
**Language,
Society
and Power**

An introduction

Second edition

Linda Thomas, Shân Wareing,
Ishtla Singh, Jean Stilwell Peccei,
Joanna Thornborrow and
Jason Jones

This edition revised and edited by
Ishtla Singh and Jean Stilwell Peccei

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

ROUTLEDGE

**Also available as a printed book
see title verso for ISBN details**

Chapter 4

Language and the media

Joanna Thornborrow

- 4.1 Introduction 56
- 4.2 The function of the media 56
- 4.3 Media, language and power 58
- 4.4 Sources of news 64
- 4.5 Media voices: accent and register 66
- 4.6 Public participation in the media 69
- 4.7 Language, society and virtual power 71
- 4.8 Summary 73
 - Suggestions for further reading 74

Chapter 4

4.1 Introduction

The media (usually understood to refer to the press, radio and television broadcasting) have become one of the most pervasive phenomena in our culture. We can also add the World Wide Web to the list of communications media, but we will be dealing here mainly with newspapers and broadcasting media (television and radio). The aim of this chapter is to examine how our knowledge about the world is mediated through press and broadcasting institutions, and to suggest ways in which the analysis of language can provide insights into how that mediation can affect the **representation** of people, places and events.

The mass media have become one of the principal means through which we gain access to a large part of our information about the world, as well as to much of our entertainment. Because of this, they are a powerful site for the production and circulation of social meanings, i.e. to a great extent the media decide the significance of things that happen in the world for any given culture, society or social group. The language used by the media to represent particular social and political groups, and to describe newsworthy events, tends to provide the dominant ways available for the rest of us to talk about those groups and events. We will be looking here at some examples of these.

Lastly, as access to television and radio discourse is widening, more programmes, such as the ever-popular talk shows and phone-ins, are being dedicated to the ‘voices’ of the ordinary public, rather than limited to journalists, politicians and media experts. Also, with the development of the internet, a vast amount of information is now available from many different sources. But does this necessarily mean that a broader spectrum of people and opinions are being represented as a result, or do media institutions to a large extent still maintain control of who can talk and what gets said? We will also be addressing this question here.

4.2 The function of the media

We use the media for many different purposes; for information, for entertainment and for education, through a range of programmes for schools as well

as university broadcasts. We listen to the news on radio and television for information about local, national and international events; many people spend hours every week being entertained by a variety of programmes from regular soap operas to weekly quizzes and chat shows. Sometimes, the boundaries become blurred between information and entertainment, and a new term has been coined to refer to programmes which serve both functions: 'infotainment'. Wildlife programmes, docu-dramas and the growing number of talk shows could all be described as having a dual role: to entertain as well as to inform. There is also an ongoing debate about what television is for, often centred on the quality of programmes such as the popular 'reality TV' series *Big Brother*. This kind of television gives us another kind of viewing experience, seen positively by some people as an interesting social and psychological media experiment, negatively by others as being voyeuristic and banal.

The mass media provide the means of access to much information and represent a potentially powerful force in our society. This is partly due to the fact that the media can select what counts as news, who gets into the papers and on to television and radio and, most importantly for linguists, the way that stories about people and events get told and the frameworks in which people get to appear and talk. However, we must be careful when talking about the media as powerful. Any newspaper story goes through several stages before it appears on the page, and many different people can be involved at each stage. The same is true of broadcast news stories. Rather than seeing the media as being a group of individuals who control and in some way manipulate what we read or watch, we need to think of each medium as a complex institution. This institution is characterised by a set of processes, practices and conventions that the people within it have developed within a particular social and cultural context. These practices have an effect both on what we perceive as news and on the forms in which we expect to hear or read about it.

The media are always there, and have come to be taken for granted as an integral part of most people's lives. Scannell (1988), in an account of the social role of broadcasting, argues that even the language we use to talk about television programming reflects this ordinariness, this taken-for-granted place in our lives. The expression 'there's nothing on TV' has come to mean 'there's nothing I want to watch', rather than describing an actual state of affairs where there is really nothing being broadcast if you switch on your set. The fact that, with the increase of twenty-four-hour broadcasting and multiple channels, there is practically always something on television is now quite unremarkable for most of us.

We should not be too quick to see the media as all-powerful, and the public as mere puppets of media control. The relationship is not a straightforward one. The reading, listening and viewing public can also choose not to

buy, listen or watch; they can switch off, change allegiances and in some cases challenge versions of events. For example, as a result of the events surrounding the Princess of Wales's death in August 1997, a new set of laws may be passed in Britain restricting the rights of 'paparazzi' journalists to take intrusive photographs, and this is due in some part at least to the public reaction to her death. On the other hand, the same public were always ready to buy the papers and watch the programmes that featured reports of her both when she was alive and after her death, and in that sense, the media were providing, and continue to provide, what sells their product.

4.3 Media, language and power

As we noted in the last section, one of the most important and interesting aspects of the potential power of the media from a linguistic point of view is the way that people and events get reported. Since the early 1970s, linguists have been interested in the relationship between how a story gets told, and what that might indicate about the point of view that it gets told from (Lee 1992; Simpson 1993; Montgomery 1996). This level of language use is called linguistic representation (see Chapter 2), and we will now look at some linguistic structures that can determine how events are represented, and thus lead to different versions, or views, of the same event.

On Tuesday 7 January 2003, the news broke that the previous Sunday police had raided a flat in north London, where they found a small quantity of a poison called ricin, and that seven people had been arrested, one of whom was later released. (Ricin had previously been used in the 1978 assassination of a Bulgarian dissident, Georgi Markov, on the London Underground. The poison had been smeared on the tip of an umbrella.) The group was quickly suspected as having links with al-Qa'ida, and as being part of the terrorist network responsible for 9/11 and the Bali nightclub bombing in 2002. The next day, the front pages of many newspapers carried the story of the police raid, but as we can see from the following articles, they presented the story in rather different ways. (See Chapter 2 for an analysis of another similar incident.)

The *Daily Mail* is a daily tabloid newspaper with right-wing sympathies, which generally disagrees with the current New Labour government headed by Prime Minister Tony Blair. The *Daily Mirror*, also a red-top tabloid, tends to have more left-wing opinions but can also be critical of New Labour.

If we analyse the language used in these articles, we find contrasts in how the story was told in each newspaper, and what the implications of this event might be. Looking at the linguistic choices made in the two texts means asking: what kinds of words or phrases are being used to refer to people or

places or events, what kinds of actions are involved, and who is responsible for them? These choices are part of the process of **representation** in discourse. By examining the way events are represented, we can begin to see more clearly how different points of view, or **ideologies**, are constructed linguistically.

The following are the headlines carried on Wednesday 8 January:

Daily Mail

POISON GANG ON THE LOOSE

Huge hunt for terrorists armed
with deadly ricin

Daily Mirror

IT'S HERE

Deadly terror poison found in
Britain

The large-print front-page headline from the *Mail* refers to a 'poison gang', who may still be at large and in possession of ricin, foregrounding the people involved and that some of them have still not been arrested. The accompanying smaller headline expands 'poison gang' as 'terrorists armed with deadly ricin', and the 'huge hunt' refers to police action to find those who are still 'on the loose'.

The large-print headline from the *Mirror*, 'It's here', foregrounds the substance itself. The phrase is *deictic*, which means that the reader has to work out what the pronouns 'it' and 'here' refer to in this context. This is simple enough given the accompanying smaller headline 'deadly terror poison found in Britain', but the use of the deictic phrase is more dramatic than if, for example, we replace the pronouns with a corresponding fully lexicalised phrase. Which of the following is more sensational?

Ricin in Britain

Deadly poison found in Britain

It's here

The choice in how to summarise this particular story in the headline text is handled in different ways by each paper, with the *Mail* focusing on the people involved (the gang and the police) and the *Mirror* on the poison ricin and where it is (in Britain). The *Mirror* headline focuses on what the police have found, while the *Mail* headline focuses on what the police are doing.

How is the story developed? In the paragraphs that follow the headlines, further differences between the two papers can be seen in the way the story is constructed, and which elements are given prominence. Some of the elements are the same, for example, both texts share the adjective 'deadly' to refer to the ricin, but the way the elements are put together makes the emphasis of the story slightly different in each case.

Britain was on red alert for a bio-terror attack last night as a hunt was launched for a gang of suspected Al Qaeda activists armed *WITH A DEADLY POISON*.

Police who raided an Al Qaeda poison factory in London fear most of *THE DEADLY RICIN* is missing and in the hands of terrorists.

The *Mail* continues to foreground the hunt for the ‘gang of terrorists’, and tells the story in terms of the action being taken, with the first clause describing the state of the country, and the second the search for the gang of activists:

Britain was on red alert for a bio-terror attack
a hunt was launched

The *Mirror* tells the story with a focus on the whereabouts of the missing substance, beginning with the main clause describing police ‘fear’ which develops the sense of suspense and public danger found in the headline:

Police fear most of the deadly ricin is missing and in the hands
of terrorists

Here is the continuation of the story as it appeared in the next five paragraphs in each paper:

Anti terrorist police arrested seven North Africans after the discovery of traces of ricin, which can send a person into a coma and kill within hours.

One of those held is believed to have worked as a science teacher. Security sources said at least three members of the alleged terror cell were still at large and may be in possession of the chemical.

The amount seized is too small to launch any ‘mass casualty’ attacks but the real fear is an assassination attack on a major public figure, such as the prime minister, by spraying the toxin in his face or injecting it.

Britain was on alert last night for an attack, possibly by aerosol spray or by smearing the substance on door handles at busy public buildings or shopping centres.

Confined spaces such as a commuter train carriage, a Tube station or a lunchtime restaurant were thought to be possible targets of the original plot.

Six men and one woman were arrested on Sunday in swoops on the ricin ‘plant’ – a flat in Wood Green, North London – and other addresses in the north and east of the capital.

It could also be ingested through the skin after being smeared on door knobs or handrails. 'People who come into contact with it will die,' said a government source.

Westminster sources revealed that levels of security surrounding Tony Blair have been 'significantly upgraded' over the past few days.

The males – in their late teens, 20s and 30s – are all said to be Algerians linked to Osama bin Laden's network. The woman has been freed.

Up to 30 more confederates are feared to be operating in Britain, most of them living in London.

The following paragraphs appear a little further down in each article.

Scotland Yard swooped at 10am on Sunday in a flat above a pharmacy in Wood Green, North London, after receiving a tip-off over the New Year.

Up to 20 officers wearing white protective suits found equipment covered in chemical traces and began removing items in protective black bags.

Armed special Branch officers in white chemical warfare suits smashed their way into the rented Wood Green property in the early hours.

A small quantity of ricin – used in the 1978 umbrella murder in London of Bulgarian dissident Georgi Markov – was found amid a kitchen laboratory for making more of it.

Who is involved? In the *Mail* there are a number of phrases used to describe the police involved in the hunt:

Anti-terrorist police
security sources
Scotland Yard
up to 20 officers

and to describe government officials and spokespersons:

Tony Blair
Westminster sources
a government source

The *Mirror*, on the other hand, refers only to 'police' and 'armed special branch officers'. The sources of information are not directly attributed, as the two phrases below use passive sentence construction, where the agent of

the verb is deleted. In other words, who ‘says’ and who ‘fears’ is omitted from the account:

the men . . . *ARE ALL SAID* to be
up to 30 more [. . .] *ARE FEARED TO* be

The *Mail* gives official sources:

Westminster sources revealed
a government source said

There is also a difference in the level of certainty expressed by the two papers with regard to who the arrested people are. The *Mail* uses a number of mitigating strategies which function to distance them from strong claims about the identity of the ‘gang’:

SUSPECTED Al Qaeda activists
seven North Africans
one [. . .] *IS BELIEVED* to have worked as a science teacher
members of the *ALLEGED* terror cell

The *Mirror* however uses the unmitigated phrase ‘terrorists’, and only one mitigated identity description:

the men . . . are all *SAID TO BE* Algerians linked to Osama bin Laden

The difference here then, is that the *Mail* seems to be more cautious than the *Mirror* about the identity of the gang. Another difference is the *Mirror*’s reference to the attack on Georgi Markov. The attack had a classic undercover ‘secret agent’ spy-thriller character, and adds to the drama being created in the *Mirror*’s story.

The *Mirror* uses three different noun phrases to describe the kitchen in the north London flat where the ricin was found:

an al Qaeda poison factory
the ricin ‘plant’
a kitchen laboratory

while the *Mail* describes it as:

a flat above a pharmacy in Wood Green

What is the effect of these different choices in representation? We could argue that in line with the headline text, the *Mail* is placing less emphasis on the substance, and more on what is being done. The *Mirror* on the other hand continues to increase the semantic load by using phrases which categorise the kitchen as a ‘factory’, ‘plant’ and ‘laboratory’. A similar semantic loading can be found in the description of the clothing worn by the police officers who raided the flat:

Up to 20 officers wearing *WHITE PROTECTIVE SUITS* found equipment
 Armed special Branch officers in *WHITE CHEMICAL WARFARE SUITS* smashed
 their way in

The *Mail*'s use of ‘white protective suits’ is made more dramatic and sensational by the *Mirror*, which describes the clothing as ‘white chemical warfare suits’.

The story in the *Mail* represents the main threat from the ‘poison gang’ as being to public figures (like the Prime Minister Tony Blair). The *Mirror*, in contrast, sees the main threat as being to ordinary members of the British public, and lists six places where the poison could be used: door handles, shopping centres, public spaces, commuter trains, Tube stations and lunchtime restaurants. The *Mail* only mentions ‘door handles’ and ‘handrails’, without specifying any places.

In these two short articles, we have shown how the same event can generate two rather different stories. Apart from the differences in style, where the semantic loading and reduced level of mitigation tend to emphasise the dramatic nature of this event in the *Mirror*, there is also a difference in the two papers’ interpretation of what this event means. For the *Mail*, it is the danger to the establishment (senior public figures), which underlies the urgent hunt for the rest of the gang; for the *Mirror*, it is the danger to the British public at large which is foregrounded if the rest of the substance is not found.

Do these two stories reveal two different ideological stances taken by the two papers? The *Mail*'s and the *Mirror*'s reporting of this event cannot be described as an expression of ‘right-wing’ and ‘left-wing’ political opinion. However, the differences that our analysis has begun to reveal do seem to reflect a difference in perspective on this story: a concern with the Establishment and the maintenance of order (increasing security measures, hunting the gang) in the *Mail*, and a concern for the British people (locating the poison, the danger of ricin in public places) in the *Mirror*.

ACTIVITY 4.1

This analysis has dealt with only some of the differences between the two texts. To take the analysis further, you could list all the verb phrases that occur in the two stories and compare them. Would this support the findings that (1) the *Mirror* story uses more dramatic language than the *Mail*, and (2) that the *Mail* is concerned with the Establishment while the *Mirror* is concerned with the people?

4.4 Sources of news

The attribution of a source is important to the level of ‘factuality’ that can be claimed for a story. In the following extract from a story about Princess Diana and British rugby player Will Carling, the ‘facts’ of the case are far from clear. Although sources are given, the original source of the information on which the newspaper bases its report is masked by the way this paragraph is written. A complex series of reporting phrases appears to indicate the source, but effectively succeeds in making it quite difficult to retrieve. These phrases are italicised in the text below:

The newspaper *claimed* Mr Carling arranged to take former England foot-baller Gary Lineker to lunch with the princess at Kensington Palace earlier this year. A friend of Mr Carling’s *is reported as saying*: ‘He [Mr Carling] *told* me later Gary had bottled out *saying*, “that woman’s trouble”.’

(*The Guardian*, 7 August 1995)

There are four sources of information mentioned in this passage: Lineker, Carling, Carling’s friend and a newspaper (*News of the World*). Their reports range from the direct ‘said’ and ‘told’ to the more mitigated ‘is reported as saying’ and ‘claimed’, suggesting that the paper is anxious not to claim outright that this third- or fourth-hand information is absolute fact.

In this section we have shown how the linguistic choices made in a text can construct different accounts, or linguistic representations, of events in the world. In doing so, we may have mentioned some terms for linguistic structures which are not familiar to you, but if you want to find out more about these structures, and how to use them in an analysis of a media text, you may find it useful to refer to Fairclough (1989, particularly Chapter 5) and Thornborrow and Wareing (1998).

ACTIVITY 4.2

Look at two newspapers on the same day and compare two versions of the same story. What differences can you detect in the way language is used? Do these differences influence or affect your interpretation of the event?

4.4.1 Commonsense discourses

The tendency to represent people, situations and events in regular and predictably similar ways results in the linguistic choices that are used in these representations becoming established in our culture as the most usual, prevailing ways of talking or writing about types of people and events. Once something has been represented in a particular way, it becomes more difficult to talk ‘around’, or outside that representation, to find an alternative way of describing a social group *X*, or a political event *Y*. As discussed in Chapter 3, we call these prevailing choices in representation **commonsense** or **dominant discourses** (see also Chapter 2, and Fairclough 1989).

An illustration of how one event can become the frame for representing subsequent events is the tendency to refer to any story of American presidential cover-up scandal as some kind of ‘gate’. Since Nixon and the Watergate scandal, there has been Reagan and ‘Irangate’, Clinton and ‘Whitewatergate’, followed by ‘Zippergate’, and ‘Fornigate’. While the history and circumstances of each individual situation may be distinct, the use of the term ‘gate’ categorises them according to the notion of an American president deliberately setting out to deceive the American public. The category has also been taken up by the British press and has been used in the context of the British royal family. ‘Camillagate’ was the story of the long-standing relationship between Prince Charles and Camilla Parker-Bowles, which hit the headlines some years after his marriage to Diana Spencer, when her problems with him and other members of the royal family had entered the public domain.

4.4.2 The power to change?

If the media are powerful as a site for producing and maintaining dominant discourses, as we have claimed in the previous section, they can also be a possible site for change. One of the most publicly discussed changes in recent years has been the move to use non-sexist language, and to encourage **symmetry** in the representation of men and women. Sometimes the press can be seen

to be trying to adopt grammatical forms which are neutral, such as the **third person pronoun** ‘they’ or ‘them’ as a non-specified-gender **pronoun**.

The following extract is from a story about Texan farmers suing the talk show host Oprah Winfrey for damaging their business when she invited people on to her show to talk about the risks involved in eating American beef:

And this year the average American will chew their way through 631b of Texan beef, compared to only 51lb of chicken and 46.71b of pork. It’s an ill-advised man who stands between an *American* and *his* burgers.
(*The Guardian*, 10 February 1998)

This extract shows the use of the **unmarked** possessive form *their* (rather than *his* or *her*) in the phrase ‘chew their way through’ to refer back to the earlier noun phrase ‘the average American’. So far, so non-sexist. But in the following sentence, this is not sustained, and we have the **marked** male forms ‘it’s an ill-advised man’ (rather than ‘it’s an ill-advised person’) representing the actor in this sentence as male, and ‘an American and his burgers’, which also represents the average American as male. (For more on the use of **asymmetrical** language in the representation of gender see Chapter 5.)

In this section we have introduced the concept of **dominant discourses** within the context of the media, and have suggested that these discourses are produced by recurring similarities in the way information is represented. We have looked at some examples of linguistic choice in reporting newsworthy events, and how different newspapers can represent the same event in different ways. In the next section we turn to the question of ‘voice’ in the media, looking at whose voices are represented, and who gets to say what.

4.5 Media voices: accent and register

ACTIVITY 4.3

When you listen to the news on your local radio station, what **accent** does the newsreader have? Is this the same as those on the national, or more prestigious, radio station? Listen to the television news at different times of the day; do you notice any difference in the accents of the newsreaders at these times?

In the early days of news broadcasting in Britain, the accent used almost exclusively by presenters was one called advanced **Received Pronunciation**

(advanced **RP**). This was the accent of the educated and the wealthy, which gave no indication of what part of the country the speaker came from. This accent gave rise to the expression **BBC English**, so strong was the link between this accent and the British Broadcasting Corporation. This has now given way to what is known as ‘mainstream RP’, an accent which sounds less formal than advanced RP and is the one that most people in Britain generally hear when they listen to newsreaders on national television.

This established use of mainstream RP is linked to the continuing perceived status of RP as an accent of authority. In radio and television discourse, the occurrence of marked regional variation in accent in the national news tends to be organised according to a hierarchy within programmes: the main newsreaders in the television studio read in standard English, with a mainstream RP accent, while the accents of specialist reporters outside the studio ‘at the scene’ are much less constrained and may sometimes be regionally marked (for example, one well-known BBC TV journalist and political commentator, John Cole, had a marked Northern Irish accent). Voice-overs in documentaries are also likely to be mainstream RP, while the accents of sports commentators, weather presenters, political commentators and other media ‘voices’ tend to be more regionally varied.

At one time this difference was especially noticeable on British television when a particular sports journalist would modify slightly his accent depending on which programme he was reporting for. On the national six o’clock evening news he would give the sports news bulletin in a mainstream RP accent, and half an hour later, on the local London South East news, he would shift into a more marked London accent.

Allan Bell (1984) uses the term **audience design** for speakers changing their style of speech according to the person or people they are addressing. Bell also suggests that, since radio and television presenters are addressing a distant, unknown audience of viewers and listeners, then they may design their speech according to certain linguistic ‘values’ or **norms**. In this case, newsreaders may be selecting one **variety** over another according to the conventionally prestigious norms of RP rather than according to the actual audience they are addressing. This is a particular type of audience design that Bell calls ‘referee design’.

4.5.1 Variation in register

Register has been defined as **linguistic variation** according to the context of use (Halliday 1972). This means that we expect to find language used in different ways according to the situation it occurs in, and according to different

types of media. For example, the register of weather forecasting in Britain depends on three features: its topic or **field** (the weather around the country), its **tenor** (the way it is delivered by the presenter) and its communicative **mode** (speech, writing and some visual modes in the form of maps and icons). We expect a weather bulletin to contain technical vocabulary relating to temperature, high and low pressure, cyclones, etc., but we also expect the presenter, unlike newscasters, to address the audience directly, by saying things like 'look at this rain moving in from the west here'. On television weather reports, there is also usually some visual representation of the weather being described, for example a small sun to represent sunshine, arrows for the direction of the wind, and snowflakes for wintry conditions. The register of weather forecasting depends also on the cultural context of the broadcast. The British format has just been described, but the format can vary from country to country.

The same expectations of linguistic register (language variation according to context) apply to other media **genres**, where there are conventions of appropriate language use for specific types of programme. When these conventions are well established, often the form of how something is reported can outweigh the content, or the information itself.

A famous media hoax used a well-established media format (the documentary) to broadcast information that was false. A report of a 'spaghetti harvest', broadcast on BBC One's documentary programme *Panorama* on 1 April 1957 (1 April being a traditional date for practical jokes) showed strands of pasta growing on trees, while a male RP voice-over provided a serious commentary on traditional spaghetti farming in Italy. Radio, television and newspapers in Britain still successfully play hoaxes on the public on 1 April. Similarly, though unintentionally, misleading was the radio broadcast in the United States on 30 October 1938 of Orson Welles's reading of H. G. Wells's short story *The War of the Worlds*. It apparently caused panic among listeners who believed that New Jersey was being invaded by Martians.

These occurrences demonstrate the potential power of the broadcast word to be received by the public as authoritative, factual and believable. On the other hand, research into how audiences react to and interpret news programmes (Morley 1980, 1992; Richardson and Corner 1986; Moores 1993) has suggested that the viewing public is not always so ready to believe events as they are presented through the news media, and has other resources for interpreting what it sees and hears on the news.

However, it does remain the case that the media are constantly shaping our expectations about the way different kinds of information are transmitted, and these conventional formats can play an important part in the way we interpret the messages they contain. Language plays a central role in structuring these conventions through the association of particular registers with specific

types of programme, such as the language of documentaries, where voice-over commentaries can often produce an effect of authority and objectivity in their account of events on the screen (see Fairclough 1995).

The effect of an institutional, authoritative, objective voice can be compared to the effect produced by voices which are beginning to be heard on television in new media genres such as BBC Television's *Video Nation* slots. These are very short video film sequences, lasting only a few minutes, made by 'ordinary' (i.e. non-institutional) people, about themselves, or any topic they feel strongly about. The growth of public participation programmes and phone-in radio shows also provides a space for lay people to contribute to the variety of voices represented in the media, as we shall see next, although the final 'gatekeeping' to decide who gets access, and who does not, remains with the broadcasting institutions.

4.6 Public participation in the media

Programmes which involve audience participation, such as *Oprah Winfrey* and *Donahue* in the United States, *Kilroy* and *Esther* in Britain, have been growing in popularity and number, and achieve very high viewing ratings. There is some disagreement about whether these programmes provide the opportunity for more democratic debate in the media, or whether they in fact depoliticise important issues by presenting them in this format. Some theorists (e.g. Livingstone and Lunt 1994) have argued that these programmes open up access to an important public domain for people whose voices and opinions are not usually heard on television, and that talk shows provide a powerful space for the voices of ordinary, lay members of the public to be privileged over the voices of institutional representatives and experts whose opinions and views usually predominate elsewhere in other media genres. Others (e.g. Fairclough 1995) have argued against this view, saying that audience participation programmes are structured in such a way that the discourse of the experts and the institution is still the framing, dominant discourse, while the discourse of lay participants is always mediated and constrained within the institutional format.

An example of this can be found in a study of the interaction between host and callers to a London talk radio show. Ian Hutchby (1996) explores the strategies available to participants in argument sequences, and shows that typically the caller 'goes first', by stating their position in relation to a particular topic, while the host 'goes second', challenging the caller's opinion without necessarily having to produce one of their own. The following transcript illustrates this phenomenon:

- 1 Caller: When you look at e:r the childcare facilities in
 2 this country, .hh we're very very low (.) i-on
 3 the league table in Europe of (.) you know if
 4 you try to get a child into a nursery it's
 5 very difficult in this country. .hh An' in fa:ct it's
 6 getting wor::se.
 7 Host: What's that got to do with it.
 8 Caller: .phh Well I think whu- what 'at's gotta d-do
 9 with it is . . .

(Hutchby 1996: H:21.11.88:11.1)

This resource of 'going second' in an argument is available to both caller and host, but in this context is principally used by the host, making them interactionally the most powerful participant through their position as challenger to a previously stated claim.

Another strategy which also contributes to the interactional power of the television host over audience participants is illustrated in the following transcript of a sequence in a British talk show, *Kilroy*. Here, the talk of the lay audience member is directed and to some extent controlled by the host's intervention and questioning:

- 1 Host: Tell me about this (.) household
 2 Alice: erm well both my parents are very loving (.)
 3 very accepting of lots of things (.) and (.)
 4 therefore that rubs off (.) on my sister and
 5 I – erm
 6 Host: – how old are you
 7 Alice: nineteen
 8 Host: how old's your sister
 9 Alice: sixteen
 10 Host: mmm
 11 Alice: and erm (1.0) I've lived with both separately (.)
 12 I've lived with Dad for the last couple of years
 13 – now
 14 Host: – does Dad have a lover
 15 Alice: Yes he does (.) – Pedro
 16 Host: – You live with Dad and lover
 17 Alice: yes
 18 Host: How old were you when you lived with Dad and
 19 lover

- 20 Alice: erm (1.0) I was seventeen when I moved to
 21 Melbourne
 22 Host: cause you problems
 23 Alice: no
 24 Host: did you find it strange
 25 Alice: no
 26 Host: find it difficult
 27 Alice: no it's just like living with any other
 28 parent and their lover
 29 Host: it's just like living with any other parent
 30 and their lover

(Thornborrow 1997: Adoption/Kilroy/1994)

In this extract, Alice is asked by the host to tell the story of how she came to live with her father and his male partner. However, she is not left to tell her own story without the intervention of the host. She starts by focusing on the quality of the relationship between her and her parents (lines 2–5), but the host interrupts her several times, asking her questions which elicit certain kinds of information (about her age, her father's relationship and how she felt about it), resulting in a story which is jointly produced, rather than a story told by Alice in her own words.

4.7 Language, society and virtual power

To conclude this chapter we look briefly at the development of computer-mediated communication (CMC) over the past two decades. This new form of communication can take a variety of forms, from email exchanges to synchronous (real-time) interaction in chat rooms and MUDs (Multi-User Dimensions), to asynchronous (postponed-time) interaction in newsgroups and bulletin boards. David Crystal (2001) provides a comprehensive overview of the linguistic features of CMC, and the language we use to communicate on the web. This has been given various names including 'netspeak', 'netlish', 'weblish', 'wired-style' and 'cyberspeak', and some of the words and expressions first coined in this context have now become part of the language we use every day. Crystal gives examples of terms such as 'multi-tasking', 'dot.com', and 'he's 404' (2001: 19) which are used 'offline' as well as 'online'. But many of the questions we ask in this book about how language can be powerful apply to social relations in virtual realities just as much as they do to social relations in 'real' life (IRL). What are some of the issues involved?

4.7.1 Social identity

In the early days of CMC it was thought that this new medium would result in more democratic communication, because a person's social identity (their gender, ethnicity, age) can be hidden in the virtual world. In cyberspace, people can also play with identity and present themselves in different personas, so the internet would be a place where social hierarchies become levelled out, and people could encounter each other in a more equal way. However, this has turned out to be not quite so simple. As Nancy Deuel found in her study of virtual sex interactions, stereotypical interpretations of gendered behaviour still prevail:

Sexual aggression is assumed to be a male trait and one participant notes: 'It seems to me that if a female character shows any bit of intelligence and sexual recognition, people will think she's a male IRL. If she flirts shamelessly and has a smutty description, people will think she's a male IRL.'
(1996: 134)

So while it may be possible to disguise your identity on the Net, the people you interact with will still make assumptions about who you are based on what you say and how you say it.

4.7.2 'Netiquette'

The internet makes it possible for people who are geographically scattered thousands of miles away from each other to interact either in real time or with a very small time delay. This has led to the concept of cyberspace as a 'global village' (Crystal 2001: 5) where people who use the Net are members of a virtual community. As in any other community, rules and codes of behaviour have developed in order to control the way that members of the community behave. Entering a chat room as a 'newbie' means having to learn the conventions and rules of interaction in that space. Many newsgroups have a FAQ (frequently asked questions) file which sets out what these rules are, some even have moderators or 'wizards': people who are prepared to spend time monitoring the use of a group and making sure that rules are kept. Inappropriate behaviour can get you sanctioned, and possibly excluded from a group. 'Flaming' (aggressive verbal behaviour), 'spamming' (sending unwanted long messages) and 'grandstanding' (posting your opinions widely with no respect for the topic of a newsgroup) are all activities that can lead to sanctions. One example of this is using a 'kill file', a kind of shield which can be used to prevent unwanted, offensive messages from getting through to you. Kollock

and Smith (1996) describe this kind of shield as a powerful interactional device, one that can ‘make invisible any objectionable person’ (120). However, it works only on an individual, not a community, level, and, even if you banish someone from your screen, other users may not, so you will still see future postings if other participants comment on them. What is particularly interesting about the rules that attempt to control social interaction in cyberspace is that it is the people who use the Net who establish those rules. Cyberspace is a community regulated not yet by a ‘top-down’ authority but by a ‘bottom-up’ process developed by internet users.

4.7.3 Cyberspace: a socially powerful community?

In her study of a community protest, Laura Gurak (1996) explains how a database called ‘MarketPlace: Households’ (listing details about millions of American households and produced by a company called Lotus) was prevented from becoming commercially available. The release of this product became the subject of an intense debate about privacy, not just in newspapers but across internet newsgroups and bulletin boards. For two months across the United States, people were posting information about the database, and how to contact Lotus to complain about the violation of their privacy. The speed and efficiency of this medium resulted in a highly effective campaign to stop the database going on sale. Gurak makes the point that what she calls ‘rhetorical communities’, diverse groups of people who participate in protests and campaigns via the internet, can be socially and politically powerful. In cases such as this, CMC can provide a public forum for action and protest, as so many participants can become involved very quickly in a campaign.

ACTIVITY 4.4

If you regularly use internet sites such as chat rooms, or post to a newsgroup, what are the rules that govern behaviour in these cyberspaces? How do you know what they are, and what happens if you break them?

4.8 Summary

In this chapter we have discussed the power of the media to determine what counts as news, and also how it gets represented. We have outlined the

conflicting views of the media, on the one hand as organs of democracy, providing essential public information and on the other as powerful monopolies which relentlessly pursue their own interests. With the increase of public access to broadcasting space, and particularly with the arrival of the World Wide Web, and its potential for unregulated mass communication, these questions remain central to the debates about the function and power of the mass media. Are they providing an emerging forum for public debate, or are they still closely monitored institutions with hierarchies of discourse and systems of 'gatekeeping' which continue to control who gets to say what, and how? An analysis of the language and discourse used in mediated contexts provides a valuable way of finding evidence to support or counter these claims.

Suggestions for further reading

- Fairclough, Norman (1995) *Media Discourse*, London: Edward Arnold. This book covers a wide range of language use in the media from a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) perspective.
- Graddol, David and Boyd-Barrett, Oliver (eds) (1994) *Media Texts: Authors and Readers*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. A collection of essays which cover a range of different themes in media discourse, from the style and structure of news stories and the role of visuals to more theoretical discussions of the concept of 'author', and the interpretative role of the audience.
- Simpson, Paul (1993) *Language, Ideology and Point of View*, London and New York: Routledge. This is an accessible account of the relationship between linguistic forms and point of view in a wide variety of media.
- Thornborrow, Joanna and Wareing, Shân (1998) *Patterns in Language: An Introduction to Language and Literary Style*, London: Routledge. A practical introduction to how to approach texts using linguistic tools of analysis. Chapter 7 deals specifically with examples of media language.

Readings on the World Wide Web

Many studies are beginning to appear of the way we use language in CMC. David Crystal's book provides an overview of the linguistic features of 'Netspeak', while Susan Herring's collection of articles provides some interesting insights into aspects of the social and cultural issues involved in this new form of communication.

- Crystal, David (2001) *Language and the Internet*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herring, S. (ed.) *Computer Mediated Communication: Linguistic, Social and Cross-cultural Perspectives*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.