.

The theories and methods that found a home in language studies were widespread and strongly European in origin, though some efforts were dis-played in the United States. Semiology, discourse analysis, critical linguistics, narrative analysis, rhetoric, and content analysis were but a few of the research perspectives employed by scholars seeking to examine language. At the heart of each perspective was a combination of one or more of three basic approaches to language—structuralism, culturalism, and functionalism.

Structuralism typically considered language as an autonomous abstract system that existed in an arbitrary relationship with reality. Language in this

view was predicated on the universality of linguistic structure that followed its own set of rules independent of the context at hand. Culturalism, sometimes called the "anthropological perspective" on language, promoted the idea that cultures develop different languages for perceiving reality. An extension of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, this view popularized the twin assumptions of linguistic relativity and linguistic determinism in offering the perspective that languages changed according to the cultures using them. Functionalism, which both sociolinguists and ethnomethodologists employ, saw language use as determined by the function it fulfilled in those who used it. This view offered a correlation between certain linguistic features and aspects of social context.

The analysis of journalism's languages typically employed a combination of these different perspectives on language use. In that each approach presumed that language resulted from construction, rendering language the focal point of analysis, each went against the grain of journalists' self-presentation by undermining their insistence that they mirrored reality. The enthusiasm for studying the languages of news accompanied an ascending recognition of the construction work underlying journalistic practice. At the same time, this assumption allied language research strongly with critical and ideological studies and thus saw journalists as agents of the ideological order.

The emphasis on language played to both formalistic and less formalistic attributes that were repeatable and patterned, hence analytically accessible due to what appeared to be a static and seemingly stable nature. Differences that came to the fore when considering the use of passive or active voice or the differentiation across gender terms came to be seen as useful information in understanding the mind-set of journalists and journalism, and language gradually came to be regarded as a unique analytical setting for these reasons. For instance, it offset sociological inquiry's relative lack of interest in news texts. Conversely, sociological inquiry's greatest strength—the emphasis on interactions across groups of people—remained beyond the interest of most scholars engaged in language studies.

Against this background, inquiry into language and journalism developed in numerous parts of the globe, its establishment facilitated by the ascent of computers in conducting searches. Tools such as Lexis-Nexis, a search engine that looked for a single phrase or word across newspapers, and other software, which allowed scholars to search for the pairing of certain words, made it easier to trace language use in the news. Language studies primarily emerged from analyses of English-language news, though some scholars also analyzed the news in German (Burger 1984), Italian (Mancini 1988), French (Brunel 1970), Chinese (Scollon 1998), Dutch

(van Dijk 1988), and Hebrew (Roeh 1982; Blum-Kulka 1983; Nir 1984). Certain scholars provided comparative analyses across nation-states and languages (e.g., van Dijk 1988). Leitner (1980), for instance, compared two cases of official radio-talk—BBC English and *Deutsche Rundfunksprache* (the designated language of German radio)—finding that the sociopolitical structure determined which sociolinguistic categories became designated news languages. In all cases, different invocations of part or all of three bodies of scholarship targeted the verbal and visual languages of journalism as follows:

- An orientation to the informal attributes of the languages in which journalistic texts were relayed: Such attributes ranged from the number of times a word or phrase was mentioned to the linkage across the connoted meanings of a news photograph or front-page headline. Typical approaches here included content analysis and semiology.

- An orientation to the formalistic aspects of a journalistic text: Included were its grammar, syntax, morphology, semantics, lexical meanings, and pragmatics. Typical approaches here included sociolinguistics, critical linguistics, discourse analysis, and formalistic studies of the visual attributes of news.

- An orientation to the pragmatic use of journalistic language: Examples of such scholarship included those focused on the act of telling a story and its narrative formula and storytelling conventions, on rhetoric, and on the use of news as a framing device. Typical approaches here included the various modes of narrative analysis, rhetorical analysis, and framing studies. In recent years, this category of scholarship drew particular interest from those interested in alternative types of journalistic storytelling, as evidenced by the tabloids, and in visual storytelling.

Journalism and the Informal Study of Language

Interest in the languages of journalism was slower in coming to inquiry into journalism than were the focal points of other disciplinary perspectives. It was primarily in the mid-1970s that journalism scholars began to respond to the fact that language had not been systematically studied as part of journalism. Some efforts had been made, but they were generally isolated and unrelated to each other. As the Glasgow University Media Group (1976: 21) noted, there was an "almost complete lack of convergence between the discipline of linguistics, the literary and stylistic criticism of texts and the

rag-bag of sociological content analysis," all of which made the analysis of news language a highly unattractive proposition. And yet, the growing and often competing presence of content analysis and semiology, and eventually of framing, in inquiry into journalism began to force the question of language's relevance, offering divergent alternatives for thinking about how language might function as part of journalism. Although none of these approaches offered the type of formalistic analysis of language that would later come with the more linguistically driven analytical perspectives, content analysis in particular positioned language as a given that merited generalized scholarly attention. Over time these approaches facilitated the sustained recognition of language as a complex and patterned venue worthy of analytical attention.

Content Analysis

Although content analysis does not consider the formal attributes of news languages per se, its attention to news texts made the centrality of language an unavoidable aspect of journalism's study. In its purest form, content analysis was clarified most extensively by Klaus Krippendorff (1980/2004), who delineated precise formulations about inference making and a conceptual framework for how to move between a text and its context. Simply put, it involved counting the number of times a phenomenon—a word, a phrase, a story, or an image—appeared in a text, classifying each of them according to predefined categories, and offering latent and manifest explanations for their patterned appearance. Although Krippendorff's template was extensive and painstakingly laid out, few works that eventually labeled themselves "content analyses" actually developed along the lines he suggested (Krippendorff 1980/2004; Rosengren 1981). Over time, many procedures he suggested for connecting a phenomenon with the larger world it represented were simply cut out of analysis, and contemporary instances of content analysis often tended to do little more than count frequencies of appearance of a given phenomenon.

Early attempts at content analysis of the press were implemented earlier than other language approaches, already at the turn of the 20th century in both Europe and the United States: Kurt Lang, for instance, listed numerous efforts at that time, among them a U.S. study in 1900 of different kinds of news content, a French 1902 examination of Parisian and provincial dailies, and a German 1910 study of 30 Berlin and provincial newspapers (Lang 1996). Krippendorff (1980/2004) mentioned yet another study that, in setting up a bookkeeping system that monitored the number of column-inches of coverage on certain news topics, sought to reveal "the truth about

newspapers" (Street 1909). Approximately 30 years later, as propaganda became an issue of concern in the years leading up to and following World War II, social science scholars began to apply their own analytical tools to the systematic study of content patterns of press coverage (Simpson 1934; Kingsbury 1937). Julian Woodward (1934), for instance, saw it as a technique of opinion research and a reflection of the uses to which social science methodology could be put. Topics ranged from the *New York Times'* disastrously optimistic reporting of the end of the Russian Revolution (Lippmann and Merz 1920) to Communist propaganda (Lasswell and Jones 1939) to general patterns of war coverage (Foster 1937). Harold Lasswell (1941) invoked certain tenets of the perspective while examining the circulation of political symbols in news editorials.

Over time efforts became more sophisticated. In that the perspective involved the counting and summation of phenomena, it was seen as an empirical method worthy of recognition by scholars in the social sciences and rapidly became a perspective of choice, offering them a way to account for a phenomenon's variance over time, geographic region, or issue. Scholars like Bernard Berelson (1952), Ithia de Sola Pool (1959), and Ole Holsti (1969) used content analysis to make broad statements about political life. In 1959, Wilbur Schramm's *One Day in the World's Press* used content analysis to show how the ideological prism of 14 major world newspapers affected the reporting of two international crises—the attack on Egypt by European and Israeli forces during the Suez Canal crisis and the entry of Soviet tanks into Budapest.

The method behind the early studies was simple, was easy to understand, and promoted an implicit emphasis on journalistic language. And yet it assumed implicitly that if journalists made a given statement or reference to a phenomenon in their news reports, that statement or reference was sufficient evidence that the phenomenon existed. Much work here did not consider the selection and construction work implicit in language's shaping, assuming instead that the articulation of a phenomenon was primarily what was relevant. Moreover, it did not consider numerous embedded dimensions of language use, such as its social situatedness, tone, style, and other affective qualities. Language, then, was seen as a neutral carrier, a conduit for events to be articulated in the public sphere.

The simplicity of that logic had an impact on broader understandings of how journalism worked. One issue frequently examined through content analysis was journalistic bias. Beginning with Richard Hofstetter's (1976) analysis of bias in the coverage of political campaigns—where it was largely reduced to the linguistic evidence of a deliberative choice for or against a candidate—content analysis became a means for implementing a slew of

similar studies of news over the decades that followed (e.g., Robinson and Sheehan 1983, Moriarty and Popovich 1991, Kuklinski and Sigelman 1992, Kenney and Simpson 1993, Patterson 1993, Dickson 1994, Domke et al. 1997). Studies examined the bias of verbal reports and visual images across national and international contexts, each time relying at least partly on the number of times a certain phrase or theme was mentioned or a certain image appeared. Although the notion of bias has since been complicated as a given in journalistic practice and discourse (see, e.g., Hackett 1984; Zelizer, Park, and Gudelunas 2002), the repeated studies proclaiming degrees of its absence or presence in news on the basis of the number and frequency of certain linguistic or visual markers deserve pause. Their prevalence helped instantiate a widespread reliance on language without due consideration of the factors that influenced language's shaping. In other words, much early work in content analysis treated language like an empirical reality, rendering it a given for examining journalism's workings without considering the features that went into its making.

From the 1970s onward, certain work in content analysis helped establish the ideological leanings of the news. The Glasgow University Media Group (GUMG) saw content analysis as one of its central analytical methods. Using the most sophisticated technologies then available—the video cassette recorder and the software system SSPS—the group found itself recalculating the time and effort its content analysis would entail but used it to uphold findings about an antilabor bias in British TV news (GUMG 1976, 1980). Other work combined content analysis with interviews to examine the working patterns of editors of the book review sections of U.K. newspapers (Curran 2000b).

Though still in use for studies that primarily enumerate frequencies of a given phenomenon in the news, content analysis has been critiqued for its oversimplification of the complexities it addressed (e.g., Schroder 2002). In one contemporary media critic's words, most studies are "rarely 'scientific' in the generally understood connotation of the term. Many are merely pseudo-science, ideology masquerading as objectivity" (Alterman 2003: 15). Although content analysis did much to focus scholars' attention on the relevance of language to inquiry into journalism, and it increased in prominence with the more frequent use of computers, the ascendance of other language-based approaches to journalism created a more complicated stream of language studies on journalism.

Semiology

Semiology's arrival in inquiry into journalism forced a rethinking of the empiricist notion of "what you see is what you get" in language. Of all

language approaches, semiology, also called semiotics, was perhaps most responsible for moving the study of journalism's languages toward a consideration of texts in context. Following the work of Ferdinand de Saussure (1916/1965), Claude Lévi-Strauss (1958/1968), Roland Barthes (1957/1972, 1967), Charles Peirce (1893–1913/1998), Umberto Eco (1976, 1984), and Thomas Sebeok (1964, 1979), semiologists, also called semioticians, promoted the notion that the form of a message was as important as its content. Drawing on the one hand from de Saussure's insistence on the arbitrary relationship between signs and the real world and Lévi-Strauss's concern with myth's capacity to dissolve distinctions between nature and culture, and on the other hand from an interest in the science of signs drawn from philosophy and logic, these scholars set about excavating the various sign systems at play in journalistic texts (Leach 1976). News texts provided a captive corpus, in which journalism scholars saw significant opportunity for furthering existing understandings of news.

The relevance of semiology to journalism was evident already from Barthes's provocative collection of essays *Mythologies* (1957/1972), in which he analyzed photographs of politicians, the language of the press during the Algerian war, and politicians' political speeches as a means of uncovering the semiological patterns in public discourse. Using what he later developed as an approach to narrative analysis (Barthes 1967), he examined how the French media strategically manipulated codes of signification while proclaiming that no such codes existed. But it was the application of his work to news photographs—in a seminal essay in cultural studies by Stuart Hall (1973a) of the Birmingham School—that directly piqued the interest of scholars wanting to account for the twofold ability of news language to both signify and impact larger power structures. By the time the Birmingham School published *Culture, Media, Language* in 1980 (Hall, Hobson, Lowe, and Willis 1980), language's study had begun to be seen as an important analytical entry for understanding the ideological positioning of the media.

Parallel efforts in earlier years by the U.S. philosopher Charles Peirce (1893–1913/1998) developed a second strand of semiological work, focused on a philosophy of signs derived from logic. Developing a distinction between a sign's representation, the object to which it referred, and the interpreted version of the sign, Peirce was interested in explaining how the cognitive activities involved in interpretation gave rise to an ongoing process called semiosis, by which the interpretation of signs continually generated other interpretations. Semiosis over time became invoked as a useful basis for extensive theories of the communication process, although Peirce's work was applied to journalism more slowly. Scholarship in Italy by Umberto Eco (1976) extended Peirce's work and further elaborated the importance of distinguishing between natural and cultural codes of meaning in the news. In

the United States, Thomas Sebeok (1964, 1979) led the way in introducing semiotics to more traditional modes of language analysis.

By the late 1970s and early 1980s, semiology began to be adopted by British and Australian researchers, working independently to understand the languages of news. Focusing on the role of language in helping explain how meanings were socially produced rather than individually constructed, as well as subject to power relations, these scholars developed the idea that news consisted of both signs and codes—the former referring to any items that produced meaning, the latter to how they were organized in conjunction with the surrounding social and cultural order.

Within this paradigm, the two most well-known texts were John Fiske and John Hartley's *Reading Television* (1978) and John Hartley's *Understanding News* (1982). Both were responsible for introducing those studying journalism to a set of focal points and analytical terms that significantly changed understandings of the centrality of journalistic language. In *Reading Television* (1978), Fiske and Hartley reproduced an entire television news bulletin for analysis, offering a point-by-point examination of it in terms of line up, word choice, and verbal and visual sequencing. They argued that journalists primarily functioned as bards in providing and selectively constructing social knowledge for the public, supplanting individuals who in earlier times had fulfilled the same function—priests, patriarchs, intellectuals. Hartley's book, *Understanding News* (1982), called by one scholar "of great importance in restoring semiotic concepts to the theory of news representation" (Fowler 1991: 223), extended the work of *Reading Television* into a wide-ranging consideration of journalism's verbal and visual dimensions. Offering simple definitions for fundamental concepts from a semiological standpoint—signs and codes, denotation and connotation, paradigm and syntagma, myths and icons—the book applied the basic premises of semiology to journalism by elaborating the broad cultural codes in which journalism's languages took shape. Hartley argued that audiences learned not only to understand the information they received but also to interpret the world in terms of the codes they learned from the news.

Both Hartley and Fiske continued their semiological excavation of news in later work, extending it to a broader mode of cultural analysis that over time met criticism due to its wide-ranging applications and because it initially assumed that all readers decoded in basically the same way (e.g., McGuigan 1992). Fiske (1988, 1996) examined the ideological positioning of journalists and journalism in a wide span of news events, including the O.J. Simpson court trial and the Anita Hill-Clarence Thomas hearings. Hartley (1992, 1996) primarily considered the visual dimensions of journalism, where he used semiology to examine the function and role of photography in the news.

The Glasgow University Media Group also followed semiological perspectives in some of its later examinations of language (GUMG 1980) but more directly in its consideration of the visuals of news (GUMG 1976, 1980). Focusing on a combination of film logic and its adaptation to simultaneous audio commentary, the group showed how presentational cues in the news guided viewers in assessing the legitimacy of what they heard. Other work here was visual in focus, as in Zelizer's (1990b) analysis of how visual codes on broadcast news conveyed a false sense of proximity between anchorperson and event. Although later work by other scholars utilized many of the premises set in place by semiology, particularly its emphasis on cultural codes, much of this later work tended to be codified as cultural studies (e.g., Allan 1998), where issues like meaning and power became central imperatives for studying texts.

Other work of a semiological bent developed in France, where, following on the legacy of Barthes, scholars focused on language in the media, paying particular attention to political discourse (e.g., Dayan 1999, 2001). The establishment of the review *Mots,* dedicated to "the languages of politics," explored different dimensions of the language underlying the intersection of journalism and politics, including political speeches, political cartoons, journalistic reviews, and journalistic rhetoric. For example, socialist discourse of the mid-1980s began repeatedly to reference modernization in the news, revealing a change in the lexicon of terms related to French social democracy (Neveu 1998). In addition, scholars argued that journalistic representations of foreigners as "immigrant workers" linked them to law and order discourses or that the scene construction for a French political talk show was built to reflect a mock House of Commons, where political guests were divided spatially by political loyalties (Neveu 1998).

Over time many semiological studies of journalism ceased to be called such even though they continued to adopt certain tenets of semiology, particularly given the ascent of critical cultural scholarship that insisted on a wider range of responses to news than semiology initially allowed. Nonetheless, semiology's attentiveness to the form of a news text and to the nuanced intersection between journalism's textual and contextual features introduced vital focal points that were taken up in other language studies of journalism.

* * * * *

The informal study of journalism's languages was important in that it established a setting for thinking about language as a valuable analytical venue of inquiry into journalism. Although content analysis and semiology did not offer a close analysis of the detailed features of news language and

each profited instead from thinking broadly about its positioning as evidence of either a concrete phenomenon, as in content analysis, or cultural meaning, as in semiology, their positioning in inquiry into journalism facilitated the development of other language-based approaches to journalism.

Journalism and the Formal Study of Language

The formal inquiry of the languages of journalism paralleled a broader interest in the academy. Developing primarily in Western Europe, Australia, and New Zealand, from the 1960s onward, an interest in syntax, morphology, phonology, and lexicology was used to engage larger units of meaning in language studies. In the view of one journalism scholar, "the most important development in linguistics for our work has been the emergence of sociolinguistics as a proper field of study . . . the study of language as a means of establishing, maintaining, and mediating social relationships" (Glasgow University Media Group 1980: 126). Alongside sociolinguistics, the analysis of critical linguistics, discourse analysis, and the visual attributes of news made for a wide-ranging analytical setting. Its topics, moreover, extended across the wide range of journalism's performances, as in the analysis of the language employed in sportscasting (Kuiper 1996), the study of DJ conversations on radio (Heritage 1985), analyses of the visual forms of news (Barnhurst 1994; Barnhurst and Nerone 2001), or even Erving Goffman's (1981) seminal discussion of radio talk.

Sociolinguistics

This primarily functionalist approach to language, which considered language use through the functions it filled in those who used it, typically examined correlations between linguistic features and aspects of social context. Following the work of U.S. scholar William Labov (1972), who argued that variants in pronunciation corresponded with the socioeconomic classes of speakers, this work examined journalistic language in its social context throughout the 1970s. It extended along two main analytical tracks: (1) conversational analysis and ethnomethodology (Garfinkel 1967; Sacks 1972) and (2) the ethnography of speaking (Hymes 1972; Bauman and Sherzer 1974).

For most sociolinguists interested in journalism, the work of the Glasgow University Media Group was seen as having most actively promoted the salience of news language. By showing that news was always reported from a particular angle, the group established that news "imposed a structure of

values, social and economic in origin, on whatever is represented; and so inevitably news, like every discourse, constructively pattern[ed] that of which it speaks" (Fowler 1991: 4). The group succeeded in establishing a constructionist view of news work that was a necessary starting point for further linguistic inquiry into journalism.

The Glasgow University Media Group was explicit about its ties to soci-olinguistics. Dedicating its first volume to the memory of conversational analyst Harvey Sacks, it concerned itself with how issues germane to con-versational analysis—how successive utterances were organized, who con-trolled conversations, and how speaker turns were negotiated—could be applied to the mediated languages of news. Using Sacks's consistency rule, by which categories of speakers were characterized by the rules of their conversation, the group demonstrated that the aim of scripted news talk was "to create preferential hearings which invite the competent listener to hear the talk as neutral. . . . [closing] off any questions about evidence and the problematics of production and . . . [resting] upon unexamined causal infer-ences" (GUMG 1976: 25). Borrowing also from William Labov's ideas about speech variations across social classes (1972) and Basil Bernstein's distinction between restricted and elaborated codes—the former spoke to particular groups, whereas the latter offered more universal framings of events—to analyze British television news, the group argued that news lan-guage functioned as a restricted code (GUMG 1980). Characterized by a high degree of predictability, a simplified framing of public events, and a high level of redundancy, these attributes encouraged audiences to align themselves as part of a group rather than express individual differences. In other words, language itself underscored the maintenance of the status quo.

Other work followed the tenets of conversation analysis and ethno-methodology with similar vigor. Concerned with the micromechanics of verbal interaction, scholars looked primarily at broadcast journalism. Their studies ranged from examinations of accents and pronunciation patterns on the news, as in Martin Montgomery's (1986a) discussion of the tensions between BBC English and the wider range of accent types in U.K. broad-casting to the broad range of talk patterns displayed in interviews, talk shows, radio DJ talk, and sports broadcasting (Bell 1982; Crow 1986; Montgomery 1986b; Heritage 1985; Kuiper 1996). Sociolinguistic work on news grew particularly over the last decade. Paddy Scannell put together one of the first edited collections on broadcast talk (Scannell 1991). In 1998, Allan Bell and Peter Garrett tracked the key issues in the analysis of news language, with each chapter of their edited volume addressing a different aspect of the languages of journalism, including discourse structure, word choice in editorials, and layout design of front pages, to name a few. John

Heritage and David Greatbatch used conversational analysis separately and together to analyze British news interviews (Heritage 1985; Greatbatch 1988, 1997; Heritage and Greatbatch 1991). Philip Bell and Theo van Leeuven (1994) used a combination of different sociolinguistic methods to consider the news interview. Steven Clayman (1990) showed how the interactional style of the interview was transposed into the print media. Barbie Zelizer (1989) used Dell Hymes's (1972) framework of the ethnography of communication to examine journalistic quoting practices and notions of differential address in U.S. radio news.

Work on the sociolinguistics of journalism received particular acclaim in New Zealand, where journalist Allan Bell produced one of the most extensive examinations of the language of radio news. Following the work of William Labov (1972), Bell (1991, 1994) considered the level of comprehension evident in the various linguistic features of news registers. Maintaining the singularity of media discourse from a sociolinguistic perspective—in that it did not allow for a co-present listener able to affect conversational flow—Bell showed that the language of news displayed a set of characteristics both typical of and different from those of other conversational settings.

Critical Linguistics

Critical linguistics developed in the late 1970s, when interest in the properties of mediated language grew among British and Australian linguists at the University of East Anglia. The approach sought to establish links between the language of media texts and the production of ideology, reflecting in turn on the reproduction of a social order that perpetuated inequalities. Jointly developed by Roger Fowler, Bob Hodge, Gunther Kress, and Tony Trew as a systemic linguistic template by which to analyze news language, the group produced a series of books elaborating the importance of language's lexical and syntactic choices in demonstrating ideological meanings. Under titles like *Language and Control* (Fowler, Hodge, Kress, and Trew 1979) and *Language as Ideology* (Hodge and Kress 1979), this approach showed the widespread and patterned use of language in all institutional settings.

One work that effectively demonstrated the potential relevance of critical linguistics to journalism was a study of press coverage of racial tension in South Africa, which used language to level criticisms on the variations in media coverage by showing how linguistic variations shaped perceptions of social violence in the news (Trew 1979a). Arguing that linguistic variations encouraged certain public perceptions of the world over others, Trew's work underscored the degree to which journalists' invocations of preferred

ways of describing social violence seemed commonsensical to those who encountered them. In *Language, Image, Media* (Davis and Walton 1983), scholars investigated the parallels across the institutional settings that were impacted by language, with Kress (1983) addressing the linguistic and ideological pairing that characterized the rewriting processes of news reporting. Other works by the same group (Kress and Trew 1978; Trew 1979b) further elaborated the discursive features of the press, while still others extended across numerous case studies (e.g., Hodge and Kress 1988).

Concerned with the "fixed, invisible ideology permeating language" (Fowler 1991: 67), these scholars moved from an a priori recognition of language's constructedness and ideological positioning to a delineation of the syntactic, lexical, semantic, pragmatic, and textual features that made it possible. Critical linguists believed that the style of language was critical because it encoded ideology. In that each choice concerning language use—whether it involved syntax, grammar, or word choice—reflected an invocation of some kind of broader ideological positioning, all aspects of linguistic structure were thought to carry ideological significance. Style constituted ideology's most obvious embodiment and offered a primary link between journalists and readers, who decoded and encoded through a shared familiarity with certain social and discursive practices.

For instance, Fowler (1991) examined how ideological significance was encoded in discourse about gender groups. He argued that the reliance on personalization—and its emphasis on individuals and individual details—hid a more basic thrust in news discourse toward categorization, which provided a discursive basis for discriminatory practices by grouping people, things, and activities into culturally organized sets of categories. Discourse allowed these categories to be traded freely, and discriminatory discourse reinforced stereotypes. This was important to examine because of its effect: Individuals who were placed into discriminatory categories enjoyed less power than did other people.

Critical linguistics was also applied to journalistic visuals. Although *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design* did not center directly on journalism, newspaper photographs figured liberally in the book as examples of the larger visual grammar deployed (Kress and van Leeuwen 1996). Elsewhere, the same authors provided a provocative reading of newspaper front pages (Kress and van Leeuwen 1997). Theo van Leeuwen examined the proxemics, or spatial codes, of the TV news interview (van Leeuwen 1986).

In each case, critical linguistics provided a systematic and wide-ranging mode of engaging with journalistic languages. The perspective's insistence on ideological positioning and its embodiment in language made it attractive to journalism scholars interested in finding a vehicle to substantiate

ideology's presence. At the same time, however, its attentiveness to small, discrete features of language limited its applicability for scholars interested in journalism's "big picture."

Discourse Analysis

Another approach to language and news was developed by numerous European researchers under the rubric of discourse analysis. Established along largely parallel trajectories, these attempts made significant headway in connecting language to its social situations.

Dutch text linguist Teun van Dijk (1983, 1987, 1988) led the way in this regard. He provided what has evolved into probably the most systematic exploration of the discursive features of mediated language, using tools culled from linguistics, literary studies, anthropology, semiotics, sociology, psychology, and speech communication. His approach, developed at the end of the 1960s and beginning of the 1970s in the Netherlands, provided a highly inter-disciplinary theoretical and methodological approach to language and language use that was concerned primarily with group-based forms of inequality in the news. Teun van Dijk centered on the ways in which journalistic texts supported an unequal distribution of power in society and argued that it could be found in language along lines of class, gender, ethnicity, race, or other indices related to status, domination, and power.

Discourse, for van Dijk, referred to the language patterns that were associated with social action and the ways in which people interacted in real situations. In this attempt to merge the microanalysis and macroanalysis of social phenomena, discourse analysis aimed to show how social relationships and processes were accomplished at a micro level through routine practices. In a number of books, including *News as Discourse* (1987), *Communicating Racism* (1989), and *News Analysis* (1988), van Dijk combined text linguistics, narrative analysis, stylistics, and rhetorical analysis to help explain the fundamental legitimation of inequality in society. Discourse analysis, in his view, could not be separated from the larger world but was necessarily associated with what people in a given culture knew, believed, and valued as appropriate.

Another central figure in the development of the discourse analytic work on journalism was British scholar Norman Fairclough (1992, 1993, 1995). Offering a model of language use that conceptualized language as nested within what he saw as a combination of discursive and social practices, Fairclough examined certain types of journalistic relays—such as interviews or news reports—in terms of their dependence on texts from other contexts, like government reports or press releases. Fairclough argued that these

different kinds of texts constituted a blended environment in which the spread of informal speech and colloquial expression helped legitimate certain ways of seeing the world (Fairclough 1996, 1998; Chouliaraki and Fairclough 2000). More so than other approaches, this work stressed the centrality of intertextuality as a way of acceding to certain worldviews and was therefore less impacted by theories of social cognition than by those of cultural impact.

Other scholars developed additional versions of discourse analysis and the news. Working from an analysis of the news in Chinese and English, Ron Scollon (1998) developed a conceptualization of journalistic discourse as a form of social interaction, arguing for more focus on the interactions that shaped journalistic language because they reflected the various discursive identities brought to bear on journalism. Certain scholars (Deacon, Pickering, Golding, and Murdock 1999) applied a combined approach of the work of van Dijk and Fairclough when analyzing the language of British newspapers. Some focused tightly on word choice, voice, or tense as a way of establishing broader meanings about the news, such as newspaper accounts of riots (Potter and Wetherell 1987; also Potter 1996), while others employed somewhat broader notions of discourse to examine the discursive features in talk that appeared both in journalism and elsewhere (e.g., Billig 1995).

In recent years, the invocation of "discourse theory" to describe the work of scholars as diverse as Jurgen Habermas, Ernesto Laclau, Chantal Mouffe, and Slavoj Zizek somewhat muddied the recognition of discourse analysis as a distinct set of methodological tools for analyzing language. None of the latter researchers engaged in the kind of focused analysis of language that the discourse analysts mentioned here were intent on implementing.

Visual Attributes of News

Related here was a growth of literature focusing on the visual aspects of journalism, which exhibited an approach to its formal attributes in ways that drew upon the positioning of visuals as a language. Scholars, though, remained divided about whether or not to call the visual domain a language per se.

The work in this area ranged broadly, including literature on the layout, design, and visual architecture of the news. Leading the scholarship on the visual attributes of print journalism was the work of Kevin Barnhurst (1994), and a later book on the evolution of newspaper design by Barnhurst and Nerone (2001). In both books, the careful and meticulous practices by which different newspapers displayed the news were chronicled; in the latter case, the connection between front-page design and the self-images

of certain cities offered a striking way to consider the salience of visual languages in news. The work of other scholars focused on specific kinds of visuals in the news, such as maps (Monmonier 1989), photographs (Schwartz 1992; Griffin 1999; Newton 2001), and even the visual display of quantitative information (Tufte 2001). In each case, scholars comprehensively laid out the attributes by which journalism visually crafted its messages. Certain work focused on the visuals used in journalistic coverage of specific events, as in Theo Van Leeuwen and Adam Jaworski's (2003) analysis of the images of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the British and Polish press. Yet others addressed the broader function of visuals as an integral, though not always accepted, tool of information relay (e.g., Stephens 1998).

Of particular interest were the visual dimensions of online journalism. From issues as wide-ranging as web design to computer graphics, journalism's visual domain was seen as particularly relevant, with a large amount of literature tracking the issues of visual design and visual communication from a professional perspective (e.g., Lester 1995; Harris and Lester 2001; Holland 2001). In that regard, numerous websites, such as "News Page Designer" (www.newspagedesigner.com), and professional organizations—including the Society for News Design (with chapters in the United States, Latin America, and Scandinavia) and the Society of Publication Designers—were established as ways of sharing design tips in journalism. Under the heading "There are no facts, only interpretations," Visualjournalism.com was established as a European resource site to discuss visual aspects of the news. In the United Kingdom, the Royal Photographic Society set up a new group called Visual Journalism, under the caveat that it included, according to its website, "television news and film documentaries, in addition to newspapers, magazines, and books, and now, of course, the Internet."

Accompanying the focus on the visual attributes of news was the question of whether or not the visual domain could in effect function as a language. While certain researchers explicitly adopted the terms of linguistic relay (e.g., Kress and van Leeuwen 1996), the issue remained unclear for many scholars interested in visual journalism.

* * * * *

The formal study of journalism's languages was crucial for it drew a comprehensive and systematic portrait of the patterned reliance of journalists on certain kinds of verbal and visual tools in crafting the news. It demonstrated that regardless of context or issue or national boundary, the choices inherent in language's construction offered a highly strategic view of how the world worked. Perhaps more so than other types of inquiry, these studies strongly offset the popular notion that journalistic accounts reflect the world

as it is. Though often difficult for nonlinguistic scholars to follow, due to its tight focus on linguistic and other language-related details, the formal study of news language nonetheless performed a critical service for the inquiry of journalism that established a thorough and multivariant picture of choices available to journalists in making news and the patterned ways in which decisions about a news text were typically made.

Journalism and the Pragmatic Study of Language

A third body of language-based research on journalism—the study of the pragmatic use of language invoked in telling a story, as rhetoric, or as framing—drew extensive attention over the years. This research examined how journalists structured accounts of reality through stories, narratives, rhetoric, and frames, using language to affect a cause or service a specific aim. Drawing on the constructivist impulse that characterized the other kinds of language-based scholarship, this body of research offered an extended applicability to journalism texts because it drew upon the broader uses of language in numerous settings. The familiarity of such uses of language—familiar from a wide range of contexts, including history, the family setting, even the Bible—made journalism appear more like other kinds of public expression and made journalists more like other groups of public speakers, such as members of the clergy or politicians. As the pragmatic approach to language gained in popularity as a viable way to think about journalism's study, it became more difficult for journalists to claim exclusive status, such as that surrounding objectivity or truth, for the stories, rhetoric, or frames they crafted.

Dating to the work of Aristotle, who emphasized the importance of both storytelling and rhetoric in his *Poetics,* language in this view offered a way to craft a coherent sequencing of events across time and space, and its relay referred to the processes involved in the act of putting that sequencing into play. This research borrowed from a widespread interest, particularly prevalent in the disciplines of folklore, literature, rhetoric, and anthropology in the United States and Europe, in the works of scholars in Russian formalism and its related scholarship (Propp 1930/1984; Hjelmslev 1943/1963; Jakobson 1962–1966; Todorov 1978), scholarship in the United States on dramatism (Burke 1945, 1950), the Anglo-American tradition of language use (Booth 1961; White 1987), and, particularly in France, European modes of literary criticism (Barthes 1977). In each case, scholars focused on how language was used to structure—through narratives, rhetoric, and frames—broader understandings of the world.

Narrative and Storytelling

Work on narrative and storytelling presumed that both offered a funda-
mental epistemological way of knowing the world. Theorists interested in
narrative helped bring certain notions about language to the fore, extrapo-
lating on the need to consider both form and content. From Tzvetan
Todorov's (1978) notions about narrative equilibrium to Vladimir Propp's
(1930/1984) ideas about narrative balance and function, narrative theorists
showed a concern for how representations of the social order imposed clo-
sure on understandings of the world. Roland Barthes (1977) discussed five
basic codes of signification or meaning in narrative—semic, referential,
symbolic, proiaretic, and hermeneutic—which together reflected the codes
in which the author and reader necessarily interacted. Seymour Chatman
(1978) argued for a distinction between the "what" of narrative (the story)
and the "way" of narrative (the discourse or the way in which the story is
transmitted), while elsewhere the distinction between form and content sep-
arated the "how" of narrative from the "what" of narrative (Kozloff 1992).
Narrative theorists raised scholarly sensitivities about a narrative's repeat-
able or formulaic dimensions, making distinctions between narrative simi-
larity and narrative difference and arguing for degrees of narrative balance
and fidelity (Kozloff 1992). The notion of discourse emerged here too,
as a reference to the wider distribution of social and cultural power: for
instance, how a teen news magazine interwove discourse about delin-
quency, urban life, and college together to fashion meaningful stories for
its readers.

Central to thinking about narrative and storytelling in journalism was a
broader tension derived from how journalists themselves saw their work.
Particularly in the U.S. context, scholars tracked an evolution in storytelling
that separated those who saw journalism as "information" from those who
saw journalists as producing stories (e.g., Schudson 1978). As cultural critic
Walter Benjamin put it, the lingering emphasis on "information" rather than
"story" was a choice of form that was highly strategic for journalists: It laid
"claim to prompt verifiability" and was "shot through with explanation"
(Benjamin 1970: 89). Focusing on the informative rather than narrative
aspects of news emphasized "the causes of events rather than their mean-
ings," removing "astonishment and thoughtfulness" from the relay and
replacing them with the "clarifications of a report" (Inglis 1990:11). Over
time, however, there grew a gradual recognition that not one but both
choices, information *and* stories, constituted equivalent alternatives of nar-
rative style (Manoff and Schudson 1986). However, even then, the recogni-
tion of narrative's importance was fraught with ambivalence, making it no

surprise that, to quote Jack Lule (2001: 3), "we run the words 'news story' together so often that their meaning gets lost."

The interest in journalistic narrative in the United States grew substantially during the 1980s, when an interest in narrative made its way into communication. In 1985, the *Journal of Communication* published a special issue entitled "Homo Narrans," which underscored the centrality of the storytelling and narrative paradigm in communication. In that forum, scholars debated storytelling's relevance and efficacy as a potential explanatory metaphor for explaining communicative practice. John Lucaites and Celeste Condit (1985) in particular argued for narrative's functionality. Summarizing the forum, Walter Fisher (1985) argued that narrative was fundamental in establishing effective communication. Humans, in his view, were ultimately storytellers, and people chose sets of stories through which to elaborate their life experiences (see also Fisher 1987).

As narrative scholars turned toward journalism's study, the early targets of analysis were the more traditional forms of journalistic relay. Early work focused on those attributes of journalistic storytelling most closely aligned with journalism's sense of self. Hard news was established as the background setting for considering narrative parameters, and news content was seen to be timely, important, interesting, and novel. In the U.S. context, the form of most news stories was expected to take the shape of brief, thematized, concrete accounts of public events, and language was expected to include few adjectives or descriptive phrases, relying on an omniscient, authoritative third-person voice. Both Robert Darnton (1975) and Michael Schudson (1982) elaborated on the formulaic narrative attributes of U.S. news, showing how journalistic storytelling was patterned, predictable, and systemic. Mary Mander (1987) observed that journalistic storytelling was shaped so as to establish an all-knowing and prophetic moral order of events in the news, while Jack Lule (1995) and Ronald Jacobs (1996) focused on the ritual aspects of news narrative. W. Lance Bennett (1988) discussed how journalists personalized, dramatized, fragmented, and normalized the public events whose stories they told. Barbie Zelizer (1990a) argued that reporters used the narrative techniques of synecdoche, omission, and personalization to marshal both individual and collective professional authority. Both Theodore L. Glasser and James Ettema (1993) and Itzhak Roeh (1982, 1989) showed how irony permeated news narrative.

Scholarship on news narrative was set in place with a certain degree of opposition from journalism professionals and traditional journalism scholars, for the narrative qualities of news from the onset were seen as posing problems for journalists. Steve Barkin was first to point out that the act of telling a story was unevenly paired with the act of reporting (1984).

05-Zelizer.qxd 3/31/04 3:41 PM Page 131

Language Studies and Journalism   131

Although Helen Hughes's *News and the Human Interest Story* (1940) was among the first attempts to differentiate one type of storytelling from the setting of hard news, in fact there existed a split between research on the storytelling of hard news and that of the rest of journalism, because hard news was supposed to count as true, not stylized, accounts of the real world. To be a good storyteller meant that one was not a good journalist, and the more objective a story became, the more unreadable it also was thought to become. Narrative style was thus encoded as antithetical to the process of producing neutral news reports, and a good journalist became one whose presence as a storyteller was muted (Barkin 1984; Bird and Dardenne 1988).

At the same time, narrative analysis was well positioned to account for the varieties of journalistic practice. Although not part of journalists' self-presentation, much of journalists' authority rested not in what they did but in how they represented what they knew. Narrative, then, was a way of figuring out how journalists constructed their own authority (Zelizer 1990a, 1993b), and extensive research on journalistic storytelling set out to show how this was accomplished. In one valuable discussion, S. Elizabeth Bird and Robert Dardenne claimed that journalism of all kinds owed equal parts to real life happenings and to the codes and conventions of storytelling. Arguing to put aside the "interesting/important" dichotomy, they suggested that news stories needed to be considered as one whole with different parts, as a particular kind of mythological narrative "with its own symbolic codes that are recognized by its audience" (Bird and Dardenne 1988: 72–73). Similarly, James Carey (1986a) offered extended discussions of the way in which story forms privileged certain ways of knowing the world through news. He argued that such story forms underemphasized the "how" and "why" behind the news, inflating the focus on descriptive but not necessarily instrumental details. Beyond the United States, in which the idea of storytelling seemed to raise less strident a response from journalism professionals, scholars focused on alternative narrative modes that were regularly used to structure the news (e.g., Chalaby 1996, 1998; Benson 2002).

For those narrative analysts who pushed beyond the professional resistance to regard news as narrative, narrative analysis showed how all kinds of journalism were part of the same family and that differences between them were differences of degree rather than kind. Because it assumed that journalistic storytelling was a choice between alternatives for creative expression, narrative analysis necessarily regarded storytelling across the continuum of different kinds of journalism—hard and soft, elite and tabloid, mainstream and oppositional, television and press, broadcast and internet. While journalists themselves historically insisted on demarcations between the "high" and "low" lives of journalism—which over time

switched from distinctions between tabloid and mainstream to distinctions
between television and print, TV news magazines and regular television
programming, tabloid TV and TV news magazines, cable TV and inter-
net—their defense had a familiar quality, distinguishing repeatedly between
information and entertainment, substance and style, public interest and
commercialism, responsibility and sensationalism. In each case, they tended
to exclude the lower end of the comparison from evaluation. Narrative
analysis, however, forced the comparison on both ends.

Journalism scholars examined journalistic narratives in three main areas
of research—in the mainstream press, on television news, and in the alter-
native journalistic forms of tabloids, reality television, and the internet. In
each area, questions persisted regarding the privileged and less privileged
forms of journalistic storytelling, and how each came to be thus positioned.
Much of this research developed among U.S. scholars.

Storytelling in the Mainstream Press

There have been many narrative forms in the mainstream press. As
G. Stuart Adam (1993) recounted, in the British context alone, journalism
of the 17th and 18th centuries took the alternative forms of news briefs,
literary essays, polemical writing, and legislative reports.

But the most regular invocation of storytelling technique, of how the news
is told, was the oft-cited distinction between hard and soft news. As noted
earlier, during the rise of the penny press, practices of storytelling were cen-
tral to distinctions made between journalism that informed and journalism
that told a gripping tale (Schudson 1978). For some time, the development
of the less privileged form, at least in the United States, was more readily
associated with storytelling, while hard news was thought, at least among
journalism professionals, to involve no narrative technique whatsoever.

The so-called softer form focused on dramatic or heartrending stories,
moral imperatives, and compelling plotlines. In part, this reflected the nar-
rative features of the human-interest story, which Helen Hughes (1940), a
student of Robert Park at the University of Chicago, was first to mark as a
necessary and important deviation from the brief, dispassionate chronicles of
the newspaper's front pages. A sidebar of the penny press in the 1830s, the
human interest story was a form that addressed events in the lives of the indi-
vidual and community in accessible and often emotional ways. Regarding
the human interest story as part of a historical evolution that introduced the
masses to reading, Hughes saw it as necessarily democratic and crucial for
facilitating the transformation of the masses into a public. Storytelling was
also associated with other alternative, often softer narrative forms in the

mainstream press. Literary journalism, called also "new journalism," was articulated by its visionaries as a way to highlight the narrative style of journalism over the substance of the stories it told (e.g., Pauly 1990; Sims 1990; Sims and Kramer 1995).

But as narrative analysis grew in scope and interest, the hard news of mainstream journalism drew the interest of narrative analysts. The language considered here was what one observer called "the plain style" (Kenner 1990). In G. Stuart Adam's view, it invoked simplicity and explicitness, and its attributes were as follows:

> The storyteller in newspapers and newsmagazines is often disguised behind the device of an anonymous third person. That third person may be the publisher, the persona in the mind of the writer who writes authoritatively that the war has ended or has been declared, or that the election campaign has begun or the vote tallied. (Adam 1993: 33)

According to Adam, the plain style was uniform and consistent, delivered in a "stylized, published, and routinized voice" and often in an official tone. In every case, the journalist "is a presence who guides the reader through a story. He or she shows, tells, and explains." Finally, "the devices the narrator in journalism uses are those used by all storytellers: 'plot, characterization, action, dialogue, sequencing, dramatization, causation, myth, metaphor, and explanation'" (Adam 1993: 33–34; also Roeh 1982, 1989).

One of the first articles to explore mainstream journalistic storytelling directly was Robert Darnton's "Writing News and Telling Stories" (1975). Interested in the impact of the journalist's working milieu on news narrative, Darnton used his early experiences as a reporter at the *New York Times* to consider factors as varied as the spatial arrangement of the newsroom, the reporter's relation to primary and secondary reference groups, patterns of the reporter's occupational socialization, and storytelling techniques. Arguing that there were preestablished categories for both news form and content, Darnton (1975: 189) showed that "the story" ultimately involved the "manipulation of standardized images, cliches, angles, slants, and scenarios, which call forth a conventional response in the minds of editors and readers." For example, there existed a certain kind of "bereavement quotes" for bereavement stories. Journalists engaged in a sort of "search and find" process in writing news that upheld standardization and stereotypy.

Other scholars soon followed suit. British sociologist Philip Elliot (1980) advanced the notion that press rituals in the mainstream press functioned as folk literature. In "The Politics of Narrative Form," Michael Schudson (1982) examined the effect of narrative codes on the representation of

reality. Although Schudson's interest in storytelling dated back to *Discovering the News* (1978), where he had pointed to two kinds of journalistic accounting, information and stories, here he focused exclusively on narrative form as a way of understanding U.S. journalistic practice. Journalism's ultimate power, he argued, rested in the forms by which declarations about reality could be made, and his tracking of reporting of the U.S. President's State of the Union Address over 200 years showed how reporting conventions like the summary lead and inverted pyramid, a focus on the U.S. President as the most important actor, a focus on a single rather than continuous event, highlighting political speeches, and contextualizing political acts moved journalists from reporting events to interpreting them. Emerging as expert analysts of the political world rather than partisans of political causes, journalists thus came to be seen as interpreters of political events rather than mere reporters, with the meaning of political events found not in the events themselves but in the political aims of the actors within them. The article's main point was central: Narrative form had a tremendous effect on news content, which in turn directly inflected the shape of what was regarded as news.

Elsewhere, much work on journalism and storytelling suggested that journalists fashioned stories according to definitive narrative patterns. Phyllis Frus (1994) elaborated on the historical differences between journalism and literature and concluded that current movements inside journalism were more open to embracing the narrative forms of storytelling. John Hartsock (2001) charted the evolution of literary journalism from the late 19th century onward, arguing that its particular form of storytelling developed its own resonance with the public over time, while Louise Woodstock (2002) reflected on the therapeutic elements of public journalism's narratives about itself. By the mid-1990s, even journalism professionals experienced a rebirth of interest in writing as part of mainstream journalism (e.g., Clark 1994).

Related here was a substantial amount of work on the visual languages of the mainstream press, and work on photography, video, and photojournalism drew substantial academic attention across the board of scholars interested in narrative. While work by Barthes (1967, 1977), Peirce (1893–1913/1998), and Hall (1973a) on the iconic, indexical, and symbolic dimensions of photographic authority had existed for years, it was only with the advent of narrative as a way of making sense of a text, combined with some of the alternative sites for analysis favored by cultural studies, that this work took hold. For instance, work here focused both on the general patterns of news photography (Schwartz 1992; Perlmutter 1998) and on the function of photography in response to certain types of circumstances (J. Taylor 1991, 1998; Brothers 1997; Moeller 1989; Zelizer 1998).

Also of relevance was extended work on the mythological parameters of journalistic narratives. John Pauly and Melissa Eckert (2002) addressed what they called the "myth of the local" in U.S. journalism, while Carolyn Kitsch (2000, 2002) looked at the various narrative elements that took on mythological proportion in U.S. newsmagazines. Jack Lule considered how myth played a part in journalism generally (2001) and in mainstream editorial pages following September 11 (2002). In his view, the daily news remained "the primary vehicle for myth in our time," and seven master myths—the victim, the scapegoat, the hero, the good mother, the trickster, the other world, and the flood—offered patterned ways for audiences to make sense of surrounding events (Lule 2001: 19).

Storytelling in Television News

Other scholars considered the stories of television news, with an emphasis on its narrative structures (e.g., Hartley 1982). James Lett (1987) delineated the narrative traits characteristic of TV news programming, such as pandering to the visual dimensions of a message or stressing the dichotomous aspects of the conflicts reported. Dan Nimmo and James Combs (1983, 1985) discussed the narrative style of crisis reporting across three U.S. television networks, finding that each network had its own style of telling the story of crisis: CBS was interpretive and official, ABC focused on the common people involved in the crisis, and NBC resigned to move on beyond the chaos that the crisis introduced. Certain scholars focused on televisual style more generally (e.g., Griffin 1992; Postman and Powers 1992; Griffin and Kagan 1996), with Justin Lewis (1994) arguing that television news in effect functioned in the absence of narrative codes, rendering it disjunctive and ineffectual. The narrative structure of TV news, he said, resembled more "a shopping list than a story" (Lewis 1991: 131). Narrative style was tracked across different kinds of journalistic coverage. Katherine Fry (2003) looked at television's representation of natural disasters, while Matthew Ehrlich (2002) examined the "On the Road" television reports of Charles Kuralt for CBS News. Barbie Zelizer (1992b) examined U.S. television's news relays of the John F. Kennedy assassination.

TV news magazines and current affairs programs drew particular attention from scholars interested in narrative (e.g., Nichols 1991). In *60 Minutes and the News* (1991), Richard Campbell argued that storytelling helped establish the authority of the TV news magazine, which evolved in the late 1960s as an application of the magazine—rather than the newspaper or film—to television. While narrative style was antithetical to the neutral reports favored by hard-core reporters, Campbell maintained that

"60 Minutes," as a news program, was more interested in narrative than were other news programs. The style of personal reporting and its drama were as much connected to the program's popularity as the facts it reported. Thus, the program strategically developed certain formulaic narrative conventions by which viewers could understand the world: Reporters were either characters or narrators, storylines were multiple, dramatic tension was mediated so as to build narrative conflict, and the camera frame was controlled in a way to give the reporter control over the story. Campbell identified four news frames through which the program framed the world—as mystery, therapy, adventure, and arbitration—and maintained that through them "60 Minutes" persisted as a support for middle-American morality. Elsewhere (Fiske 1988; Postman and Powers 1992), scholars focused on the ways in which TV news magazines either enhanced or detracted from the attributes of basic TV news programming.

Storytelling in Alternative Journalistic Forms

A substantial amount of work focused of late on the narrative parameters of still-evolving, less obvious modes of journalistic relay. In particular, as work in cultural studies forced open some of the boundaries by which journalism constituted itself (e.g., Dahlgren and Sparks 1992), the relevance of narrative and storytelling in delineating the formulaic features of a broadened repertoire of journalistic forms became evident. In less celebratory terms, these genres showed that, as had been predicted with the advent of television, "organized journalism is dead" (Altheide and Snow 1991: 51). Such alternative forms included tabloid journalism, reality television, sports and weather journalism, and online journalism.

Tabloid forms of storytelling had long been part of journalism across the world. The readiness with which certain journalistic practices were lumped together as "tabloid" varied across contexts and historical periods. For instance, Colin Sparks argued for five kinds of journalism in regard to tabloidization—the serious press, semi-serious press, serious-popular press, newsstand tabloid press, and supermarket tabloid press—each of which offered variant versions of the traits thought to characterize all tabloid forms (Sparks 2000). At the same time, the existence of tabloid journalism was widespread.

In the U.S. context, tabloid versions of the news bubbled up with the penny press of the 1830s, the rise of the sensationalist Pulitzer and Hearst newspaper empire of the 1890s, the jazz journalism of the 1920s, and the supermarket tabloids and tabloid television of today (Bird 1992), though it was argued that the U.S. fascination with crime, gossip, and sex had been

ongoing at least since the 16th century (Stephens 1988). In the United Kingdom, tabloids had a more even and continuous history, dating to the introduction of compulsory education in the mid 1800s (Engel 1996). Elsewhere, they were connected with localized modes of popularization in the broader culture, as seen in Australia (Lumby 1999), Hungary (Gulyas 2000), and Germany (Klein 2000). Certain differences prevailed, as in Mexico, where the tabloid remained primarily a television phenomenon (Hallin 2000). And yet, in each case of their analysis, the narratives of the tabloids were fairly uniform: more sensationalistic, accessible, provocative, and popular in tone, more textually fragmented and concerned with specta-cle and messages of exclusion. Their function was to provide partisan sources of collective knowledge, teaching readers how to disbelieve what they read or saw while learning to exploit the contradictions in news story-telling (Fiske 1992b).

Perhaps the most articulate discussion of tabloid journalism as story-telling was that offered by S. Elizabeth Bird. In a range of works, Bird (1990, 2000) discussed tabloid forms by exploring the common storytelling traits that were shared by the mainstream and tabloid press. In *For Enquiring Minds* (1992), she showed how the narrative traits of the tabloids—timelessness, high moralism, political conservatism, predictability, and individualism—aligned with the trajectory of oral tradition. Packed with news about natural disasters, unusual births, omens and murders, tabloids typically focused on stories of human gore, celebrity gossip, and human interest. Bird also showed how a number of journalistic values—such as objectivity and credibility—were realized through parallel practices among tabloid and mainstream journalists.

Other scholars investigated additional variants on the split between mainstream and tabloid news. Matthew Ehrlich (1997) found that tabloids differed almost inconsequentially from their mainstream cohorts, with sto-rytelling conventions ultimately reflecting the various modes of cultural production from which they borrowed. Kevin Glynn (2000) examined the tabloid's generic and historic functions, arguing that the particular generic form of tabloid television became the central impulse of the media environ-ment of the 1980s and 1990s. Narrative was key here. As John Langer (1998: 6) phrased it, tabloid journalism needed to be examined precisely because of, and not despite, its peculiar narrative qualities: "its commitment to storytelling, its formulaic qualities as well as its search for visual impact." In contrast to those types of journalism that "could be described as the 'purer' forms of political culture," tabloid forms profited mostly from attempts "to track down and account for the 'trivialities'" (Langer 1998: 7). They remained the "other news . . . the remaindered news, recognized in

passing, but left aside in order to focus full attention on what was perceived as more serious and more pressing news matters" (Langer 1998: 8–9).

In addition, journalistic talk shows, sometimes called "assertion journalism," where journalists provoked conflict instead of presenting so-called reasoned analysis, or vox pop shows, where audiences took the place of journalistic experts, constituted further elaborations on the tabloid themes of popularization and individualization. Related here was what broadcasters—and certain scholars—preferred to call reality programming. Indicating a slew of programming types that stretched from cop shows to tabloid talk shows, these forms of journalism were seen to inhabit the borders of recognized journalistic practice (e.g., Fishman 1999; Friedman 2002). And yet, the similarities were tangible. In the United States, shows like "A Current Affair," "Hard Copy," "America's Most Wanted," and "Inside Edition" offered stories of moral disorder and deviance that were personalized through subjective treatments, the use of music videos, and the recreation of actuality—all of which had long been considered inappropriate for mainstream television news, yet all of which offered representations of the so-called real world for their audiences. These hybrids of the narrative forms of newscast, telethon, documentary, cop show, and family drama (Glynn 2000), which were further developed by shows like "Big Brother," "Survivor," and "A Makeover Story," offered a new version of what journalism could be. Similarly, work on sports journalism and weather journalism offered an ongoing complication to traditional notions of what journalism was for (e.g., Hargreaves 1986; Rowe 1999; Miller 2002).

Narrative work on the internet also began to draw interest as online journalism became a more integral aspect of journalistic work. Allan (2002) delineated some of the ongoing problems that the internet posed to traditional notions of journalistic narrative: the lack of editing and related instantaneous replay, the diminished authority of the journalist, the personalized fashioning of news preferences, and the interactivity. Elsewhere (Hauben and Hauben 1997; Borden and Harvey 1998), scholars extrapolated on the narrative potentials that could develop as online journalism continued its expansion. Seen informally as a kind of collaborative journalism, the narratives of online news were thought to provide an alternative twist to the ways in which the news had been traditionally presented, and thus the storytelling attributes that they adopted were seen of particular value.

Rhetoric

Rhetorical scholars offered a separate set of analytical tools through which to consider the authority and power of journalism. By far the earliest

set of ideas available for analyzing texts, rhetorical study drew in broad strikes from the writings of Aristotle and Plato. Concerned with the study of persuasion, it shaped its analyses by considering texts in conjunction with the five stages of preparing a speech as identified in the rhetorical tradition— *inventio* (collecting and conceptualizing subject matter), *disposito* (structuring a speech), *elocutio* (giving a speech linguistic articulation), *memoria* (memorizing the speech), and *actio* (performing the speech). This scholarship also drew from the more contemporary work of Kenneth Burke (1945, 1950, 1978), whose notion of language as action provided a fruitful starting point for the analysis of news texts. Concerned with the attribution of motive, Burke developed the notion of the "dramatistic pentad," by which act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose were thought to come together in explaining human action, and that of the "terministic screen," by which certain aspects of action were presumed to come to the forefront of attention while others dropped to its backstage. Both notions, together with the broad range of Burke's work, facilitated an address to language use in conjunction with pragmatic aims.

The rhetorical analysis of journalism's languages developed primarily in the United States and largely at the margins of rhetoric or English departments. As notions of power and authority came to be attributed to journalism, rhetoric came to be seen as particularly relevant to news and of particular interest to scholars interested in political communication. In this regard, rhetorical scholars elaborated the ways in which journalism could be thought of as an act of rhetoric. Interviewers or anchorpersons were seen as conveying journalistic authority by constructing arguments in certain ways and not others. Which figures of speech figured into which kinds of talk were seen as strategic and patterned choices that in turn supported the positioning of journalists in the public sphere.

A wide range of scholars applied Burke's premises to understanding the work of the media in shaping language and vice versa (e.g., Edelman 1964, 1985; Duncan 1968; Combs and Mansfield 1976). Burke's (1978) notion of the terministic screen, for instance, was seen as relevant to a wide range of discussions about the filters journalists used in coverage. Celeste Condit and J. Ann Seltzer (1985) addressed the rhetorical attributes of the press coverage of a murder trial. Bruce Gronbeck (1997) used Burke's notions to examine local newscasts, whereas Barry Brummett (1989, 1991) examined the popularization of journalism in conjunction with Burke's understanding of public action. Burke was invoked in Carol Wilkie's (1981) discussion of pretrial publicity in the scapegoating of Bruno Richard Hauptmann and in John Marlier's (1989) analysis of coverage of Oliver North's testimony. Few of these studies, however, linked the discussions of coverage with an

understanding of journalistic routine. In addition, many of the events they examined were contested events whose deliberation took shape in an institutional setting, such as a courtroom.

In that rhetoric was particularly concerned with persuasion, much work focused on acts of political communication as situated against the broader journalistic frame. Thus, work by Kathleen Hall Jamieson (1984, 1988) and Roderick Hart (1987) focused on the ways in which coverage of campaigns established a certain rhetorical authority for political candidates. Other scholarship focused on the visual dimensions of the journalistic text, as in the work by Robert Hariman and John Lucaites (2002, 2003, in press) on iconic photographs.

Certain scholarship here employed a looser definition of rhetoric, focusing on the rhetorical dimensions of news in ways that did not necessarily date back to the early origins of the field but clarified rhetorical authority nonetheless. Burke was loosely invoked in Jack Lule's analyses of coverage of both the Challenger disaster (Lule 1989a) and the downing of KAL Flight 007 (Lule 1989b). Itzhak Roeh (1989) discussed the rhetorical modes of address employed in the news in a variety of contexts, including coverage of the war in Lebanon (Roeh and Ashley 1986), late-night TV news broadcasts (Roeh, Katz, Cohen, and Zelizer 1980), and newspaper headlines (Roeh and Feldman 1984). In *The Rhetoric of News* (1982), Roeh elaborated how irony was brought to bear in the news and argued that news language functioned as what he called a "rhetoric of objectivity," whereby journalists used objective modes of address in a rhetorical fashion.

Framing

One of the more recent approaches to journalism that drew upon a grounding in language was scholarship on framing. Borrowed from early work by Erving Goffman (1974) and Gregory Bateson (1972) in which all public life was seen as organized by frames through which individuals perceived surrounding action, framing offered a way to understand the systematic and often predetermined organization of news stories into types facilitated by patterned selection, emphasis, and presentation (Gitlin 1980; also Gamson 1989).

Called by Todd Gitlin (1980: 7) a way to "organize the world both for journalists who report it and, in some important degree, for us who rely on their reports," framing studies offered journalism scholars a means of examining the filters that made the news sensical to both journalists and the public. Favored largely by U.S. scholars in political science and political communication, framing research constituted a way to account for the lack of neutrality in news and provided "a standard set of themes and values

common to much of the information American news audiences receive"
(Price and Tewksbury 1997: 174). Often invoked in conjunction with schol-
arship on agenda setting and priming, framing research focused on story pre-
sentation as a way of explaining the news (Iyengar and Kinder 1987; Iyengar
1991); in Robert Entman's (1993a: 52) view, "to frame is to select some
aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient." At the same
time, framing was thought to occur in conjunction with the public at which
it was directed. In this regard, it differed from the other approaches to
language use.

Over time defined as a "central organizing idea or story line that provides
meaning" (Gamson and Modigliani 1987: 143) and as "mentally storied
clusters of ideas that guide individuals' processing of information" (Entman
1993a: 53), framing among journalists came to be seen as working both
culturally and cognitively (Reese 2001). Frames drew upon numerous tools
of language, including metaphors, exemplars (or historical lessons), catch-
phrases, depictions and visual images such as icons (Gamson and
Modigiliani 1989: 3). In this way, framing was thought to reflect both jour-
nalistic interpretations of events and the contexts by which they were made
sensical, with journalists setting the frames of reference by which audiences
interpreted the news (Gamson 1992; Neuman, Just, and Crigler 1992).
Much of the research on framing focused on ascertaining the systematic
effect of the frames through which the news was relayed or, in Vincent Price
and David Tewksbury's (1997: 175) words, on clarifying "issue-framing
effects—the ability of media reports to alter the kinds of considerations
people use in forming their opinions."

Much of the more recent literature on framing focused on the patterns of
news coverage in types of discourse, as in Shanto Iyengar's (1991) discussion
of political coverage on television or the coverage of particular issues or
events. On the latter count, literature ranged across discussions of risk
(Hornig 1992), the Intifada (Cohen and Wolfsfeld (1993), the antinuclear
movement (Entman and Rojecki 1993b), the Gulf War (Iyengar and Simon
1993), the crash of TWA flight 800 (Durham 1998), and European recep-
tion of the Euro (de Vreese 2001). Others used framing to draw comparisons
across different kinds of news events (e.g., Gerstle 1992).

At the same time, scholars invoked framing in a wide variety of ways,
prompting Robert Entman (1993a) to call it a "fractured paradigm."
Zhongdang Pan and Gerald Kosicki (1993) argued that other structures,
such as themes, schema, and scripts, filled many of the same functions as
frames. Maxwell McCombs, Donald Shaw, and David Weaver (1997)
maintained that framing performed a second-level agenda setting in linking
salient characteristics of journalistic stories with the audiences' interpre-
tations of them. Others pondered whether or not framing constituted a

method, a theory, or neither. A collection of essays edited by Stephen Reese, Oscar Gandy, and August Grant (2001), for instance, surveyed the range of theoretical and methodological issues that arose in framing research, including its relation to agenda setting, public deliberation, and postmodernism. In certain views, the fractured nature of the literature did not improve over time (e.g., Scheufele 1999).

Nonetheless, framing provided an important pathway for thinking about language use in conjunction with the intersection between journalists and their public. In this regard, and more broadly than many other arenas examining the languages of journalism, it highlighted the centrality of language for disciplines in which language was not necessarily an obvious target of analysis. In so doing, framing thereby critically extended the domain of language studies and journalism.

* * * * *

Work on the pragmatic uses of language in journalism was noteworthy in that it not only allowed scholars to consider journalism through one of its most obvious, proven, and patterned manifestations—language—but it also helped make journalistic work comprehensible by connecting it to the broader uses of language. The scholarship on journalistic narrative, rhetoric, and framing also played an important role in helping scholars focus beyond the discontinuous episodes and events that constituted the news. Offering an accessible and patterned template of sorts to which journalists repaired while crafting news of most sorts, work on news narrative, rhetoric, and framing helped force recognition of the systematically constructed nature of journalistic work, even if journalists were reluctant to admit as much in their own discussions of journalism.

The Centrality of Language Studies and Journalism

What did the study of news languages more generally offer the inquiry into journalism? To begin with, its emphasis on journalistic texts displayed the strengths and weaknesses associated with language study. While this scholarship offered a prolonged and detailed view of what a journalistic text looked like, it also stressed the text over the larger environment and the processes by which journalism was made. In this regard, language studies offset the relative disinterest in news texts that characterized many of the other disciplinary perspectives.

At the same time, language studies did not offer equal scholarly attention to all aspects of news making. Absent from this approach was a consideration

of production, the audience, the historical context and diachronic dimension of journalism, and journalists per se. In fact, this scholarly view, like certain other disciplinary work, remained largely unpeopled, with texts shaped and analyzed in a somewhat disembodied fashion. The study of the languages of journalism, then, overstated journalistic language by considering it in isolation from the larger surround in which journalism took shape.

In addition, the language-driven study of journalism focused only on certain kinds of texts in generalizing about how language worked in this setting. In that the perspective offered highly focused glimpses of different news texts, it did not go beyond the boundaries of those texts as much as it might have. Such extensions could profitably include examinations of different kinds of news segments, different kinds of news texts (such as the trade literature), and the various patterns of intertextuality within and beyond news organizations. For instance, much of the mainstream narrative work took shape within the United States and thus established a familiarity with mainstream U.S. news that was not matched by an attention to other narrative forms in other regions. By contrast, work on the narratives of tabloid journalism seemed to reach far more stridently across the journalisms of different nation-states.

Like other microanalytical work, these language-based approaches to journalism tended to be extensive, systemic, and comprehensive. However, also like much microanalytical work, the detailed material that emerged from this type of inquiry did not generate many attempts at replication because its detail was highly particularistic, minutely focused, and difficult to connect with the broader aspects of the analysis of journalism. For example, invoking the tenses of broadcast news commentary as an illustration of a journalist's proximity to a news event required an a priori sensitivity to the importance of language, which was not characteristic of most journalism scholars. Indeed, the opposite has appeared to be the case, where scholars who were not invested in the language-based inquiry into journalism paid the findings related to language an uneven degree of attention.

And yet, language study moved journalistic inquiry in definitive ways. Each of the discussed studies on journalistic language proceeded from a belief that examining the constructed nature of texts could help establish the elaborated dimensions by which journalism worked. Focusing on the text itself, as a starting point for understanding journalism more broadly, was a useful alternative to the heavy emphasis on people established by other modes of inquiry. Questions did remain concerning the degree to which journalism's various "textual" attributes needed to be delineated and examined before moving on to more general issues related to the craft and processes of journalism. Similarly, reaching clarification and consensus on how to best locate

05-Zelizer.qxd 3/31/04 3:41 PM Page 144

evidence of the ideological positioning implicit in journalism's languages remained at issue. And yet, the fact that all three approaches to language—informal, formalistic, and pragmatic—started with the premise that language was ideological offered a critical counterassumption not only to the more mainstream scholarship on journalism but also to claims of journalism professionals that journalism was a reflection of the real. Other domains of inquiry would take these notions beyond language and apply them to a broader repertoire of additional aspects of the journalistic world.