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CHAPTER I

SELF-REFLECTION BY THE AUTHOR

In a broad sense, the present study is a subjective and interpretive study of television news communication. By its definition then, this study is "intrinsically incomplete" (Geertz, 1973, p. 29) and open and maybe vulnerable to challenges of methodological validity and reliability. In any case, I cannot simply get away with this "subjective" nature of the study merely by saying that "I don't care whether or not you agree with my approach. This is what I have found, anyway." Pilotta and Mickunas (1990) contend that "No science can be truly scientific unless it becomes aware of the operations used in the formations of logical objectives. Without exploring the acts of consciousness through which objectives are formed, logic cannot justify its goals and the method it employs for its realization" (p. 2).

In this context, in the following, I would like to self-reflect on my research conduct and provide a biographical and procedural information in regard to the present study in the hope that those who happen to read this document will understand better the context of my research in terms of its assumptions, claims and findings. It is then needed for me to describe where my present position has come from and how I have ended up making use of a particular theoretical/methodological framework for the study. In short, this chapter intends to respond to "how" and "why" questions on the
methodological formation in the present study, and thereby to enhance the reader's comprehension of the perspective or context of my study.

The purpose of the present study has been to explicate structural patterns, or systematic meaning system of television news narrative across both paradigmatic and syntagmatic dimensions. It was presupposed that these structural patterns were to be abstracted from the "text" itself by means of subjective but "understandable" process of investigation. In doing so, this study was not begun in a vacuum; that is to say, this study also has gone through the process of "structuring" of a particular methodological framework, and thus, it has "selected" ideas from linguistics, literary criticism, anthropology, sociology and (mass) media studies and "combined" them into a meaningful whole. After all, this study has utilized some valuable ideas from theories on narrative (Propp, Todorov, Chatman, and Genette), structuralism (Levi-Strauss) and semiotics (Peirce, Eco, and Metz) in the first place. In addition, it has also brought into play insightful ideas from the theories of cultural studies (Carey and Hall), of phenomenological sociology (Berger & Luckmann) and of interpretive anthropology (Bourdieu, and Geertz). In a sense, it may be argued that the present study follows a kind of "eclecticism," which has drawn its theoretical and methodological formations from various interdisciplinary fields.

This is not a new approach which has not been done before, however. In the area of television studies, this kind of interdisciplinary and eclectic style of approach has already been used, as found in works by Campbell (1986), Ekdom (1981), Robinson (1984), Silverstone (1981), etc. Although the characteristics of these eclectic studies, due to their multi-perspectival nature,
are hard to define in a neat way, they tend to share a common assumption that, as Robinson (1984) notes, "human beings live in a symbolic as well as physical environment, both of which must be accounted for in understanding social behavior" (p. 200). Therefore, these studies seem to be based on the idea that a single perspective alone often cannot adequately make sense of our cultural product, since the meaning of cultural text is constructed and maintained within a complex web of multifarious symbolic representations of our reality. In the case of television news narrative in particular, unlike in other fictional programs, its simultaneous and dualistic roles of information-transmission and fictional entertainment, the presence of newscasters and all kinds of computer-generated audio-visual devices tend to add to our difficulty in understanding its complex symbolic practice. Because of this multi-faceted nature of the text, it seems necessary to look into it from various perspectives in order to achieve a comprehensive understanding of it. As one of such attempts of interdisciplinary interpretation, the present study has tried to understand television news-making as a story-telling practice in the first place on the ground that its fictional and entertaining quality resembles that of "our ancient ways of telling 'stories'" (Darnton, 1975, p. 191). This narrative quality seems to me the most significant aspect of contemporary news communication practice, and this realization has provided me with a starting point of the present study.

In retrospect, however, it should be noted that the researcher has also gone through the process of so-called paradigmatic selections and syntagmatic combinations of ideas in laying out the present research plan. These personal acts of selecting and combining then have been used in interpreting another
paradigmatic and syntagmatic course of action which has been involved in journalistic practice of television news narrative. In other words, both acts of the researcher's interpretation and the journalist's narrativistic representation can not avoid their "situatedness" in particular contexts. Broadly speaking, any kind of communication action cannot get away with its situatedness within particular temporality and spatiality. In the meantime, it seems that to understand a text means to understand the context of the text itself, its situatedness. In the same way, one needs to know the context of the research project in order to have an adequate understanding of it. Therefore, it seems that the researcher is responsible for providing the readers with information of particular situatedness or context with regard to his/her project in order to have his/her research reporting be understood properly.

The following section then tries to provide the "situatedness" of the present study mostly, albeit maybe insufficiently, by describing the researcher's personal paradigmatic and syntagmatic journey which has eventually made the present study possible. Basically, the formation of the present research framework has undergone three syntagmatic procedural moments, which can be marked by three developmental phases each of which deals with our cultural forms in general and television in particular as "shamanistic," "mythic" and "narrativistic" rituals respectively.

During the literature review on contemporary journalism, I have found that many of theoretical and empirical works deal with (either print or broadcast) journalism as a story-telling practice. According to this assumption, television news does not simply deliver us the raw events, but rather helps us construct our reality in particular way. Indeed, television
narrative and its viewing as a whole appears to be a symbolic "ritual" by means of which, as Carey (1975a; 1975b) argues, our reality is created, maintained, transmitted and modified. In this sense, it seems to me that all journalists resemble "shamans" in terms of their socio-cultural symbolic function, and that television viewing is just like a shamanistic ritual, by means of which community members symbolically make sense of and overcome unknowable, unfamiliar and unpredictable happenings by transforming them into something familiar, knowable and predictable, and thus maintain their identities and social order in the midst of chaotic happenings. This metaphorical use of the term, "shamans" for contemporary journalists is not new, however. According to my literature review, this kind of religious metaphor for journalism has already been made use of in the area of news media criticism (Gans, 1979; Gerbner, 1977; Mander, 1987). Mander, for example, compares the social role of modern journalist with that of a shaman; he contends, "the modern journalist resembles the shaman who pretends his acts are magical because pretense is demanded of him by the society in which he lives. Like the shaman, the reporter is a kind of official who is vested with authority by the public, and it is incumbent upon society to believe in him" (p. 63).

If one of the most important characteristics of shamanism is its use of symbolic language, it may not be much different from our use of symbolic devices in television. Television's magnificent power would not exist if its audience is just too "rational" to perceive fictitious events in television dramas as if they were real and thus to share the happy, sad, or fearful feelings which are evoked and transmitted through various symbolic devices such as
lighting, sound, screen and so on. In other words, through the use of this kind of symbolic language, we transcend the temporal and spatial limitations and thus feel the symbolically transformed world as real. In regard to this "transformative" power of magical ritual in our contemporary society, Pilotta and Mickunas (1990) argue:

In magical incantation, the spatio-temporal distances are abolished. If one performs a ritual, the ritual has, indeed is, the power that is identical with events happening elsewhere and at another time: the rain dance and the incantation means that tomorrow's rain is present in the ritual. The same is true of modern concept of conditions. What one does today in the form of establishment of conditions is assumed to establish the presence of the transformed "reality" tomorrow.... Mead, in fact, suggested that the modern science in its technological guise is magical, because it allows us to avoid undesirable results and to obtain desirable results. It is capable of transforming events. (pp. 141-142)

While I was reading theories of shamanism in the meantime, it was found that they were not able to be fully understood without being related with theories of "myth." On the one hand, theories of shamanism could provide a good starting point for developing valuable research topics in the field of media studies. On the other hand, it was thought that the application of shamanism into the study of mass communication would be understood better only if they were taken into consideration in a broader context of theories of myth. The partial reason which has motivated this perspectival shift may be found in the fact that the fast growing recent concern about the applicability of theories of myth into mass media studies among communication scholars has provided me with more chances of access to the literature of that area. While the most influential figures to me might include Levi-Strauss and Barthes, some others such as Foucault, Bourdieu,
McLuhan, Horkheimer and Adorno, V. Turner, Carey and Silverstone have also given me a great deal of influence, either directly or indirectly.¹

Since my concern was moving into theories of myth, I have had an overview of overall theoretical development in our intellectual history from the Greek era all the way through up to the twentieth century, including: the sophist's allegorical interpretations of myth which have attempted to reveal some hidden values in myth in terms of morality; the Epicurean's rejection of allegorical mode of interpretation; Euhemerism which is considered as the root of the Enlightenment movement and thus of the contemporary rationalism, and according to which myths are merely symbolized stories of all purely historical people; the Romantic movement of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, which stresses the "poetic" and autonomous quality of myth; Durkheim-Malinowski's functionalistic approach to myth, according to which myth is not merely a fictitious story, but an ever-present reality lived in the past and the present and also to be lived in the future; Jung and Freud's psychological study of myth, which tries to seek the origin of myth in the deep layers of the human psyche; Levi-Strauss's structuralist analysis of myth; Barthes's Marxism-oriented social analysis of myth, which equates myth to ideology; Horkheimer and Adorno's perception of myth as a cultural form which is seen as a commodity of capitalism. Taking into account their significant influence on the formation of the present study, the

basic ideas of Levi-Strauss, Barthes and McLuhan would better briefly be
introduced for a moment.

Levi-Strauss's structuralism, in the study of myth, radically differs
from romanticism or Durkheim-Malinowski's sociofunctionalism. He is
interested neither in poetic expressions nor in social functions of myths, but
rather in underlying logical structures that make meanings in myth possible.
Therefore, the significant point of Levi-Strauss's work is, as he claims, "not
about how men think in myths, but about how myths operate in men's
minds without their being aware of the fact" (1964/1969, p. 12).

The main job of Levi-Strauss's structuralism is to decompose
mythological narratives by identifying bits and pieces of their most
elementary constituent units, termed "mythemes." Myth-makers assemble
these units into a meaningful whole according to a set of organizing
structural rules which are deeply embedded within a particular cultural
context. The basic units are then arranged in orders of binary terms that are
expressible effectively in terms of complete polar concepts. Among the
examples are life and death, male and female, good and bad, mortal and
immortal, etc. The conflict between polar opposition is then resolved by
means of introducing a third intermediate term such as, for example, "warm"
between "hot" and "cold," or "boiled" between "raw" and "broiled." In Levi-
Strauss's structuralism, therefore, truth in myth is not dependent on the
intrinsic value of the materials but on the adequate structures that convey the

---

2. For a valuable summary and criticism of Levi-Strauss's idea of
structuralism, see Hawkes (1977, pp. 32-58); Sturrock (1979, pp. 19-51);
Coward and Ellis's (1977, chap. 2).
cultural standards in a particular society. Hence myths do not represent 'facts' pure and simple, but demonstrate a dialectical organization of facts.

On the one hand, he is criticized for not having done on historical analysis of myth and thus for ignoring the historical significance of structural patterns. Nevertheless, he is credited with his proposal of an alternative way of reading myth which has been hardly imaginable before him. In brief, as Levi-Strauss repeatedly maintains, every myth is a transformation; A myth should not be treated as static object but as something that is constantly transformed in the course of its transmission. This is why the various stages of transformation of any particular myth can be found within any cultural system. Levi-Strauss's study of transformation and transmission of mythic structure has opened up a new way of seeing our reality represented in various cultural forms, which is usually taken for granted and thus not questioned. In this context, it is not accidental that some contemporary scholars of critical theory and analysis have begun to break the coherent world view and clarify the decentering of reality experienced, perceived and ideologically conceived. Barthes is certainly one of these critical scholars.

Barthes, as one of those contemporary Marxist social analysts, is also important since he situates myth in the realm of the political discourse and argues that myth depoliticizes ideology and thus camouflages the present social inequalities. He begins his investigation into contemporary myths, in his *Mythologies* (1957/1972), by questioning the ways in which a variety of cultural forms including newspapers, films and art enforce us to accept that the reality they construct is "natural." For Barthes, the principle of myth is to transform History into Nature: Myth converts historical reality into an
illusory image of the world as "nature." Myth deprives the object of all History and lets us not wonder where it comes from but simply enjoy it. Myth, for Barthes, is also "depoliticized speech" since myth forgets that reality is a product of human activity and struggle. In this sense, the major function of myth is to empty reality by distancing itself from history, and thereby to serve for the maintenance of the dominant ideology by presenting us a world of no history and politics and moreover of no contradiction.

In short, Barthes sees myth as a vehicle used by the dominant class to represent, confirm and preserve its dominant ideology. In this sense, Barthes's notion of myth is similar to that of traditional myth in that myths within both notions are seen to control the ways of thinking and acting of the community members for the sake of the status quo. Hence the goal of Barthes's study of modern myth is to demythologize the ideology which is constructed and presented through various cultural forms.

The most crucial point in both Levi-Strauss and Barthes, like other structuralist, is that their concern is no longer about "message," the content aspect of text, but "medium," its formal aspect. This emphasis on "medium" is also shared by McLuhan as manifested in his famous phrase, "Medium is message." In "Myth and Mass Media" (1959) McLuhan demonstrates how mass medium as a language and thus as a myth performs a mythic role in the modern society. The major point of his discussion is that mass medium as a new mode of communication, like language, shapes the character of what is thought, felt, and said by the people who use it. He also argues that mass medium, like language, is a message and its effect depends on its form not on its content. Finally, he calls a mass medium as well as a language a
"macromyth," while defining a single "myth" as an image, photograph, still-shot, or static abstraction of a macromyth in action. With regard to electronic mass medium in particular, McLuhan concludes that the information which is electronically and simultaneously transmitted through mass medium such as television, like mythic images of the preliterate age, lets us have many cultural languages in a compressed and multilayered way in which several external spatio-temporal domains are mingled in a single image or situation.

According to all of these insights by Levi-Strauss, Barthes and McLuhan, every cultural form looks like a mythic ritual, a mythic practice. By means of this kind of practice, human beings try to translate the unknown phenomena into their local framework of reality which is already available, and thereby transform nature into culture, the sacred into the profane. When they are faced with the significant events that are not immediately familiar and thus threatening, they need to have an alternative mechanism by means of which they could solve the problem. Mythic thinking tends to provide this alternative way of problem-solving by means of narrating some "as-if" stories which are immediately translatable within their existing framework of the world. Through this metaphorically transformational function of myth, human beings are able to impose meanings and orders on the unfamiliar/unknown experiences, and thereby release symbolically the tensions between the known and the unknown.

What has been learnt from the overall literature review then is that our long-time, on-going rigorous efforts to solve the puzzles about myths have not been centered on any common denominator in terms of their research theme, but rather they have played in different grounds, each of
them, along with different concern, trying to explore different aspect of myth. Therefore, in a broad sense, their theoretical differences do not seem to be representing their different perspectives on myth; Instead, they seem to represent their different research questions which are closely related to their unique research interests which vary depending on whether their approach to myth is cosmologically, poetically, psychologically, functionalistically, or structuralsistically oriented. Whatever different research questions they bear in mind, one thing shared in common through all these approaches seems to be that myth is a "story," a "narrative" which follows a certain form including a beginning, a middle and an end, and mythic practice is a communication process that has to do with particular story "events." In fact, one cannot think of any myth or other cultural product which does not have "story" in it, whether it is about cosmology, poetics, history, politics, art and so forth. According to ancient Greek usage, in fact, "a myth is a spoken or written narrative, or story, with certain distinguishable qualities and properties" (Murray, 1959, p. 214).

In the meantime, a story is not a story unless it goes through some kind of communication channel which is either aural or visual and gets to be told or expressed one way or another. It would be useful here to introduce Murray's (1959), as he calls, "formal" or "qualitative" definition of myth as follows:

Myth is a sensible and dramatic representation of a supposedly recurrent or unique event (in the past, the present, or the future), an event with an important theme, which is represented primarily in the mind (imaginal myth), but secondarily in words (narrated myth), in quasi actions (enacted myth), or in some artistic form (portrayed myth). (p. 215)
According to Murray's definition, any cultural product which contains at least one significant event in it and is able to be appreciated by any of our sensory organs is supposed to have mythic qualities in some way. Television narrative in particular seems to retain at least three aspects of Murray's myth; That is to say, television narrative is a mode of communication which usually contains a story (or stories) made up of a series of events and which always involves in it some kinds of audio-visual narrations and portrayals. As will be discussed more in detail in the subsequent chapters, any study on "narrative" basically examines two aspects of it, its content (story) and expression (discourse). Since television is a medium in which the quality of a story is enriched and elaborated upon by means of various audio-visual devices for expression, the adequate explanation and understanding of it can be reached when it is examined at both levels of expression and of story. In this regard, it was considered that application of theories of visual semiotics in particular might be helpful in exploring the signifying sign systems used in television.

In any case, the practice or experience both of story and discourse of cultural product seems to be realized only with and within symbolic rituals. Television is one of these symbolic rituals in modern culture, by which we make sense of the world. Television culture, as a symbolic ritual, then tends to demand collective participation of people with "a" mind and to make us arrive at the state of communion. Furthermore, in terms of message structure, television and myth are alike in that both work through the process of, as Kluckhohn (1959) summarizes (as constant tendencies in myth-making), (1) duplication, triplication, and quadruplication of elements, (2)
reinterpretation of borrowed myths to fit pre-existing cultural emphases, (3) endless variations upon central themes, and (4) involution-elaboration (p. 278).

Eventually, the above perception of television as a form of mythic narrative has turned my attention and motivated me to look into and question the narrative qualities of television. On reviewing theories of narrative (mostly from literary studies in the first place, that is, works by Propp, Todorov, Chatman, Genette, etc.), it was found that any "story" has to be investigated and understood both on paradigmatic and syntagmatic dimensions. For it seems that reading a story only on the paradigmatic dimension would not produce a proper interpretation of it; it would merely tells about the story at the "element-al" level. To understand a story in a proper way is to understand "relations" which connect various story elements in a meaningful whole. Elements and their relations are not separable; instead, they always go hand-in-hand in the course of a story. Lacking any one of these in story-telling makes the story incomplete, confusing and hard to understand both in our practice and experience of it. Put in words by Pilotta and Mickunas (1990), "Combination and selection are strictly related here; if one is weakened, linguistic and communicative process is disturbed and finally abolished. Combination without selection leads to a compulsive relationship (closed context), selection without combination leads to an arbitrary and disconnected relationship" (p. 103). Unfortunately, nevertheless, according to my (maybe limited) literature review, most studies have not turned considerable attention to the syntagmatic dimension of news narrative, and thus limited the possible
extension of analytical perspective by setting limit to "context." Pilotta and Mickunas point out the importance of "a progressive constitution of a context" as the following:

Context is a field of meaningful acts of relating, whether such acts are one's own or those of the other, whether they are successive or simultaneous; these acts relate to the field and organize it in a particular way. This required the notion that language consists of two strata; the syntagmatic axis, which obeys the principle of succession and simultaneity, and the paradigmatic axis dominated by the principle of exchangeability. In this sense, every linguistic activity unifies an operation of combinations that builds the context and an operation of selection that allows substitutions. (p. 102)

In short, then, it may be argued that the focus of the present study is, most of all, laid on the explicating practice on the relational dimension of elements in an attempt to understand how paradigmatic rules are intertwined together in the course of syntagmatization of events. In carrying out the project, this study had to identify deep structural patterns in the first place, which performed a controlling function in the paradigmatic selection of particular signifiers both at the aural and visual levels; Secondly, it related them with the actual representational forms that one could hear and see on television screen.

Now, what is the real value of this kind of study after all? What are we going to do with the findings of structural patterns? Are these merely a self-comforting and self-competent theoretical claim? If not, how are these research findings related with our real experiences in everyday activities? Certainly, there is a danger in the present study since the focus of attention has been turned a great deal to the television narrative as a "medium," that is, the formal part of it, not much to its content or value aspect. In this
respect, it must be acknowledged that this study alone is not complete; rather, it should be taken into account as a complement to traditional "value" studies, which in a way relate to our day-to-day cultural experiences. In this regard, a phenomenologist film critic, Ayfre says that, "the process here is not yet complete, for the critic, enriched with his ideas, must then resubmit himself to the image and descend to the level of experience, letting the image sink back into the flux of inner life. The critic must follow the image by responding anew to reality" (Andrew, 1976, p. 252). As implied here, the real value of the present research is to be claimed only if the analyzing activity is turned back and situated anew into our everyday socio-cultural practice.
CHAPTER II
A NARRATIVE INTERPRETATION OF THE NEWS

Following a conventional assumption, news makers and readers tend to habitually believe that "news," whether it is printed or broadcast, presents an "objective" version of the world we live in. As Stephens (1988) points out, journalists began to use the term "objectivity" in the twentieth century "to express their commitment not only to impartiality but to reflecting the world as it is" (p. 264). This assumption of "objectivity" presumes an external reality that exists "out there" and can be discovered by our rigorous scientific effort (O'Sullivan, Hartley, Saunders, and Fiske, 1983, p. 160). In this view, "news" is supposed to simply deliver the "fact" with accuracy and without bias or distortion of any kind. It was not surprising, then, to find a printed card decoration which demanded "ACCURACY, ACCURACY, ACCURACY" in the newsroom of Joseph Pulitzer's New York World at the end of the nineteenth century (Stephens, 1988, p. 253).

Since the second half of the nineteenth century, the arrival of a so-called new newswriting style, the "inverted pyramid," in the world of print journalism gave "facts" their true voice. Operating in this style of newswriting, journalists organize news stories around facts, not around ideas or chronologies; the most newsworthy facts go to the "lead" position, followed by supporting materials in descending order of newsworthiness.
Along with the introduction of the inverted pyramid style, journalists began to think of themselves as professionals, and "impartiality" has become an important part of the journalism ethics, the primary requirement of a "set of professional norms" (Stephens, p. 262).

Pertaining to the ideologies of "objectivity" and "impartiality," journalists themselves believe that what determines the content of news is not news organizations, but "events" themselves. So, the "facts" the reporters gather and present to the audience are the omniscient entities, not the reporters themselves. This line of thought, then, tends to provoke a proposition that events speak to us and therefore make the news. In other words, news is considered a "mirror" of society as far as it is believed that the news provides us with no more than mirrored reality, simply reflecting, with transparency, whatever happens in front of us. This perspective of news as a mirror of society was proposed by Frank Stanton, then president of CBS, when he professed before a House Committee, "What the media do is to hold a mirror up to society and try to report it as faithfully as possible" (Epstein, 1974, pp. 13-14).

In this context, many significant studies dealing with such research topics as "bias," "objectivity," "impartiality" and "balance" have been done for long among many journalism scholars in America (Altheide, 1976; Breed, 1955; Cirino, 1971; Diamond, 1978; Efron, 1971; Epstein, 1974; Sigelman, 1973). As Hackett (1985) notes, such bias/objectivity studies tend to accept collectively the following assumptions: first, "the news can and ought to be objective, balanced and a reflection of social reality"; second, "the political attitudes of journalists or editorial decision-makers are a major determinant
of news bias"; third, "bias in news content can be detected with existing reading methods"; fourth, "the most important form of bias is partisanship" (p. 251). What is deeply embedded in these assumptions is the ontological and epistemological premise that there is a neutral, external reality, which is knowable and thus can be accurately transmitted. In this perspective, news stories are seen as pure, neutral and transparent transmissions of what happens out there in the real world of events and facts. What is central to this this line of philosophical assumption is, to borrow Carey's words, the information "transmission" view of news-communication (1975a, 1975b, 1977). Such bias/objectivity studies of news-communication as a whole, however, tend to ignore its another aspect, that is to say, the news as a cultural "ritual" or "form," through the practice of which reality is "created, modified, and transformed" (Carey, 1977, p. 412) and thus by which one makes sense of the world. Viewed from this alternative perspective, the reality of the news is not simply comprised of a given set of facts; Instead, as Hall (1982) argues, it could be considered:

the result of a particular way of constructing reality. The media defined, not merely reproduced, "reality." Definitions of reality were sustained and produced through all those linguistic practices....It implies the active work of selecting and presenting, of structuring and shaping: not merely the transmitting of an already existing meaning, but the more active labour of 'making things mean'. (p. 64)

Similarly, Fiske and Hartley (1978) point out that "the reality...is always experienced through the mediating structures of language. And this mediation is not a distortion or even a reflection of the real, it is rather the active social process through which the real is 'made'" (P. 61). How, then, do the news media in general "make things mean"?
Journalism as Narrative Story Telling

Many journalism scholars have already adapted in their research the notion of news-communication as an active social apparatus of reality construction: for example, the following list of studies that dealt with news production as a "story telling," a "narrative" or a "mythic narrative" (Bennett, 1980; Bird, 1987; Bird & Dardenne, 1988; Campbell, 1986, 1987, 1991; Carey & Fritzler, 1987; Darnton, 1975; Ekdom, 1981; Ellis, 1987; Ettema & Glasser, 1988; Kozloff, 1987; Mander, 1987; Manoff, 1986; Morse, 1986; Nimmo & Combs, 1985; Schudson, 1978, 1988; Sperry, 1976), as an "ideological" practice (Chomsky & Herman, 1979; Dreier, 1982; Gitlin, 1980; Glasgow Media Group, 1976, 1980; Hall, 1981, 1982; Knight & Dean, 1982; Morley, 1976; White, 1987), as a "semiotic" representational system (Bentele, 1985; Chung, 1992; Collins & Clark, 1992; Hartley & Montgomery, 1985; Kervin, 1985; Robinson, 1984), or as a social "discourse" (van Dijk, 1985, 1988; Pietila, 1992). Within this line of research, the concepts of bias and objectivity as evaluative standards are rejected. Instead, the structural/ideological aspect of news is considered to be a more fruitful research topic (Hackett, 1984, p. 251). There are also researchers who stress the "mediating" role of journalism between the world and its representation. According to Hackett's (1985) classifications, they include: first, some production/organization studies (Altheide, 1976; Epstein, 1974; Tuchman, 1978) which point out the "journalism's editorial mediation of events in the process of structuring news media's representation of social and political events; second, some linguistically oriented studies (Hall, 1982; Hall, Critcher, Jefferson, Clarke, & Roberts, 1978; Morley, 1976) which refuse
the idea of value-free language and thus note the linguistic mediation of the meaning or truth of events; third, those studies (Altheide & Snow, 1979; Fishman, 1980; Molotch & Lester, 1974a, 1974b) which reject the idea that the media can be separated from the events to be observed and reported, and which, instead, stress the media's active social role in the construction of reality of the world.

In spite of the differences in their focus of investigation, all these studies share a similar idea that as Hartley (1982) says, "news is not the newsworthy event itself, but rather the 'report' or 'account' of an event"; "It is a discourse made into a meaningful 'story'..." (p. 11). This idea of news as a constructed story of events also serves as a dominant and persistent assumption for the present study, which presumes that the "form" of journalism's news production tends to resemble the structural nature of a "narrative," which only delivers us a socially constructed version of reality. The narrativistic nature of the news helps in rendering its fiction-like reconstruction of events to appear to be real and factual. This is why Robinson (1984) argues that the focus of attention in the interpretive research must be laid "not only on what is talked about, but on the way in which ...news goes about telling its stories" (p. 201).

In addition, it should be noted that the narrativistic nature of story telling in news communication requires a certain set of rules that create and maintain some specific cultural meanings for raw events. As Hall (1980) notes, with regard to television news narrative in particular:

A 'raw' historical event cannot, in that form, be transmitted by, say, a television newscast. Events can only be signified within the aural-
visual forms of the television discourse. In the moment when a historical event passes under the sign of discourse, it is subject to all the complex formal 'rules' by which language signifies. (p. 129)

These rules are so taken for granted and naturalized that their existence is very hardly recognized by us. Thus, a good journalist may mean a news maker who is familiar with or accustomed to these rules and knows how to impose "an old form on new matter in a way that creates some tension...and then resolves it by falling back on the familiar." (Darnton, 1975, p. 189). By the same token, the layman's conception of "news" is seen based on his/her familiar way of telling stories or on, in Darnton's (p. 191) terms, 'ancient ways of telling 'stories'." Then, what are the structural characteristics of ancient narrative, the old way of story telling? How are these characteristics related to news-communication? In other words, what are the narrative qualities of news stories? In order to deal with these questions, it is then required to look at the basic theories that deal with nature and structures of narrative in general and to examine their applicability to the study of television news narrative. The discussion regarding these problems will be provided in detail in the next chapter, since it will serve as the theoretical background for the present study. In the following section, I will briefly discuss the purpose and scope of this study.

The Present Study: Its Purpose and Scope

The major concern of the present study is neither to criticize the ethical problems or any particular ideologies of the contemporary journalists, nor to redefine what news is or should be. It is rather, in a broad sense, to interpret and understand the news narrative as a form of "culture," a cultural system,
which, along with other cultural forms, participates in creating and maintaining our reality. Geertz (1973) defines culture as "an historically transmitted pattern of meaning embedded in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life" (p. 89). Applying Geertz's insight to the study of television news, the present study attempts to look into the "form," the meaning "system" of news narrative in general and television news narrative in particular.

As early as in the 1950s, Frye (1957) had already pointed out the importance of the "form" of narrative as it shapes and contains meaning:

The word form has normally two complimentary terms, matter and content, and it perhaps makes some distinction whether we think of form as a shaping principle or as a containing one. As shaping principle, it may be thought of as narrative, organizing temporally what Milton called, in an age of more exact terminology, the "matter" of his song. As containing principle it may be thought of as meaning, holding the poem together in a simultaneous structure. (p. 83)

In a similar vein, Geertz (1973) asserts that "cultural patterns are 'models',...sets of symbols whose relations to one another 'model' relations among entities, processes." The term "model" here has a double senses, "a model of" reality and "a model for" reality because "they [cultural patterns] give meaning, that is, objective conceptual form, to social and psychological reality both by shaping themselves to it and by shaping it to themselves" (p. 93). In the same way, news can be defined as a set of symbols which, on the one hand, consist of historically transmitted conceptions and which, on the other hand, conceptualize reality by giving meaning to it, make it understandable and thus provide the guidelines and sources for maintaining
our reality. In other words, news provides a symbolic communication system by which "reality is produced, maintained, repaired and transformed" (Carey, 1975a, p. 10).

Following this perspective, this study begins with the assumption that news narrative blurs the distinction between fact and fiction, between information and entertainment, between nature and culture, and finally provides a systematic frame of reference through which the world view is created, maintained and transformed. The study of news as a form of narrative, however, is not to claim a total rejection of a traditional "transmission view of communication," (Carey, 1975a, 1975b) but to look into the other side of it, that is, to realize that there is something more than the functions of informing and explaining. It attempts to understand the fictional narrative quality of the news, by means of which the viewers as well as the news makers organize our experiences, bring order to events, and thus make sense of the world. News reporting then, does not merely relates story events but makes stories themselves. Making stories does not operate in vacuum, however; rather, it always depends upon a set of rules and symbols embedded in a particular socio-cultural milieu. As Manoff and Schudson (1986) argue, "Journalism, like any other storytelling activity, is a form of fiction operating out of its own conventions and understandings and within its own set of sociological, ideological, and literary constraints" (p. 6). Seen from this perspective, Newcomb's (1974) suggestion is worth noting:

It should be clear by now that the relationship between fact and fiction, between reality and fantasy in the popular arts, is much more complex than the simple distinction would indicate.... In order to understand the unreal quality of TV's "real" programs, one should
not turn to the ideology of a particular set of writers or reporters, but
to the fictional structures [italics added] that news, sports, and
documentary reflect. (p. 184)

The present study of television news as a mode of narrative then
explores the structural cultural patterns embedded in the relations between
fact and text and between reality and representation by examining both the
story events and their narration. However, this study is not merely
concerned with a structural, typological study of the sampled news stories, but
rather with understanding how events are transformed into a plausible story,
that is, how do some story events turn out differently at the end of the
narration. To be concrete in relation to the topic of the study, the primary
concern of this study is to examine the populistic aspect of television
narration, that is, for example, how socially and politically important issues
end up being transformed into some trivial stories about personal events.
This populistic trend of the news has been pointed out by Gitlin (1986) as he
argues, "television" often "loves nothing more than a story about a 'little
guy' who stands up to the 'powers that be'" in "anti-establishment" themes
(p. 15).

The Present Study: A Case of the News

Coverage of the Homeless

The present study takes the television evening news coverage of the
social issue of "homelessness" during the period of 1985-1991 as a case subject
for analysis. A question now arises, "Why the homeless of all things?"
Above all, it should be mentioned that the choice of "homelessness" for the
present study has been made based on my personal experience of television
viewing. As a long time television viewer, as I confess, I have been addicted to television news or documentary programs in particular because they are "commonsensically" believed to deliver "reality" as it is the most faithful way. Because of this "addiction," I have happened to be exposed to many stories of the homeless for several years. This has led me to bear the following general impression of the homeless that they are "different" from us in that they are blankly standing, endlessly walking, begging on the streets, sleeping and eating here and there at any time of the day, and so forth. Particularly when I had a chance to visit New York city, I found it was true.

The problem occurred, however, when I realized that almost every year, television news programs have rarely missed an opportunity in reporting the stories about homeless particularly during the winter holiday seasons, Thanksgiving and Christmas. During these seasons, it has been more often than not that all networks were seen willingly carrying the report on the religious organization's charitable services providing foods to those street people. Then, the question was "Why this time of the year, of all seasons?" My initial thoughts were that this was not the proper way of dealing with the issue of "homelessness" and that it was the type of issue that could not be solved by seasonal charitable donations only during the winter season. In retrospect, I was certain that the news coverage of the homeless around these religious holiday seasons must have given the networks a good chance to "repeat" their routines of making moving melodramas out of some religious happenings in order to arouse sympathetic feelings among the viewers by prettifying them. It was realized that the networks's coverages of the homeless have tended to be seasonal and have been done in more or less
fixed patterns. This realization after all, has turned out to be a starting, motivating moment for the initiation of the present study. In a sense, the subject of the topic for this research can be anything, for example, such as all-time controversial issues, prostitution, alcohol/drug-abuse problems, gay/lesbian culture, or other issues regarding marginalized groups of people, as I have been personally concerned with these issues pretty much.

Whereas the term "homeless" is now so familiar that every one has his or her own conception of it, it was not until the early 1980s that the term "homeless" first appeared in the American mainstream journalism. Before the 1980s, the stories of the homeless of course were reported in the news media, but under such terms as vagrancy, street people, housing, etc. What has made this semantic shift and made the term "homeless" draw a large attention among the public? This shift, first of all, seems to indicate the fast increasing number and newly emerging types of the homeless people in America (Campbell & Reeves, 1989; Kozol, 1988; Neubeck, 1991; Ropers, 1988). Although precise statistics has always been a matter of dispute, one widely accepted estimate, which is endorsed by the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), shows that 2 million to 3 million Americans as of the late 80s, contrary to the number of 250,000-350,000 by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), are currently homeless (Neubeck, 1991, p. 207). The types of homeless in the 1980s differ from the recent past. A dramatic decrease in the average age of the homeless and the fast growing segment of homeless "families" of most often mothers and their children have marked the most significant change in the picture of the homeless in the 80s. Whereas the major constituents of the homeless in the 50s were
elderly, white, male, skid row alcoholics, they tend to be younger, minority
groups, and very often female and entire families in the 80s (Appelbaum,
1988; Neubeck, 1991; Ropers, 1988). Robert Hayes, one of the most popular
homeless advocates in the 80s and counsel to the National Coalition for the
Homeless, once asserted that about 500,000 of an estimated 2 to 3 million
homeless people are dependent children and at least 750,000 of those are
family members. Rivlin describes in detail these diverse modes of the
homeless as the following:

Single men and women and poor elderly who have lost their
marginal housing, ex-offenders, single-parent households, runaway
youths, "throwaway" youths (abandoned by their families or victims
of family abuse), young people who have moved out of foster care,
women escaping from domestic violence, undocumented and illegal
immigrants, Native Americans leaving the reservation after Federal
cutbacks and unemployment, alcoholics and drug abusers, ex-
psychiatric patients, and the so-called "new poor" who are victims of
unemployment and changes in the job market. (Neubeck, 1991, pp. 297-
208)

What are these people really, then? How are these people conceived of
in society? How do others think of the origination of these people?
According to a common belief among many journalists and politicians, the
homeless of America are generally considered as consisting of former mental
hospital patients who were deinstitutionalized since the 1950s. Hence the
popular myth of the homeless that they are mentally, psychologically
disordered and thus psychotic, lazy, crazy, drunk, doped, etc. (Ropers, 1988, pp.
28). This is the essence of the so-called "victim blaming" perspective. In the
following, I will provide a brief sketch of the theory of victim blaming since
this theory seems to provide a very useful clue for interpreting the news stories in the present study.

Generally speaking, the victim blaming, contrary to system blaming, is an attitude of ascribing social problems to the psychological/psychiatric conditions rather than seeing them from the sociological, political and economic perspectives. In choosing between two contrasting perspectives about social deviants, that is, in deciding whether they are the problem itself or only victims of it, for example, the victim blaming attitude takes exclusively the first one for a choice (Eitzen & Zinn, 1989, p. 11; Ropers, 1988, p. 29; Ryan, 1976, pp. 3-23). Carefully listening to the victim-blamers, Ryan (1976) criticizes their attitude as an ideological process in the following:

Victim-blaming is cloaked in kindness and concern, and bears all the trappings and statistical furbelows of scientism; it is obscured by a perfumed haze of humanitarianism.... Blaming the Victim is an ideological process, which is to say that it is a set of ideas and concepts deriving from systematically motivated, but unintended, distortions of reality. In the sense [of Karl Mannheim]...an ideology develops from the "collective unconscious" of a group or class and is rooted in a class-based interest in maintaining the status quo. (p. 6-11)

What is implied in the victim blaming theory is then, in short, an inverted logic of cause and effect so that cause becomes effect and vice versa. Ryan (1976) describes the process of this inversion of cause and effect as follows:

All of this happens so smoothly that it seems downright rational. First, identify a social problem. Second, study those affected by the problem and discover in what ways they are different from the rest of us as a consequence of deprivation and injustice. Third, define the differences as the cause of the social problem itself. Finally, of course, assign a government bureaucrat to invent a humanitarian action program to correct the differences. (pp. 8-9)
Contrary to the psychological victim blaming attitude towards the social problem of homelessness, the critical scholars approach the problem from a macro perspective, arguing that the answer for the origin of homelessness should be sought primarily from the context of economy (Kozol, 1988; Ryan, 1976; Ropers, 1988). Campbell and Reeves argue that the current problem of homelessness is rooted in three areas of economy: the recession of the early 1980s that caused millions of job and home losses; the lack of affordable homes and federal cutbacks for low-income housing subsidies; "the gentrification of the cities" that took away cheap flophouses and skid row districts where the poor used to live. (1989, p. 22).

Turning back to the television news coverage of the homeless, for the time being, the present study, in a broad way, will examine the way of representation of homelessness in television news narrative and its relationship to reality construction, as this study assumes that the news-communication is an active social practice in creating and maintaining our reality. In other words, the study will explicate the process of, that is, the signifying rules and practices of television news narrative communication, by which particular meanings of homelessness are constructed. Hence the research question is "How television news narrative treats the social issue of homelessness, that is, whether the homeless are portrayed as the victims of social problems or problem makers?" Specifically, I will, above all, attempt to identify the narrative structures of television news in their relation to story and discourse. To elaborate, the study will search for any underlying paradigmatic symbolic patterns, first of all, by adapting Levi-Strauss's theory of binary opposition. Secondly, this study will examine how the paradigmatic
principles work in the syntagmatic development of the story as a whole by making use of Propp's and Todorov's insights about syntagmatic narrative process. Especially, the focus of the study will be on the explication of the syntagmatic perspective of television news narrative in an attempt to see how it ideologically deals with the social issue of homelessness, either taking the victim blaming perspective or the system blaming one. In addition, this study will explicate the discourse dimension of television news narrative by examining how semiotic modes of expression in television narrative such as camera work, sound, editing, etc. are related to the whole paradigmatic/syntagmatic patterns of narrative. In order to achieve this task, this study also borrows basic ideas regarding sign systems from the theories of visual semiotics by Peirce, Eco, Seiter, Silverman and Metz. Also, in this part of the analysis, the role of the anchorperson as a super-ordinal narrator and its relationship to the story dimension of narrative in particular will be studied. In this sense, the following questions in particular will be asked for the whole sampled stories: In what direction does the narrator orient the story as a whole? How is this question related to the whole point of view of the narrative, and what kinds of signifying mechanisms and devices are particularly used?

The unique contribution of this study, in a broad sense, is to provide some knowledge about the formal logic of television news narrative by means of which the world we live in is rendered meaningful and thus understandable to us. The systematic study of syntagmatic structural rules of television news narrative in particular is more contributive than the paradigmatic one. In fact, very few studies in the past have dealt with this
aspect of television news narrative in a considerable scale, although the significance of this type of study has already been indicated (Fiske, 1987b, p. 139; Hartley, 1982). The most commonly used theories in the structuralist approach to television communication tend to be Propp’s theory on narrative schema (his theory of "spheres of action" in particular) and Levi-Strauss’s theory of binary opposition. In applying these theories to television studies, however, the research tends to examine only the deep structural paradigmatic rules of television narrative and thus ignores the other half of the story dimension of narrative, the syntagmatic aspect of narrative. Many studies then tend to only focus on typological aspects of narrative as their research stresses are put on classifying the types of television news narratives or narrators. Campbell's (1986) study, for example, analyzes a news magazine program, 60 Minutes and comes up with four types of narrative formulas including detective, analyst, tourist and referee. His study tends to mainly focus on categorizing the style of reporters in terms of his four types of formulas. In a similar vein, Ekdom's (1981) study manages to classify television news narrative style into three types: as she calls, agent-centered, act-centered, and scene-centered narratives. In short, such research has not fully explored the syntagmatic aspect of television narrative in full scale, which eventually serves as another determining structural principle in orienting the story as a whole on the macro level as it controls the horizontal development of the narrative, leading towards a certain narrative closure and rendering the episode meaningful and understandable. In the following chapter, I will review the narrative theories in general and how they can be contributive to the purpose of the present study. The discussion will also
provide a brief sketch of the theories of semiotics in its relation to television visual studies.
CHAPTER III

NARRATIVE, STORY AND DISCOURSE: AN APPROACH TO
THE STUDY OF TELEVISION NEWS NARRATIVE

The Nature of Narrative

"Narrative" is an essential, inevitable part of our existence, which provides us with a primary form of expression and experience of the world. It is just like our language, and thus is so obviously and naturally embedded in our everyday life, as Webster (1990, p. 46) observes, that its significance tends to be usually overlooked because of its transparency or invisibility. Kozloff (1987), with regard to the narrative quality of television medium, also points out that it generally passes unmarked by the audience since it seems so natural (p. 45). This characteristic of narrative, its pervasiveness, omnipresence or universality has also been mentioned in works by scholars in various fields such as Barthes (1977), Eason (1981), Fiske (1987b), Jameson (1981), Polkinghorne (1988), Toolan (1988), and H. White (1981). For example, H. White (1981) contends that "narrative is a metacode [italics added], a human universal on the basis of which transcultural messages about the nature of a shared reality can be transmitted" (p. 2). Narrative as a metacode ceaselessly transforms rare events into symbolically meaningful products. So, any cultural product with "the absence of narrative capacity or a refusal of narrative indicates an absence or refusal of meaning itself" (P. 2). Jameson
(1981) claims that narrative is "the central function or instance of the human mind" (p. 13). Narrative indeed gives a primary structure to all our forms of representation and comprehension of meaning of the world. In other words, it resides in any form of our knowledge, whether written, spoken, or thought. Hence Barthes's famous paragraph in his essay "Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives" (1977):

The narratives of the world are numberless. Narrative is first and foremost a prodigious variety of genres, themselves distributed amongst different substances - as though any material were fit to receive man's stories. Able to be carried by articulated language, spoken or written, fixed or moving images, gestures, and the ordered mixture of all these substances; narrative is present in myth, legend, fable, tale, novella, epic, history, tragedy, drama, comedy, mime, painting (think of Carpaccio's Saint Ursula), stained glass windows, cinema, comics, news item, conversation. Moreover, under this almost infinite diversity of forms, narrative is present in every age, in every place, in every society; it begins with the very history of mankind and there nowhere is nor has been a people without narrative. All classes, all human groups, have their narratives, enjoyment of which is very often shared by men with different, even opposing, cultural backgrounds. Caring nothing for the division between good and bad literature, narrative is intellectual, transhistorical, transcultural: it is simply there, like life itself. (p. 79)

As implied in the previous quotation from Hartley (1982), which defines news as "a discourse made into a meaningful story," (p. 11) news narrative, like other types of narrative, works through two dimensions, "story" and "discourse," or, in Ricoeur's (1981) terms, "chronological" ("episodic") and "non-chronological" ("configurational") dimensions (pp. 278-279). Even though different terms have been used in the theoretical discussions among those scholars who study narrative poetics as to how to split the subject of observation such terms as "fabula" and "sujzet" used by
the early Russian formalists (Propp, Tomashevsky) and "histoire" and "discours" used by the recent French scholars (Benveniste, Barthes), as Toolan (1988) argues, those terms are roughly equivalent to Chatman's (1978) English terms, "story" and "discourse." According to Chatman, story is identified with "the content or chain of events (actions, happenings), plus what may be called the existents (characters, items of setting)," and discourse with "the expression, the means by which the content is communicated" (p. 19). After reviewing the various earlier works, Toolan (1988) concludes that:

_Story_ seems to focus on the pre-artistic, genre- and convention-bound basic event- and-character patterns of narrative, with scarcely any room for evaluative contrasts or discriminations.... _Discourse_ looks at the artistic and individualized working with and around the genres, the conventions, the basic story patterns, in the distinctive styles, voices, or manners of different authors. (p. 10)

Thus, story is, in Toolan's (1988) words again, "the basic unshaped story material" and has components of events, characters and settings (p. 12). That is, a story is a set of events (what) that happen to those specific characters (whom) at certain locations (where). Discourse, on the other hand, implies all technical and representational devices that have things to do with manipulation and presentation of the basic story (Toolan, 1988, p. 10). Discourse as a whole relates to "how" the stories are narrated.

The binary categorization of narrative outlined above ('story' and 'discourse') may be furthermore complicated with the introduction of new terms, 'text' and 'narration'. The introduction of these new levels of subject matter, however, does not mean the total readjustment of the theory of binary categorization. Instead, the levels of 'text' and 'narration' are the result of another bifurcation of the second category, 'discourse' (Toolan, 1988,
p. 10). Thus, 'discourse' in turn, is regarded as consisting of two sub-categories, "text" and "narration" (Rimmon-Kenan, 1983, p. 3) or "recit" and "narration" (Genette, 1972/1980, pp. 25-29). Following the spirit of Genette's distinction between 'histoire', 'recit' and 'narration', Rimmon-Kenan (1983) distinguishes those three levels in the study of narrative fiction as the following:

'Story' designates the narrated events, abstracted from their disposition in the text and reconstructed in their chronological order, together with the participants in these events....Whereas 'story' is a succession of events, 'text' is a spoken or written discourse which undertakes their telling. Put more simply, the text is what we read. In it, the events do not necessarily appear in chronological order, the characteristics of the participants are dispersed throughout, and all the items of the narrative content are filtered through some prism or perspective ('focalizer').... The act or process of production is the third aspect --'narration'...Of the three aspects of narrative fiction, the text is the only one directly available to the reader....however, the narrative text is itself defined by these two other aspects: unless it told a story it would not be a narrative, and without being narrated or written it would not be text....(pp. 3-4)

In any case, the controversy over how many specific categories are more adequate for the study of narrative products among the contemporary narrative scholars, of course, has not been fixed. It seems neither necessary to discuss more about that in detail here; instead, the chief thing to keep in mind for the present study is that we need to focus not only on "what" questions but also on "how" questions when dealing with television programs, particularly with news programs. Then, even though I will also frequently use the terms in the three-level analysis theory for the particular purposes of this study, whenever needed, I shall try to stick to the use of the two-level distinction ('story' and 'discourse') rather than three-level one.
('story', 'text' and 'narration') as long as, as mentioned above, the latter categories of text and narration can be understood simply as a bifurcation of the former category, discourse. Suffice it to say that there are basically two dimensions of study in the narrative-oriented analysis of television news-communication for the moment: put in Chatman's words (1978) again, "a story (histoire)," "the what in a narrative that is depicted," and "a discourse (discours)," "the how " (p. 19). Let me first look at the 'story' dimension of narrative.

**Story**

According to the structuralist narrative theories in general, the narrative story contains, as its components, events, characters and settings, and its narrative structure consists of two basic analytical dimensions: surface and deep structures. Television signs, like language, operate both at the horizontal (syntagmatic) and vertical (paradigmatic) levels. This will be discussed in detail in the following.

**Surface Narrative Structure**

Propp's work (1928/1968) marks the first major attempt to generalize a structural model for narratives, "a form of presentation" in his words (p. xxv). He begins his study with inviting us to compare the following events:

1. A tsar gives an eagle to a hero. The eagle carries the hero away to another kingdom.
2. An old man gives Sucenko a horse. The horse carries Sucenko away to another kingdom.
3. A sorcerer gives Ivan a little boat. The boat takes Ivan to another kingdom.
4. A princess gives Ivan a ring. Young men appearing from out of the ring carry Ivan away into another kingdom, and so forth. (p. 19-20)

No matter who the participants are in all cases above, one element which is constant is to be abstracted: that is, the transfer of someone to another kingdom by means of something obtained from someone. Propp calls this constant element a 'function'. What was found in the above example of a set of events is that neither actions nor functions changed while the names of the dramatis personae did. Thus, Propp defines function as "an act of a character, defined from the point of view of its significance for the course of the action" (p. 21). He also summarizes four points regarding "functions" of characters as the basic components of tale:

1. Functions of characters serve as stable, constant elements in a tale, independent of how and by whom they are fulfilled. They constitute the fundamental components of a tale.
2. The number of functions known to the fairy tale is limited.
3. The sequence of functions is always identical.
4. All fairy tales are of one type in regard to their structure. (pp. 21-23)

This conclusion then allowed Propp to analyze one hundred Russian folk tales according to the functions of their characters and produce a sequence of thirty-one narrative functions. What was important for Propp is not what characters are, but rather what they do for advancing the story. These thirty-one functions were then reduced to seven "spheres of action" which correspond to the roles of narrative characters, villain, donor, helper, princess and her father, dispatcher, hero, and false hero (pp. 79-80).

Propp's work, as Dundes points out (Propp, 1928/1968, pp. xii-xiii), is regarded more as a syntagmatic approach than a paradigmatic one, since it
primarily concentrated on the structure of text alone, not on its relational context of then society and culture in Russia. His work did not deal much with the integrative, paradigmatic dimension of narrative, of which the consideration would bring about a more significant understanding of the higher complexities of meaning and structure of a particular narrative. Propp's work is important, however, in that it marked the early major attempt to understand the "constructed" nature of the narrative stories by studying the underlying immanent structure of the narrative albeit limited to a particular genre. The most significant point of Propp's work is that characters are not seen as being equivalent to 'real' people doing real things, but rather as a certain device or function that holds together the events and actions (Webster, 1990, p. 49).

Propp's findings of functions and spheres of action in folk tales have been applied into the contemporary formal, structural studies of film and television (e.g., Ekdom, 1981; Silverstone, 1981). Even though Propp's model is not fit for adequate explanation of the narrative structures of television shows, his categories of dramatic personae seem suitable for studying the roles of characters in such television programs as Six Million Dollar Man, Knight Rider, The A-Team, Star Trek, Batman, Miami Vice, Starsky & Hutch, and so on (Fiske, 1987b; Kozloff, 1987). Taking advantage of Propp's insight, it could be argued that although we see countless homeless characters in television news, their "functions" as a collective representation of a certain social status hardly change. In considering the applicability of Propp's work to the study of television, Kozloff (1987) suggests that we may come up with two conclusions:
The first is that American television is remarkably like Russian fairy tales—that is, that certain motifs, situations, and stock characters may have a nearly universal psychological/mythological/sociological appeal and thus appear again and again in popular cultural forms.... The second conclusion is...that stories are governed by a set of unwritten rules acquired by all storytellers and receivers, much the way we all acquire the basic rules of grammar. (p. 49)

Seen from a minimalist perspective, in any way, a narrative may be defined as "a perceived sequence of non-randomly connected events" (Toolan, 1988, p. 7), or as a a series of events arranged according to a chronological principle (Rimmon-Kenan, 1983, p. 14). The characteristic of non-randomness in plotting the events of a story was already highlighted by Aristotle in Poetics (1954). Aristotle points out that the plot of a tragedy as a whole has a beginning, a middle, and an end; thus a well constructed plot can neither begin nor end at any random point, and to be beautiful, every whole made up of parts must present a certain order in its arrangement of parts (p. 233). As suggested in this contention, an event presupposes a recognition of a certain condition or a state of affairs and something that happens to change that state in the course of a story. In corresponding with this, Rimmon-Kenan (1983) defines an event as "a change from one state of affairs to another" (p. 15). Todorov (1971/1977) also stresses this change of state by holding that "The minimal complete plot consists in the passage from one equilibrium to another" (p. 111). He distinguishes two types of episodes in a narrative; one for describing a "state" (either of equilibrium or of disequilibrium) which is relatively static, and the other for a "passage" from one state to another which is dynamic. Construction of a narrative, for
Todorov, is then based upon a sequential combination of states and passages as described in the following:

An "ideal" narrative begins with a stable situation which is disturbed by some power or force. There results a state of disequilibrium; by the action of a force directed in the opposite direction, the equilibrium is re-established; the second equilibrium is similar to the first, but the two are never identical. (p. 111).

Put somewhat differently, while things happen on the basis of the principle of randomness out in the real world, these events, to be a story, are arranged and linked to each other on the basis of a certain temporal order and/or the causality principle. In this context, events in television stories are also presented in the way of either "X occurred, then Y occurred" or "Because X occurred, Y occurred." When considering this characteristic of non-randomness of story making in its relation to television news-communication in particular, Todorov's syntactic schema of equilibrium-(force)-disequilibrium-(force)-equilibrium provides us a very useful tool for explaining what is really being said. As Fiske (1987b, p. 139) points out, the deep, ideological dimension of news narrative can be brought to light by comparing the opening and closing states of equilibrium and by identifying the sources of disrupting and stabilizing forces between states of affairs.

Gans's (1979) observation of television news format, for example, shows us how significantly Todorov's syntactic schema of stories is unawarely used by today's journalists as he argues that today's news becomes a "morality play" which resembles the story format of traditional myth or legend (p. 162). With somewhat different terms from Todorov, Gans suggests the similar points with regard to plotting of the news stories today. He argues that newsworthy
events become news only when they are transformed into a story format, which consists of a "lead," a "narrative," and a "closer" (pp. 161-162). As Gans points out, while "lead" in most cases states an empirical highlight, brings a moral issue on the table, or questions a stereotypical expectation, it does not so in vacuum; it always presupposes a certain state of affairs (equilibrium) which is taken-for-granted within the limit of common sense. The state of equilibrium, as Fiske argues (1987b, p. 139), is rarely manifested in any explicit way, but usually contained implicitly in its opposition to the state of disequilibrium. Gans's "narrative" corresponds to Todorov's passages and disequilibrium between equilibriums, since it documents and illustrates the conflict introduced in the lead. Finally, "closer," discrediting or reaffirming the initial expectation by means of assessing the significance of the original highlight or offering a momentary resolution, brings forth a new equilibrium whether it is similar to or changed from the original state of equilibrium.

The ideological study of narrative then might take the significance of "narrative closure" into its initial consideration. The concept of "closure" in this case then refers to, as Webster (1990, p. 53) argues, "the ways in which a text persuades a reader to understand and accept a certain view of the world as valid or natural." While any narrative, by its own nature, has to end at some point, its way of closing varies, however. It depends on its particular strategy of presentation that a narrative takes either a neatly organized conclusion or a open and relatively loose ending. Thus, one may be able to explore the ideological dimension of narrative through careful reading of how the narrative ends and how it is related to the opening of the story. In applying this theory of narrative closure to the study of television culture, Fiske (1987b)
argues that "the ideological work is at its clearest in the selection of which
events are considered to disrupt or restore which equilibrium and in the
description of what constitutes disequilibrium" (p. 139).

Until now, the discussion has placed stress on giving a theoretical
outline of the syntagmatic process involved in the narrative construction of
stories, centering around Propp and Todorov. The syntagmatic dimension of
story, governed by temporal and causal principles, refers to "the linear
distribution of event and character presentation, disclosure, elaboration, and
so on" (Toolan, 1988, pp. 9-10). Put in a broad way, as has been mentioned, it
may be argued that Propp's and Todorov's schemata of stories are based on
Aristotle's linear plot structure of stories in general, beginning, middle, and
end. Their theories show us that a story as a whole develops into a narrative
text according to the chronological and non-random arrangement of events
and characters (or functions). There is another static dimension of narrative
structure in stories, so-called, "deep narrative structure," which can be
abstracted from the story itself. Deep narrative structures operate on the
paradigmatic dimension of stories on the basis of logical and semantic
relations among the constituent units of narrative. As Fiske and Hartley
(1978) argue, the paradigmatic dimension of story refers to the "vertical' set
of units...from which the required one is selected," while the syntagmatic to
the "horizontal' chain into which it is linked with others, according to
agreed rules and conventions, to make a meaningful whole" (p. 50). The
study of paradigms (the vertical sets of units) gives an important clue to our
understanding of the codes of television since it, along with the study with
syntagms, shows us how narrative units are selected and combined into a
meaningful system according to certain syntagmatic rules. It would also allow us to investigate what kind of dominant ideological norms and rules are taken for granted in a specific popular culture and how they are represented in various cultural products to which television culture, to be sure, belongs.

**Deep Narrative Structure**

Levi-Strauss, a structural anthropologist, is one of those who has had the most significant influence on the theoretical development of structuralism. As it is concerned with the study of signs as a focal point for understanding culture, the work of Levi-Strauss has been inspired by Saussure's linguistic theory, particularly by its technical components and mode of scientific approach. Structuralism in general assumes that a language may be defined as a congregation of signs which make up the words and its construction depends on a certain structural system. The system of language, however, does not have any ontological status of existence, but can only be constructed by an analyst. Saussure's contribution to the emergence of structuralism is often summarized in terms of two faces of signs he demonstrates: (1) the concurrent production of the "signifier" and the "signified" and (2) the arbitrary relationship between the "signifier" and the "signified."³ First of all, the signifier and the signified are Saussure's two components of sign; the former refers to the material dimension of language such as sound, written mark, etc., and the latter, the mental or conceptual
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dimension of language. These two components of language can be separated only by an analyst, but not in practice. Therefore, there is no signifier without a signified, and no signified without a signifier. Accordingly, the notion of a "cat" and the materialized sound "cat" in thought or speech are not meaningful by themselves alone unless they are related to each other by a certain social convention. Saussure also introduced two pairs of controversial terms of which the concepts have a tremendous influence on the later development of structuralist way of interpreting culture: "langue (language)" and "parole (speech);" the "synchronic" and the "diachronic" axes of investigation. As Sturrock (1979) reads Saussure's distinction between the former set of concepts, "langue" is "the theoretical system or structure of a language, the corpus of linguistic rules which speakers of that language must obey if they are to communicate" and "parole" is "the actual day-to-day use made of that system by individual speakers" (p. 8). In the meantime, the synchronic approach studies language "as a system functioning at a given moment in time and the diachronic one, language as an institution which has evolved through time" (P. 8). In sum, two modes of analysis are recognized in structural linguistics described in the following by Coward and Ellis (1977):

One mode analyses the structural form at any one moment,...the analysis of a particular state of langue. This is analysis of the paradigm, synchronic analysis of that which exists at a certain moment or during a definite epoch. The second form of analysis is that of the actual combinations that are generated, the signifying chains that are produced, the analysis of parole. This is analysis of the syntagm, the diachronic analysis of that which unfolds through the passing of time. (p. 14)
In addition to his introduction of crucial pairs of terms described above, Saussure also argues the arbitrary nature of linguistic sign. According to him, Sturrock (1979) summarizes:

...the signifier is arbitrary inasmuch as there is no natural, only a conventional, link between it and the thing it signifies (not the signified in this case). There is no property common to all trees, for instance, which makes it logical or necessary that we should refer to them as 'trees'....the French...refer to them as 'arbres'. But language is arbitrary at the level of the signified also, for each native language divides up in different ways the total field of what may be expressed in words.... The example...is that of colour terms, which vary greatly from one language to another. (p. 9)

In short, Sturrock continues, "language is a system not of fixed, unalterable essences but of labile forms....a system of relations between its constituent units, and those units are themselves constituted by the differences that mark them off from other, related units" (p. 10). Thus, the structure of language is a system of difference, where the particular signifiers and signifieds are constituted in a process of differentiation.

Turning back to Levi-Strauss, he, applying the basic ideas of Saussure, has studied anthropological phenomena as if they were systems similar to languages; Instead of mere empirical description of those phenomena of kinship, totemism, and myths in primitive societies, he has been concerned more with their relationship to social structures. This has led Levi-Strauss to develop the models of deep structure of narrative, although he has not used the term "deep structure," Greimas acknowledges:

The distinction made by Levi-Strauss, since his first study dedicated to myth, between an apparent signification of the myth, revealed in the textual narrative, and its deep meaning, paradigmatic and achronic, implies the same assumptions....We therefore decided to
give to the structure evolved by Levi-Strauss the status of deep narrative structure, capable, in the process of syntagmatization, of generating a surface structure corresponding roughly to the syntagmatic chain of Propp. (1971, p. 796)

According to Levi-Strauss (1958/1963), "the purpose of myth is to provide a logical model capable of overcoming a contradiction ..." (p. 229) and thus, "mythical thought always progresses from the awareness of oppositions toward their resolution..." (p. 224). Myth then transforms and expresses various forms of contradictions as disorders and provides ways of solving the problems and thus reestablishing orders of the world. Furthermore, it is by the means of telling stories that people order and resolve their experiences of basic contradictions or relations such as life vs. death and nature vs. culture. Levi-Strauss (1958/1963) points out the narrative quality of myth by contending that myth, as a language and a part of human speech, must be told (p. 209) in the process of generating meaning:

Its substance does not lie in its style, its original music, or its syntax, but in the story which it tells. Myth is language, functioning on an especially high level where meaning succeeds practically at "taking off" from the linguistic ground on which it keeps on rolling. (p. 210)

Myth then reveals its true meaning when its grammar, the underlying structural pattern is grasped by the analyst. An analyst, first of all, breaks down myths into individual units, so-called "mythemes," like phonemes, the basic sound units of language, and then, examines the particular relations by which mythemes are combined. It is the faculty of the human mind, the universal mental operations, that constructs these relational patterns beneath the surface level of the narrative. This kind of mental system operates at the level of unconsciousness when it classifies and organizes reality. Therefore, it
is not that human beings think themselves through myths, but the other way around.

According to Levi-Strauss, the conflicts in myths are embedded in binary oppositions of mytheme and the underlying structure of myth consists of four-term homology in which one pair of opposed mythemes correlates with another. Hence the fundamental formula, $A : B :: C : D$, that is, the oppositional relationship between $A$ and $B$ correlates with that between $C$ and $D$. Let me take an example of Levi-Strauss's deep structure abstracted from his analysis of the Oedipus myth (Levi-Strauss, 1958/1963, pp. 206-231). First of all, the Oedipus myth is broken down into mythemes, the individual minimal relational units of myth, which are then to be grouped into bundles of relations that would produce a meaning. Levi-Strauss after all, comes up with four vertical columns, each of which includes several relations that are grouped into the same bundle. In order to "understand" the myth, he argues, we have to "disregard one half of the diachronic dimension (top to bottom)" and read the arrangement of mythemes "from left to right, column after column, each one being considered as a unit" (p. 214). The reading of four vertical columns in the Oedipus myth then matches with the formula of four-term homology. Levi-Strauss has found that the first binary opposition ($A : B$) is between the "overrating of blood relations" (e.g. Oedipus marries his mother, or Antigone buries her brother despite prohibition) and the "underrating of blood relations" (e.g. Oedipus kills his father, or Eteocles kills his brother). The second opposition is between the "denial of the autochthonous origin of man" (The autochthonous creatures, like the dragon and the sphinx, are killed) and the "persistence of the autochthonous origin
of man" (Oedipus's swollen foot, or Laios's name connoting left-sidedness suggesting human defects, imperfection, which is a characteristic of the autochthonous beings).

As already mentioned in the quotation of Levi-Strauss, the mythical thought does not merely represents the oppositional, conflict aspect of reality, but also always moves towards the point of resolution. Therefore, Levi-Strauss (1958/1963) argues, "two opposite terms with no intermediary always tend to be replaced by two equivalent terms which admit of a third one as a mediator [italics added]; then one of the polar terms and the mediator become replaced by a new triad, and so on" (p. 224). In the study of the structure of Pueblo myths, for example, Levi-Strauss identifies the initial contradiction of Life : Death and the replaced one of Agriculture : Warfare in the first triad. In order to resolve the conflict, then, the Pueblo stories interpose, also in the same triad, the third term, "Hunting" as a mediator. This mediating structure is then followed by the contradiction of Herbivorous animals (plant-eating animals) : Beasts of prey (carnivorous animals) with carrion-eating animals (ravens or coyotes) as mediators. The introduction of mediators then resolves and connects the polar opposites as Levi-Strauss interprets, "carrion-eating animals are like beasts of prey (they eat animal food), but they are also like food-plant producers (they do not kill what they eat)" (p. 224). The mediating function of "carrion-eating animals" then "occupies a position halfway between two polar terms... [and] must retain something of that duality--namely an ambiguous and equivocal character" (p. 226).
In sum, Levi-Strauss finds a deep structure of mythic narrative, that is, a true meaning of myth by pulling characters, settings, and actions out of the syntagmatic flow of stories, reading them vertically in terms of paradigmatic relations of similarity and difference, and representing them in terms of binary oppositions. He sees this deep structure as a universal one, being inherent in the human mind so that it remains beyond our analysis. This is why, however, his work has been criticized by Marxism-oriented scholars in particular for being unhistorical and thus interested only in narrative langue, not in individual paroles. Coward and Ellis (1977, pp. 20-21), for example, criticizes Levi-Strauss's structuralism for not going further into the study of a diversity of structuring practices such as imaginary relations, real relations, and relations between these two, and thus for not conceiving of the structure as a continuous process of production. In a similar fashion, Eagleton (1983), a Marxist literary critic, concludes that "Structuralism, in a word, was hair-raisingly unhistorical: the laws of the mind it claimed to isolate - parallelisms, oppositions, inversions and the rest - moved at a level of generality quite remote from the concrete differences of human history" (p. 109).

In spite of the above criticism, structuralism in general and Levi-Strauss's structural study of myth in particular has marked the beginning of a new social and historical theory of meaning, which raises the questions regarding the relations of the work to the realities and the conditions which produce them. Structuralism, as Eagleton (1983, pp. 106-109) points out, above all, demystifies literary work by revealing the characteristic of its constructedness, like any other product of language. So, it makes it possible
for us to classify and analyze the system of meaning, that is, how meaning is constructed, like the objects of other sciences. In addition, structuralism also makes it possible for us to see that reality is not simply something out there so that it could be merely reflected by language in an objective manner, and thus it opens up a new direction for the cultural criticism in general by suggesting the perspective that reality is what is "produced," not reflected, by language.

Levi-Strauss's theory of deep structure, especially his application of binary oppositions into the study of culture has been reapplied by many communication scholars to their research of conventional storytelling format in mass communication (Campbell, 1986, 1991; Ekdom, 1981; Fiske, 1987a, 1987b; Hartley, 1982; Hartley & Montgomery, 1985; Lule, 1987; Silverstone, 1981, 1988; Wright, 1975). Fiske (1987b, p. 132), for example, demonstrates the deep structural pattern of a television drama, Hart to Hart in terms of binary oppositions. Contradictions in Hart to Hart are provided by the oppositions, Good : Evil and Hero : Villain. These oppositions which are abstract generalizations are then transformed metaphorically\(^4\) into concrete representations in the following oppositions: American : Non-American, Middle Class : Lower Class, Attractive : Unattractive, Light(cabin) : Dark(cabin), Softened/individualized (cabin) : Hard/impersonal (cabin), Humorous : Humorless, and Close-up : Extreme Close-up. The consequence of these opposed values are then presented by the Successful : Unsuccessful.

\(^4\) According to Jakobson (1958) and Leach (1976), metaphor and metonymy provide two fundamental means of communication by which the meanings of signs are conveyed. The discussion regarding these means in detail will follow in a later chapter.
opposition, alongside which is another deep structure: Masculine : Feminine, 
Active : Passive, Thinking : Object of look, and Controller : Controlled.

Hartley and Montgomery (1985), for another example, analyzes in 
similar terms four news stories covered one day on the front page of Sunday 
Express of which headlines are (1) CUT PRICE RUSSIANS CASH IN SHIP 
STRIKE, (2) TORIES TO FORCE SPLIT ON LABOUR, (3) NKOMO MAN 
MURDERED IN BOMB BLAST and (4) KIDNAP BOFFIN EXECUTED. First of 
all, they identified four basic homologic formulas in terms of binary 
oppositions, each set of homology for each story: (1) Russians : British :: 
Employers : Unions, (2) Tories : Labour :: Foot : Rodgers, (3) Zimbabwe army : 
Zipra Guerillas :: Faction 1 : Faction 2, and (4) Spain : Basque :: Basque 
Government : Basque separatists (p. 240). Four homologic sets 
correspondingly express four deep structures within individual stories 
Secondly, moving farther beyond identifying four individual homologic sets, 
they attempted to discover some continuing features between and across the 
separate stories at the relational level particularly by examining vocabulary. 
They found that the former notation could be used to express the structural 
homology between the separate stories like in the following: The 
oppositional set, Employers : Unions in the first story relates it to the second 
story as shown in Employers : Unions :: Tories : Labour, or Foot : Rodgers :: 
Zimbabwe army : Zipra guerillas, etc. Reading the whole sets of homologies 
from left to right, the authors were also able to identify one basic, organizing 
homology, that is, Domestic : Foreign :: Peaceful means : Violent means.

In any case, as Fiske (1987b) argues, the contradiction, the gap between 
such clearly opposed categories tends to be unresolvable. In these cases, even
though a hero or heroine with characteristics from both categories is
interposed as a mediator between opposite elements in the narrative, the
conflict itself can never be resolved. The mediumship can only provide an
"imaginative structure" through which only temporal and imaginative
resolution would be met (p. 133). Similarly, Ellis (1982) asserts that the
television series "implies the form of the dilemma rather than that of
resolution and closure," and is "based on the repetition of a problematic" (p.
154). In television news programs, as it follows the same format of the series
dramas, for example, the successful role of anchor person as a mediator often
seems to resolve social conflicts by giving the superficial, compromising
narrative closure. The conflicts of the same kind keep coming day after day,
week after week, however. Hence that the basic nature of narrative closure
tends to be, "formal" and "temporary," as Fiske (1987b) concludes, "the
conflict is always left unresolved and ready to disrupt the fragile equilibrium
once again" (p. 307).

Metaphor and Metonymy

The terms "paradigmatic" and "syntagmatic," introduced with the
theories of structuralism by Saussure and Levi-Strauss in the previous
section, are closely related to the terms, "metaphor" and "metonymy." In a
broad sense, metaphor can be defined as a trope to communicate the
unknown by transposing it into terms of the known (O'Sullivan et al., 1983,
p. 137). Jakobson (1956, 1960) and Leach (1976) are especially important figures
in the discussion of the terms, metaphor/metonymy and its application to
communication studies, since they have broadened the scope of the two
terms. They see metaphor and metonymy as the two fundamental modes of communication technique by means of which particular meanings of signs are conveyed. Following Saussure’s distinction between langue and parole, Jakobson (1956) asserts that "the given utterance (message) is a combination of constituent parts (sentences, words, phonemes, etc.) selected from the repository of all possible constituent parts (the code)" (p. 75). The messages are then constructed by a syntagmatic combination of words and a paradigmatic selection of words from the available inventory; The mode of combinative process is metonymic and the selective one metaphoric.

Put in a formulaic way, according to Leach (1976, chap. 3), a relationship of metaphor exists "when A stands for B" and "there is no intrinsic prior relationship between A and B, that is to say A and B belong to different cultural contexts" (p. 14). In the metaphorical connection between 'New York' and 'The Big Apple', or 'The White House' and 'the president of the United States', for example, the two terms do not belong to the same cultural sphere, but have an arbitrary relationship. The relationship between the two is not natural, but asserted and conventionalized. On the other hand, a relationship of metonymy is where A stands for B, that is, "a part stands for a whole" when "there is an intrinsic prior relationship" between two elements, A and B (p. 14). In this case, the relationship between the two elements is contiguous, rather than asserted. The substitution of 'crown' for the 'monarchy' or 'sovereignty' in the European cultural context, for example, demonstrates a metonymic relationship, as long as the former is a significant attribute of the latter. In short, Leach argues, "Where metonymy implies contiguity, metaphor depends upon asserted similarity" (p. 14); to apply
Saussure's concepts, metaphor in general is characterized as being associative and used within the vertical dimension of language, and metonymy in general, as being syntagmatic, used within the horizontal dimension of language. Leach clarifies this distinction by comparing the structures of language and music. He sees the similarity between the concepts of "paradigmatic association" and "syntagmatic chain" in language and those of "harmony" and "melody" in music, and relates them to the concepts of metaphor and metonymy:

We meet much the same contrast in music when harmony, in which different instruments make simultaneous noises which are heard in combination, is distinguished from melody in which one note follows another to form a tune. (p. 15)

As a consequence, he has come up with the equations, "Symbol/Sign = Metaphor/Metonymy = Paradigmatic association/Syntagmatic chain = Harmony/Melody (p. 15). Why are these two modes of communication important to the study of television culture, then? What do these modes of representation do in the construction of reality in television, and How?

**Television Realism**

As Fiske (1987b, chap. 2) argues, realism can be defined by its form, the way it makes sense of the real, rather than by its content, what it is or what it shows. In this context, O'Sullivan et al. (1983) defines realism as "the use of representational devices (signs, conventions, narrative strategies, and so on) to depict or portray a physical, social or moral universe which is held to exist objectively beyond its representation...." (p. 192). According to this definition, realism has nothing to do with the matter of fidelity to an empirical, external,
objective reality; Instead, it is a matter of the discursive conventions by which we make sense of the world. The reality that we think of is, then, "a product of discourse" (p. 194); that is to say, the 'naturalness' or 'verisimilitude' of realism is not natural at all, but 'conventional', mediated, and thus, recognized by us by cultural means of certain mediating representational devices. For the arbitrary nature of the sign system is a cultural phenomenon, which is naturalized, and by which the identity between signifier and signified is culturally acquired. Put another way, audiences, as Chatman (1978) applies the notion of 'naturalness' or 'verisimilitude' to his study of narrative theory, recognize and interpret conventions through the unaware process of "naturalizing."

To naturalize a narrative convention means not only to understand it, but to "forget" its conventional character, to absorb it into the reading-out process, to incorporate it into one's interpretive net, giving to it no more thought than to the manifestational medium, say the English language or the frame of the proscenium stage. (p. 49)

All this discussion is not meant to deny the existence of empirical reality, but to understand the convention as such by questioning, as (post-)structuralist and semiotic study does, its objectivity, its accessibility, its representability, and, therefore, its naturalness (Fiske, 1987b, pp. 41-42); In other words, it has much to do with 'how' of realism, rather than 'what', as O'Sullivan et al. (1983) argue:

Thus, while realism itself seeks to suppress the act of representation in order to propose its version of truth as the truth, the analysis of realism turns the tables on it by restoring the act of representation to primacy and showing how realism is an effect not of 'life' but of texts. (p. 194)
Turning back to metaphor and metonymy, they are two fundamental
types of realism devices and their existence in the realistic representation of
the real is often neglected and not recognized by us. Once particular
relationships between signifiers and signifieds are constructed and repeated
over a considerable period of time by the tropical devices of metaphor and
metonymy, the unfamiliar becomes familiar, the abstract becomes the
concrete, and thus the arbitrary connections between the signs and the world
reality become taken for granted and naturalized so that a certain version of
reality dominates over the alternative ones. Nietzsche (1968) points out this
powerful aspect of trope in representation as follows:

And what then is truth? A mobile army of metaphors, metonyms
and anthropomorphisms— in short, a sum of human relations which
have been enhanced, transposed, and embellished poetically and
rhetorically, and which after long use seem firm, canonical, and
obligatory to a people: truths are illusions about which one has
forgotten that this is what they are; metaphors which are worn out
and without sensuous power. 5

Generally speaking, it is said that the technique of metaphor, among these
two types of communication, is considered to be more innovative and
productive since it generates new meanings in ways that the technique of
metonymy can not. While metonymy is more concerned with reinforcing
the familiar ways of understanding, metaphor, as a sense-making
mechanism, is more powerful than metonymy in that it generates new
meanings and thus mediates between two different worlds of nature and
culture in particular. By means of metaphor, the unfamiliar is explained in

terms of the familiar and the abstract in terms of the concrete, or vice versa\(^6\).
In his study of musical composition (overture, theme and variation, sonata, symphony, cantata, fugue, and so on) as a metaphor to the structure of myths, Levi-Strauss (1964/1969, 1983) points out the importance of metaphor as mediator between any two opposite realms such as nature and culture:
"metaphors are based on an intuitive sense of the logical relations between one realm and other realms; metaphor reintegrates the first realm with the totality of the others, in spite of the fact that reflective thought struggles to separate them" (p. 339). Television news stories, for example, frequently use cliche metaphors such as 'war', 'sport' or 'drama' for the political stories. These metaphors have become so conventional in America that their metaphorical nature is very often unrecognized, only reinforcing the interests of the powerful. That is to say, it is probable that politics in America could only be considered by people as a conflict between parties, not as a matter of public domain. As demonstrated by Fiske (1987b, pp. 296-301) in his analysis of the Australian news story on an industrial dispute in the State Energy Commission, for example, the issue of politics is reduced to a matter of industrial dispute by means of 'war' metaphor.

Metonymy, like metaphor, is also a characteristic mode of realism (O'Sullivan et al., 1983, p. 139). Like the metaphoric connection between the signifier and the signified so conventionalized and naturalized that the conceptual equivalence between the two elements is rarely questioned, the metonyms are so natural that they tend to be taken for granted by people. A  
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\(^6\) See D. Sperber (1979, pp. 19-51). Contrary to the most writers who use concrete metaphors to express abstract ideas, Levi-Strauss shows his interest in 'abstract for concrete' substitution.
police officer arresting criminals on the street is a taken for granted metonymy of law and order, and in the same manner, a homeless person sleeping on the street equals a disruption of society.

Television realism operates at both dimensions of metaphor and metonymy. In the first order of signification, as Fiske and Hartley (1978, chap. 3) argue, the metonymy is a major mode of realism since the setting of television drama at the level of manifest content usually contributes to the construction of its realism. A shot of a city street crowded with lots of busy cars and people, for example, is predominantly a metonym for the whole city or of 'city-ness'. In the second order of signification, however, in latent content, the metaphoric mode tends to dominate. Here the transposition of elements is paradigmatic, shifting from one cultural sphere to another which is totally different from the former, while the transition in metonymic connection is syntagmatic, moving from reality to representation. The over-portrayal of street crimes or violence of a developing country can be a metaphor for the country's under-civilizedness or under-development. Once again, the constructed nature of a certain version of reality, once created and reinforced in the above manner through the patterned repetition of metaphoric and metonymic use of symbols for a considerable duration, tends not to be questioned and resisted in society.

I have so far examined a half of the narrative structural dichotomy, the content dimension ("story"). The discussion has been about the formulaic aspect of narrative story construction in general and its application to television narrative in particular. Stories, as mentioned already, are not narratives at all unless they are told, however. Now, it is time to turn to the
other half of narrative dichotomy, the expression dimension ("discourse"),
that is, how stories are indeed told.

Discourse

That a story is being told presumes a basic communication process
where the message is transmitted from a certain point to another and where
several participating elements are involved. We can think of two types of
'telling' here, depending on whether the content is directly presented to the
audience or mediated by means of certain agent. Hence the direct mode of
presentation and the mediated one, which respectively correspond to
mimesis and diegesis in Platonic terms, or to more common terms
"showing" and "telling" Chatman (1978, p. 146). In the following section
however, the focus will be on the discussion of the theories of mediated
narrative rather than that of direct presentation. For the present study
presumes that television news narrative is, above all, characterized by its
mediatedness of stories by the presence of narrators, particularly, the anchor
persons and reporters as well as various verbal and non-verbal sign systems
such as screen, camera work, sound, graphic, editing, lighting, etc. I will
discuss the role of human narrators as mediator first, and the other technical
sign systems (with emphasis on semiotics of television in particular) in the
later part of this chapter.

To begin with, considering the predominant functional position
occupied by the anchor and reporter characters in television news
communication, it may be argued in the first place that television is a
narrator's medium. With its realistic visual presentation of events,
television news narrative operates its power with centering around the dominant role of news anchors and reporters who on the whole are the most responsible for controlling the flow of narrative. As Comstock points out, "Television remains the most credible of the media no matter how public opinion is measured. This credibility is distinctly television's own making....And at its heart are two features embodied in television--the visual coverage of events and the display of news personnel."\(^7\) In order to move the discussion to how the power of the anchor as a dominant narrator in television news narrative is related to the story he/she tells, I will begin with introducing the diagram of the process of narration and examining the participants or roles involved in it.

**Narrator as Central Participant**

Any type of narrative assumes as its basic elements a teller, a listener and a story, if it is to be considered as a narrative. If the case is with the literary or visual mode, the situation becomes more complicated because it has to include the role of author, mediator, reader or viewer, etc. As largely accepted by literary narrative theorists, as Chatman's model (1978, p. 151) suggests, six participants are usually involved in the process of narration as in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real - Implied - (Narrator) - (Narratee) - Implied - Real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7\) Cited in M. Morse (1986), p. 55.
As indicated in the diagram above, Chatman immediately leaves two elements, 'real author' and its counterpart, 'real reader' out of the six participants in the process of narrative transaction, however, on the ground that their roles are pragmatically substituted by their functional counterparts, 'implied author' and 'implied reader'. Rimmon-Kenan (1983), in the same vein, also conceives the implied author as "a stable entity" when he argues, "implied authors are often far superior in intelligence and moral standards to the actual men and women who are real author" (p. 87). Moreover, Chatman (Rimmon-Kenan and Toolan also, following Chatman later on) tends to dispense with the implied author as a reconstructed 'principle', comparing it with the role of narrator:

He is "implied," that is, reconstructed by the reader from the narrative. He is not the narrator, but rather the principle that invented the narrator....Unlike the narrator, the implied author can tell us nothing. He, or better, it has no voice, no direct means of communicating. It instructs us silently, through the design of the whole, with all the voices, by all the means it has chosen to let us learn. (1978, p. 148)

Similarly, Rimmon-Kenan refuses the role of implied author to be any "personified 'consciousness' or [Booth's (1961, pp. 70-71)] 'second self' [of the real author]," asserting the following:

The implied author must be seen as a construct inferred [italics added] and assembled by the reader from all the components of the text. Indeed, speaking of the implied author as a construct based on the text seems to me far safer than imagining it as a personified 'consciousness' or 'second self'....My claim is that...the notion of the implied author must be de-personified, and is best considered as a set of implicit norms rather than as a speaker or a voice.... (pp. 87-88)
This theoretical reduction of the diagram, however, is not to dismiss the authors (real and implied) completely from the narration process at all. Instead, as Toolan (1988, p. 78) argues, this is to put aside the functions of both authors temporarily to the dimension of narrative reception, as far as they are 'inferred' authors constructed from the text reading and thus irrelevant to the narrative production dimension.

In the meantime, Chatman argues that while every text has an implied author and a reader, a narrator and a narratee remain optional; that is, in Chatman's words, "just as there may or may not be a narrator, there may or may not be a narratee" (1978, p. 150), and this is why he put the latter in parentheses in the diagram. By this, he suggests that the narration, with the presence of narrator and narratee, proceeds from the implied author to narrator to narratee and finally to the implied reader; on the other hand, with their absence, the narration movement is confined to the implied author and the implied reader (pp. 150-151).

While it differs depending on the literary narrative theorists to prefer or decide which participants should be included or excluded in the narration model, one may easily come up with more complicated diagram when dealing with the television narration in general and its news narrative transaction in particular. For among those who are often involved in the production of television narrative are program creator(s), producer(s) and director(s), one, two or more writers, etc. Furthermore, in the case of news programs, an anchor person as a supervising editor may simultaneously function the roles of real author, implied author, narrator, and listener on the one hand; On the other hand, an audience member at home may function as
a narratee, an implied viewer and a real viewer at the same time. In other words, it is really difficult to draw clear-cut lines among participants in terms of their functions suggested in the literary narrative model because television is basically a collaborative medium. Since the purpose of the present study is a structuralist narrative reading of the television news narrative, the focus of attention in the following will be mostly on the role of the anchor-narrator in its relationship to the story being told, as he/she is assumed to be the central figure in the news narration.

**Point of View and Narration**

The relationship between narrator and story has usually been taken by narrative theorists as an issue of "point of view." Telling a narrative does not operate without specifications of particular time and place, and this spatio-temporal limitation inevitably accompanies with it some perspective or vantage point from which the narrative as a whole is oriented and thus understood. As Rimmon-Kenan (1983), following Genette (1972/1980), calls this aspect of narrative "focalization," which is, "the mediation of some 'prism', 'perspective', 'angle of vision', verbalized by the narrator though not necessarily his" (p. 71). In a similar vein, Toolan (1988) understands focalization as "a viewpoint from which things are seen, felt, understood, assessed," of which the more common term is "point of view" in the Anglo-American context (p. 68). Whatever fits the best in this case, however, all of these terms, as Toolan (1988) argues, do not punctuate the confusion of two distinct aspects of narrative practice:
1. The orientation we infer to be that from which what gets told is told.
2. The individual we judge to be the immediate source and authority for whatever words are used in the telling. (p. 68)

These are two related but different aspects of narrative and have been summarized into two questions, 'Who sees?' (focalizer) and 'Who speaks' (narrator) (Genette, 1972/1980, p. 186; Rimmon-Kenan, 1983, p. 72; Toolan, 1988, p. 69). Roughly speaking, two possible cases can be thought of here: first of all, a person may be able both to see and speak, and even do both things at the same time when seeing and speaking come from the same source; secondly, a narrator may be capable of "undertaking to tell what another person sees or has seen" (Rimmon-Kenan, 1983, p. 72). In the final analysis, as Rimmon-Kenan (1983) summarizes, focalization and narration, in principle, are distinctive activities; however, they can sometimes be combined into one. The distinction between these two tends to collapse when the discussion moves to the context of television news narrative in particular. This fusion between focalization and narration will be discussed in the following with regard to the television news narration. From this point on, for the sake of convenience, I will use two terms, "focalizer" and "point of view" interchangeably insofar as they correspond to the question, "Who sees?"

In the meanwhile, focalization can be categorized roughly into two types depending on whether it is external or internal to the story (Rimmon-Kenan, 1983, pp. 74-77; Toolan, 1988, pp. 69-72). External focalization refers to the case when the point of view comes from outside the story, hardly being associable with that of any character and thus closely related to the narrating agent. On the other hand, internal focalization, as the term suggests, occurs
inside the story, or, perhaps better, "inside the setting of the events" (Toolan, p. 69), thus easily being associated with that of characters. The vehicles for these two types of focalization are therefore called "narrator-focalizer" and "character-focalizer" respectively.

To apply this distinction to the case of television news narration, the anchor person usually operates as an external focalizer, while those people who are introduced within the narrative events are internal focalizers. It is not difficult, however, to find the anchor person often functioning as both agents of the external and the internal focalizers. On the one hand, the news anchor person performs an external focalizer when he/she, as telling the news stories directly to the audience, begins his/her narration with introducing the day's topic and supporting reporter(s), enumerates various related conflicts in detail and orients the whole story towards the direction he/she plans, and, after all, closes the narrative by saying, "Good night, folks," and "I'll see you tomorrow." On the other hand, he/she is, for sure, a character-focalizer when he/she mingles him/herself with ordinary people on the streets and shares experiences with them during the interview, not speaking to us directly and thus rather indulging him/herself as a character inside the story. In principle, the anchor-person as an external focalizer (or narrator-focalizer), as Rimmon-Kenan (1983) argues, "knows everything about the represented world, and when he restricts his knowledge, he does so out of rhetorical considerations;" and accordingly, "the ideology of the narrator-focalizer [the anchor person's perspective] is usually taken as authoritative, and all other ideologies in the text are evaluated from this 'higher' position" (p. 79, 81). From this perspective, as I mentioned
previously, the distinction between focalization and narration (or focalizer and narrator) tends to collapse in the television news narrative; in other words, television news anchor tends to assume the function of an agent simultaneously for orientation and narration of the stories.

On the other hand, the knowledge of the anchor person (or people who are being interviewed in the course of narration) should be restricted when he/she, as an internal focalizer, assumes a role of story character who is directly involved in the narrated events: "being a part of the represented world, he cannot know everything about it" (Rimmon-Kenan, 1983, pp. 79, 81). In short, the anchor-person controls and shapes the narration process as a whole by moving back and forth between outside and inside the story, between the point of view from, in Rimmon-Kenan's (p. 80) words, "'objective' (neutral, uninvolved)" perspective and that from the "'subjective' (coloured, involved)" one.

**Typology of Narrators**

Despite a number of studies regarding the issue of "point of view," how the narrator is related with the story he/she narrates in the narrative production, no wide-ranging consensus has been made as to how to divide and rename the variables under the heading of "point of view." Kozloff (1987), reviewing various narrative theorists, summarizes, in her own way, six of the most important variables that have emerged in the studies of "point of view," that is, of the relationship between narrator and story. For the purposes of the present study, Kozloff's summary provides quite a useful guideline for our understanding of and attitude to the television narration in
general and news narration in particular, as it applies the theory of literary narrative to that of television narrative. Among those variables are the extent of narrator's participation in the story, the narrative level to which the narrator belongs, the degree of distance between the story and the actual narration in terms of time and space, the degree of distance the narrator exhibits in terms of detachment, irony, or self-consciousness, the narrator's reliability, and the degree of his omniscience (p. 61-62). The following discussion shows how these variables can be applied to the study of television news narrative and help enhance the viewer's understanding of the role of narrator in particular. Put in this perspective, those variables would rather be called the characteristics of this and that type of television news narrators, albeit not completely mutually exclusive.

First of all, in defining the narrator's status by its relationship with the story, Kozloff distinguishes between "character narrator" and voiceless "camera-narrator," or in Genette's terms (1972/1980), "homodiegetic" and "heterodiegetic" narrators. The distinctive characteristics of these two types are similar to those of focalizers as discussed in the previous section. According to Genette, the homodiegetic narrator is one who is "present as a character in the story he tells" and the heterodiegetic one who is "absent from the story he tells" (pp. 244-245). Due to its conventionally higher narrational authority in relation to the story it tells, the latter type of narrator is considered more objective than the former one. While the homodiegetic narrator is personally involved in the stories they narrate, the heterodiegetic one tends to observe the events from some "Olympian vantage point" (Kozloff, 1987, p. 60). Television news anchors or reporters often manage to
have both roles of homodiegetic and heterodiegetic narrators, however, just as a collapse happens between the roles of external focalizer (or narrator-focalizer) and internal focalizer (or character-focalizer) for the anchor's/reporter's position in the television news narration. When Dan Rather directly addresses to the viewer in outlining a story for the day, for example, he is seen performing as a heterodiegetic narrator mainly due to his positional quality of authority and objectivity. On the other hand, he performs a homodiegetic one when he personally engages himself, with his own emotions and casual talks, in the interview with ordinary people.

Second, narrator is classified into another pair of types according to his/her narrative level in relation with other story characters. When a major narrator tells a story that has several sub-stories involved in it, some characters in sub-stories may also be narrators albeit of the second degree of narration. Kozloff (1987), applying Genette's distinction, identifies another pair of narrator types, "framing narrators" and "embedded narrators" (p. 61), which correspond to Genette's terms, "extradiegetic" and "intradiegetic" (Genette, 1972/1980, p. 228) respectively, according to the relative subordination level of stories. Generally speaking, Kozloff (1987, p. 61) argues, the framing narrators address the viewer directly and thus appeal to be more objective and powerful than the embedded ones, as the terms themselves suggest. The camera-narrator (heterodiegetic narrator), for example, tends to dominate over the character narrator when a character within a television news stories tells another character a story.

The third variable has to do with the degree of distance between the narration and the events being told in terms of time and space. The
commonsensical way of thinking may tell us that events may be told only after they occur. The distance between the narration and the events, however, varies from text to text; sometimes, we have a kind of predictive narration which precedes the events, and, sometimes, a narration that occurs simultaneously with the events. The latter type of narration, the simultaneous one, seems popular especially in television news footage, in which things are shown as if they were happening right then and now. However, as Toolan (1988) argues, the simultaneity here is "notional rather than real, with an effect of minimizing the story-narration distance" (p. 81) and of establishing the sense of liveness, immediacy and intimacy. In a similar vein, Morse (1986) argues that television news is "live" in the sense that "the time of the act of enunciation as represented in the utterance is equivalent to the time of the utterance or message itself" and thus that in the ultimate sense, "the time of the act of enunciation as it took place in actuality is not as important as the virtual shared time created by the news utterance itself" (pp. 62-63). In other words, by means of creating an imaginary temporal and spatial collapse, television narrators establish the shared illusion of "common universe of experience" (Corcoran, 1987, p. 541) between the viewers and the news personalities. Television's "liveness," "immediacy" or "intimacy" is then a matter of virtual forms of narration, not of the real time and space of the events, and, Feuer (1983) contends, "network television never truly exploits its capacity for instantaneous and unmediated transmission. Only the ideological connotations of live television are exploited" (p. 16).
Fourth, television's realism partly relies on the degree of distance in terms of detachment, irony, or self-consciousness that the narrator presents. This argument is related to how the narrators establish the sense of "neutrality" and "intimacy" for the audience. As Kozloff (1987, p. 61) argues, most camera-narrators including the news anchor persons and reporters, for example, try to maintain the sense of neutrality and self-effacement in their narration so as to make the audience feel as if the stories were being transmitted directly to them, not filtered through the medium. However, as described earlier, they sometimes self-consciously commit themselves to being story characters and mingle with the crowd inside the story, share personal talks and feelings with people, and finally to create a mood of intimacy.

Fifth, the degree of reliability of the narrator is another important factor that confers the authoritative account on the news story. This variable in the case of television news, however, is usually related with the sense of credibility that the position of anchor person creates for the viewer. By means of his/her unique, casual, intimate and comforting style of telling, the anchor person is able to have his/her personal subjective point of view transformed into one which appears to be rather objective, so that the viewer may feel that the anchor is speaking the truth. In her study of the sources of the anchor's credibility building, Morse (1986) uses the term "paracletes" as a metaphoric definition of the news anchors, as she cites Richard Wald (the then vice president of ABC News) saying, "anchorpeople cast in the form of paracletes, messengers of God" (p. 60). The anchor's credibility is then based upon his/her own magical and charismatic power, which comes mostly from
his/her position as an "enunciator" of the news (p. 59, 74). The role of the news anchor as a paraclete and an enunciator of the news is possible, as Morse argues (pp. 60-61), only if he/she successfully recreates "the first order of social reality, the face-to-face situation," which is, in Berger and Luckmann's words (1967), "the prototypical case of social interaction" (p. 28) by which others themselves are experienced. "As long as the face-to-face situation continues," Berger and Luckmann argues, "my and his 'here and now' continuously impinge on each other....In the face-to-face situation the other is fully real....To be sure, another may be real to me without my having encountered him face to face....Indeed, it may be argued that the other in the face-to-face situation is more real to me than I myself" (pp. 28-29). As indicated here then, the direct eye-contact form of television news narration between the anchor/reporter and the viewer is the heart of television news narration's textual strategy. Thus, Hartley and Montgomery argue that "television news operates on a direct first person ('I') to second person ('YOU') axis, in the form of the newsreader's relation to the viewer" (1985, p. 245). In short, as Morse (1986) argues, the impression of presence of the anchor person is created, not by his/her actual physical presence, but through the construction of a shared realm of time and space where the speaking subject appears speaking for himself/herself, sincerely even in the absence of his/her own body (p. 62).

Finally, one might need to think about the degree of the narrator's omniscience, which always tends to be go along with the degree of credibility. Generally speaking, most television news anchors have a large degree of omniscience when they appear to know everything, displaying knowledge about the past, the present and the future. Rimmon-Kenan (1983) states, "It is
precisely their being absent from the story and their higher narratorial authority in relation to it that confers on such narrators the quality which has often been called 'omniscience'" (p. 95). As a heterodiegetic, camera- and a homodiegetic character-narrator, the anchor person moves back and forth in time and space. He/she outlines the story as a whole, already knowing the importance of the stories, the solution to the conflicts and the direction for the better future regarding the topic, as he/she detaches him/herself from the story being narrated and puts him/herself into the position of God. On the other hand, he/she sometimes penetrates into characters' hearts and minds, shares feelings with them by participating in the story and thus revealing his/her private 'self'.

In brief, Kozloff (1987) concludes that "identical story events can seem radically different depending upon the narrator's point of view and on the degree of his or her power, remoteness, objectivity, or reliability" (p. 62). The point of view study therefore attempts to obtain knowledge and understanding of the relationship between the narrator and the story he/she narrates by exploring the characteristics of narrator, that is, whether he/she is a story participant or not (homodiegetic or heterodiegetic), whether he/she is framing or embedded (extradiegetic or intradiegetic), how and to what degree he/she keeps him/herself distanced consciously or ironically from the story being told in terms of time and space, and how much he/she is reliable, credible and omniscient.

So far, the discussion has been about the structuralist narrative theories and their applicability into the study of television news narrative. In other words, the theories of the narrative's underlying principles and rules in their
relation to the text in general have been dealt with. Therefore, the nature of
discussion seems to have been limited so far to the verbal mode of narrative.
As the present study concerns the visual-aural mode of communication, not
the literary works or the aural-oriented radio communication, it is required to
look into the nature of visual signs as well as the aural. For a proper
understanding of television narrative can only be achieved by examining
both structures and sign systems insofar as the latter are deeply involved in
maintaining the structural quality of television narrative.

The television narrative consists of a multiple layer of visual signs as
well as aural entangled together in a complex way, all of which eventually
contribute to the construction of a particular version of reality. Therefore, in
order to reach a fair understanding of television narrative, we also need to
study its unique signifying system of signs. In this context, it is necessary to
look into the theory of semiotics in general and that of the visual
presentation in particular. After all, my study will be based both on
structuralist narrative theories and semiotics, while emphasizing the
former's terms and basic tenets.

Semiotics of the Visual

O'Sullivan et al. (1983) argue that "semiotics isn't so much an academic
discipline as a theoretical approach and its associated methods of analysis" (p.
210). It may be argued that if the structuralist narrative theory provides a
broad theoretical guideline above all, the theory of semiotics gives us a
practical guideline for analysis of the media on more or less micro level.
However, there is no clear-cut division between these two camps, since both
theories have derived from the same (structural) linguistic theories (mostly Saussure's) and thus share the same basic assumption regarding the nature of represented reality. It can be then argued that they share the same coin, while representing one and the other side of it respectively. From this perspective, Culler (1975) points out the inseparableness of these two theories by arguing that "...in studying signs one must investigate the system of relations that enables meaning to be produced and, reciprocally, one can only determine what are the pertinent relations among items by considering them as signs" (p. 4).

According to definition by O'Sullivan et al. (1983), semiotics is "the study of the social production of meaning from sign systems." While the major concern of semiotics is to study "signs," its particular interest is not in "what" their meanings are, but rather in their organizing "system," that is, "how" they are structurally related so as to create meanings. Therefore, as Fiske (1990) summarizes, the areas of study in semiotics include the sign itself, the codes or systems into which signs are organized, and the culture within which these codes and signs operate (p. 40). What is "sign" then? Eco (1976) defines as a sign "everything that, on the grounds of a previously established social convention, can be taken as something standing for something else" (p. 16). Put another way, as O'Sullivan et al. (1983) describes, it has three distinctive features including: "it must have a physical form, it must refer to something other than itself, and it must be used and recognized by people as a sign" (p. 214).

As implied in many works (Fiske, 1990; O'Sullivan et al., 1983; Seiter, 1987; Silverman, 1983), the most influential figures for the later
development of semiotics are Ferdinand de Saussure and Charles S. Peirce. As previously mentioned in earlier section of this chapter, one of Saussure's major contributions to the development of structuralism and semiotics later on has been his findings that "sign" consists of two distinct constituent elements within it, that is, "signifier" and "signified," and that the relationship between these two components is arbitrary and conventional, rather than natural. "Signifier" refers to the material dimension of language such as sound and written letters, and "signified," as a "signifier's" counterpart, the mental or conceptual dimension of language. These two components always go together so as not to be separated in practice unless we consciously and willingly divide them in analysis. Therefore, a "signifier" cannot exist without its counterpart, a "signified."

Saussure's theory of sign, however, tends to be limited to the level of pure linguistics, and so, Seiter (1987, p. 18) contends that it is difficult to apply to non-verbal sign systems like television's. With regard to television signs, she contends:

The signifier is made up of many different components of the image and the soundtrack. The two dimensional, luminous image is rectangular, with a fixed aspect ratio of 3:4. The focal length of the camera lens, lighting, angle, color, and composition are characteristics of the signifier as well. The signified can be thought of as everything that this television image and soundtrack represent: the newscaster, his voice, speech pattern, dress, hair-style, make-up, as well as the meanings of any words that may appear on the screen, such as weather forecast. (p. 19)

It is not until the 1960s that the semiotic study of "sign" has been expanded into studies of such visual modes of communication as visual phenomena in mass communication, advertisements, comic strips, clothes,
film, etc. by such semioticians as Eco, Barthes and Metz (Eco, 1976, pp. 11-12). The most influential figure on this expansion of semiotics into the visual mode of communication is known to be Peirce (Seiter, 1987; Silverman, 1983, chap. 1), who, in fact, has developed his theory even before Saussure.

Peirce, unlike Saussure, breaks down the sign into three parts, namely, "sign," "interpretant" and "object" as follows:

A sign is something which stands to somebody for something in some respect or capacity. It addresses somebody, that is, creates in the mind of that person an equivalent sign, or perhaps a more developed sign. The sign which it creates I call the interpretant of the first sign. The sign stands for something, its object. (Cited in Fiske, 1990, p. 42)

As suggested in this quotation, of Peirce's three concepts of sign, the last two (the interpretant and the object) in particular, are difficult to identify in a clear way. According to Seiter (1987, p. 19), in Peirce's model, the "sign" roughly corresponds to the "signifier," the "object" to the "signified," and the "interpretant" to the "sign" which is used by the second person to translate the first sign. Silverman (1983) agrees with Seiter in that the "sign" closely corresponds to Saussure's signifier. In regard to the other two, however, her interpretation is more complex, compared with Seiter's. For Silverman, the "interpretant," unlike Seiter's "object," is virtually synonymous with the signified. At the same time, the "interpretant" as the "mental effect" or "thought" (she quotes from Peirce), becomes another sign that produces another "interpretant" subsequently. The "object," for the time being, resembles "reality," which, as Peirce believes, can be truly represented (pp. 15-16). With regard to the semiotic quality of Peirce's "interpretant," both Seiter and Silverman bring in Eco's concept of "unlimited semiosis" (1976, pp. 15-16,
68-69), according to which, as Eco argues by quoting from Peirce, a sign is "anything which determines something else (its interpretant) to refer to an object to which itself refers (its object) in the same way, the interpretant becoming in turn a sign, and so on ad infinitum" (p. 69). Suffice it to say that the type of "interpretant" which is used to interpret the "sign" depends on different social or cultural backgrounds of individuals, and that the "true" representation of objective "reality" seems almost, or really (unlike Peirce's belief) impossible. What is important about Peirce's concept of the "interpretant" is that, as Seiter states:

> It forces the realization that no communication takes place outside of sign systems -- we are always translating signs into other signs. The conventions of the sign system control the ways we are able to make meanings (that is, produce signifiers) and limit the range of meanings available to us (that is, what signifieds we produce). (p. 20)

This point is semiotically significant for the present study of television news narrative on the homeless. Making use of Peirce's concept, we can examine how television's repetitious and consistent visual representations (through its unique sign systems) of the homeless in more or less a fixed pattern lead to a production of stereotypical "interpretant" in the viewer's head. For example, as the viewer is consistently and repetitiously exposed to a typical portrayal of the homeless, say, wearing rags, unwashed, unshaven, digging in the trash cans, endlessly walking on the streets, sleeping in the public places, etc., his/her way of interpretation (that is, "interpretant") might tend to be fixed into a certain shape, putting aside other alternatives. This is also true to the patterned displaying of such signs as camera work (angle,
distance, orientation and movement), lighting, sound, etc., all of which make up of a part of the overall signifying system in television.

In the meantime, Peirce's second triad distinguishes three different categories of signs, namely, "symbols," "icons" and "indices." While a "symbol," as a sign, is connected to its counterpart object, its relation is not based on its essential and indigenous quality. Instead, their connection is entirely arbitrary and based on social agreement, convention, and repeated use. Peirce contends that "A Symbol is a sign which refers to the Object that it denotes by virtue of a law, usually an association of general ideas [emphasis added], which operates to cause the Symbol to be interpreted as referring to that Object...." (Silverman, 1983, p. 20). Natural language is a typical example of this, since, as we have already discussed along with Saussure's concept of sign, the relationship between the signifier and the signified in practice is arbitrary. Television's language, however, differs from "words" in traditional linguistic sense, since it operates within its unique symbolic sign systems. So, we can have such symbolic visual examples as a red traffic light for "stop," roses for love, a flag for nation, an ambulance for accident, a rainbow for hope, darkness for evil, etc. Seiter (1987, pp. 20-21) points out that the symbolic signs are often so "emotionally" attached to their signifieds that their conventional relationship is hardly recognized in practice. Therefore, television's incorporation of many symbolic signs into its images is semiotically significant, since it leads the viewer to have signs that again stand for their corresponding signs. In this regard, as she says, "Some aspects of the image that we think of as nonrepresentational function as symbolic signs as well, such as colors (pink for femaleness, white for goodness); music
(minor chords and slow tempos to signify melancholy, solo instrumentals to signify loneliness); photographic technique (soft focus to signify romance, hand-held camera to signify on-the-spot documentary)" (p. 21).

On the other hand, the "icon" signs structurally resemble their objects. The most apparent example of icon is found in visual signs, a map, a photographic image of a horse, a drawing of a cat, etc. The proper use of these signs is, like that of the symbolic signs, also based on conventions. Because of this quality of conventionality, we are not easily aware of the fact that we are identifying the artificial iconic signs with actual objects particularly in visual practices such as film and television. Even for the distorted shape of objects due to camera's angle, distance, or color, we tend not to have any problems in identifying their images, since they have been naturalized through repetitious conventional practices.

Peirce's third type of sign is called the "indexical" sign, which has a direct existential connection to its objects, "smoke" to "fire," for example. The indexical signs are different from the iconic signs because the former rely on material connections between the signifier and the signified. As both Seiter (p. 22) and Silverman (p. 22) point out, most cinematic images belong to this category because the production of these images requires the physical presence of objects before the camera lens in a given time and place. For the time being, the signifiers of cinematic images (a photographic image of a horse, for example) are so closely connected with their signifieds, for example, that it would be redundant to try to distinguish one from the other.

On the whole, distinctions among these signs are not so clear that one image can be considered as simultaneously holding characteristics of two or
three types of signs (Seiter, p.23; Silverman, pp. 22-23). This is often the case for television as it constantly uses three types of signs at the same time. To illustrate, indexical signifiers are often produced by camera movement as the viewer's attention is instantly shifted from one thing to another. Lighting and editing produce indexical signs since they force the viewer's attention to things which are indexically selected by technicians for a certain purpose. Sound-effect also creates a certain symbolic image in its relation to the story. When all of these are put together in a shot, it may be superfluous to attempt to categorize it into any single type of sign. With regard to such roles as semiotics in television criticism, Seiter (1987) argues that "Semiotics reminds us that the signifiers produced by TV are related to the signifieds by convention, even if, when we watch something like the news [emphasis added], we tend not to think of the active production of signs involved in TV, but receive the news as pure information, pure signified" (p. 23).

In the meantime, the selection and combination of these signs in adequate time and space both at the minimal level (maybe each "shot") and at its higher levels ("sub-sequences," "sequences" or "narrative" as a whole) in television production are not the result of random or coincidental happenings. These signs are paradigmatically selected and syntagmatically arranged within a certain overall scheme of the production. Otherwise, these signs only remain fragmentary, isolated particles on screen, producing no significant meanings for the overall scheme. The theoretical application of these paradigmatic and syntagmatic organization of signs to film studies has been done a great deal by film critic, C. Metz (1974, chap. 2).
Above all, it should be noted that Metz's approach to film studies is more syntagmatic than paradigmatic, while he, like typical structuralist linguistic theorists, agrees with the existence of both categories of paradigms and syntagms in film. By comparing the structure of film with that of "language," he contends the following:

The image paradigm is fragile in film; often still-born, it is approximate, easily modified, and it can always be circumvented.... The word, which is the unit of language, is missing; the sentence, which is the unit of speech, is supreme. The cinema can speak only in neologisms. Every image is a hapax. I would be fruitless to search among images for true associative series or strict semantic fields." (p. 68-69)

The major rationale for this claim is that a paradigmatic category in film virtually contains limitless number of "commutable" signifying units which are instantly being changed at every minimal moment. In other words, no single moment can be easily grasped in film, in which we can distinguish a certain paradigmatic unit in a firm, concrete way, since, as he argues, for example, "the exact nature of lighting can be varied infinitely and by quantities that are non-discrete; the same applies to the axial distance between the subject and the camera..., to the camera angle, to the properties of the film and the focal length of the lens, and to the exact trajectory of the camera movements" (p. 100). Therefore, he continues, "Although each image is a free creation, the arrangement of these images into an intelligible sequence--cutting and montage--brings us to the heart of the semiological dimension of film" (p. 101). In short, by pointing out the quality of limitless instant variations of semiotic elements at every possible moment, he stresses the syntagmatic development of images as the focal point in semiotic film
studies. His stress on the dominant nature of syntagmatic dimension in film
semiotics also can be applied to television studies because of their similarity
in the use of same semiotic visual signifying elements such as camera angle,
distance and movement, lighting, editing, etc.

For Metz, in the meanwhile, there is no smallest unit which can be
clearly discerned in the film study. This is why he defines "shot" as "the
largest minimum segment" as a film or a part of a film requires at least one
shot. So, he contends, "If the shot is not the smallest unit of filmic
signification (for a single shot may convey several informational elements), it
is at least the smallest unit of the filmic chain" (p. 106).

Most of all, he explains a great deal about the importance of cinematic
editing (what is called, "optimal devices") primarily in its syntagmatic
relation with the total flow of narrative, as follows:

One can not conclude...that every minimum filmic segment is a shot.
Besides shots, there are other minimum segments, optical devices--
various dissolves, wipes, and so on--that can be defined as visual but
not photographic elements. Whereas images have the objects of reality
as referents, optical procedures, which do not represent anything, have
images as referents. The relationship of these procedures...have two
main functions: as "trick" devices...or as "punctuation" .... (p. 106)

As he stresses the syntagmatic use of the optical devices in his semiotic
analysis of film, while acknowledging the use of them as paradigmatic units,
he concludes that "More than paradigmatic studies, it is the syntagmatic
considerations that are the center of the problems of filmic denotation" (p.
101).

Consequently, on focusing his attention on the syntagmatic chain of
images for film study, Metz comes up with, what he calls, "the large
syntagmatic category of the image track" in which he distinguishes eight types of "autonomous segments" operating within films. A unit of, what he calls, "autonomous shot" provides an example of such segment, which, as its naming suggests, can be considered as a "sequence" since it alone "presents an 'episode' of the plot" and thus "constitutes a primary, and not a secondary, sub-division of the film" (p. 124). The first shot of every sample for the present study of television news narrative, for example, can be categorized into Metz's "autonomous shot" sequence, since it alone makes up one independent complete "sequence."

However, if his eight "autonomous segments" are considered in terms of their functions for the overall flow of film narration, it can be argued that they also fall into a paradigmatic category. For the selection and arrangement of these eight independent segments (sequences) can vary depending on different purposes of films or styles of film makers. Therefore, Heath (1973) is correct to point out that Metz's macro syntagmatic schema "is the establishment of a paradigm of units of film at the level of narrative construction" (p. 116). He also argues that "As the interdependence of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations in linguistics suggests, a cinesemiotics defining its object in terms of a syntagmatic cannot but constitute a paradigmatic. Cinema is thus found to have at least a certain paradigmatic richness" (p. 117). After all, there seems to be a symbiotic relationship between paradigmatic selection of units and their syntagmatic arrangement. Thus, formation of any meaningful signifying system requires one to put

---

8. For a full description regarding Metz's syntagmatic categories, see Metz (1974, chap. 2).
fragmentary semiotic elements together into a play-space, by means of which one could create and control semiotically signifying interactions between sets of paradigmatic and syntagmatic rules and thus construct a complete meaning system.
CHAPTER IV
METHODOLOGY

Methodological Considerations

In the last chapter, the discussion, on the one hand, was about the structuralist narrative theories and their possibility of application into the study of television news narrative. On the other hand, it also dealt with semiotics of the visual to understand how sign systems of television contribute to the construction of realistic narrative. Based on the previous discussions, the following section deals with how all these theoretical suggestions are made use of for the present study in terms of their relations to this study's methodological framework. The present chapter also discusses the research procedures, how the sample news stories have been selected and analyzed for the particular purpose of the present study. Above all, I acknowledge that the present study is substantially in debt to three groups of theories, which are largely classified as: the theories of Levi-Strauss, Propp and Todorov for the "story" dimension of news narrative on the one hand; and those of Chatman, Rimmon-Kenan, Toolan, and Genette for the "discourse" dimension on the other; and those of Peirce, Metz and Seiter for semiotics of the visual.

To begin with, I would like to introduce another pair of terms, "textual" and "cultural" dimensions of narrative, which may correspond to
terms of story and discourse respectively. I also acknowledge that these terms have been adapted from Hartley and Montgomery's study (1985) and are consistently used, along with "story" and "discourse," for representing two perspectives in the present study.

The study of television narrative can be approached from two dimensions of signification: story (textual) and discourse (cultural). Television narrative, as Hartley and Montgomery argue, "renders the world of objects, persons, events and processes on the one hand, and the way in which that same utterance [narrative] sets itself into relation with a recipient (reader, viewer or hearer) on the other" (p. 233). Put in a broad way, "wider cultural processes are not merely invoked within textual features," but rather by that "textual features play an active, political role in cultural relations of power" (p. 260). Similarly, Fiske (1987b) identifies three levels of narrative codes: "technical," "conventional representational" and "ideological" codes, while defining a code as "a rule-governed system of signs, whose rules and conventions are shared amongst members of a culture, and which is used to generate and circulate meanings in and for that culture" (p. 4-5). Fiske's technical codes, that is, appearance, dress, make-up, environment, behavior, gesture, etc., corresponding to those elements that have to do with story events, characters and setting, are concerned with the textual (story) dimension of narrative and thus serve as the components of reality construction. On the other hand, his conventional representational codes, that is, camera, lighting, editing, music, sound, etc., along with the ideological codes such as individualism, patriarchy, race, class, capitalism, etc., largely
correspond to cultural (discourse) dimension and thus concern the point of view of the narrative which is usually implied in the course of narration.

**Story Dimension**

The analysis of news in its story dimension in this study consists of two aspects as it deals with the deep and surface structures: a paradigmatic and a syntagmatic analysis respectively.

**A Paradigmatic Analysis**

In order to study how reality is constructed by means of narrative, it is first needed to identify the types of events, characters and settings. This typological study of actors and environments reveals the deep structure of narrative. For this study, Levi-Strauss's concept of "binary oppositions" provides a useful tool for analysis. Television news stories, like Levi-Strauss's myths as discussed earlier, are constructed in terms of paradigmatic binary oppositions. The social types of characters, for example, can be represented in such conceptually oppositional terms as We : They, Good : Evil, Hero : Villain, Helper : Victim, Normal : Abnormal, Honesty : Deception, etc.; the settings, in terms of Nature : Culture, Home : Street, Home : Foreign, etc. In television narrative, like myth, pairs of binary oppositions are metaphorically transformed into other pairs, usually moving from the abstract level to the concrete. An abstract pair of Good : Evil, for example, then may be transformed into a concrete pair of Rich : Poor, or of Homeowner : Homeless. Most of the time, the anchor or reporter as "framing narrator" mediates between two "polar" states by retaining the
"duality" character which is "ambiguous and equivocal" (Levi-Strauss, 1964/1969, p. 226). Some critic (Staff, 1990) calls this kind of "dual roles" of contemporary journalists "advocacy journalism" by arguing that "Journalists adopt when they see a need for social reform, abandoning balanced coverage of all sides of the issue. This sort of advocacy heightens the tension that can arise between journalists' dual roles as champions of the underdog and disinterested observers of the world around them" (p. 2). In this structuralist approach, then, it is said that characters, like other story-building elements, are seen not as autonomous individual beings but as discursive textual devices culturally constructed from discourse (Fiske, 1987b, p. 153). The search for these binary oppositions helps us understand how the social types (class, values, status, etc.) of participants (actors) are constructed through their manifested representations by the sign systems.

For the first step of my research on the story dimension, then, the identical homologic sets of binary oppositions in Levi-Strauss's sense are abstracted, which are considered to be the deep structural moving force that partially serves a organizing principle for the sample narratives as a whole. In the first place, the primary pairs of binary oppositions at the highest level are abstracted from the news stories, and the subsequent follow-up binary oppositions are identified. The latter supplementary oppositions are metaphorically transformed usually from those at the abstract level to those at the more concrete level, albeit the other way around is sometimes possible, as previously discussed. The identified binary oppositions are then supposed to reveal what conflicts are really going on in the samples news narratives at
their deep cultural level insofar as they are considered to represent the culturally embedded social values or ideological trends.

On doing the first step of analysis for all the sampled news stories, the study also discusses if there are any recurring, enduring structural patterns in them, or if there have been any changes through the sample period (1985-1991). This process attempts to reveal if any social values are so enduring that they have been consistently recurring as the dominant ideological framework in the news making practice, or if the society has been going through any changes in its cultural values during the period.

A Syntagmatic Analysis

The next step concerns the syntagmatic analysis of news stories by means of Propp and Todorov's theoretical schemes. As Propp and Todorov's theories suggest, this part of the study examines how conflicts involved in the news stories are managed in the syntagmatic process of narrative. As discussed earlier, the partial conclusions of Propp and Todorov's studies indicate that any narrative has its own plot that allows the story as a whole to move on from a certain state of equilibrium (beginning) to another state of equilibrium (closing) no matter if the latter is to confirm the former or is to arrive at a state of equilibrium which is different from the former. Between these two equilibriums are always contradictions (conflicts or disruptions) involved in, and these are then usually resolved by certain mediator(s) or helper(s). The resolutions of the conflicts are not real, virtual ones, however, but rather, they tend to be temporary and theoretical. To use a metaphor, a
news narrative dealing with a serious topic develops like a rocket in the beginning, but comes down like a stick in the end.

This is mostly the case with television news narrative. As many scholars (Fiske, 1987b; Tuchman, 1978; Hall, 1981; Gitlin, 1986) indicate in their research, one of the techniques commonly used for this practice is so called "personalization" of the serious and hard issues. This is the mode of transformation by which, for example, the reporter isolates the person involved in a socially and politically significant issue under consideration from his/her relevant social and institutional context and thus attributes the source of social conflicts to the personal motivation. In other words, by means of this, Fiske (1987b) argues, "Social and political issues...can be embodied in an individual, and thus social conflict of interest is personalized into conflict between individuals. The effect of this is that the social origins of events are lost, and individual motivation is assumed to be the origin of all action" (p. 294).

In this respect, the present study compares the states of the opening and closing equilibriums for every news stories in the sample to see if there is any consistent form of news narrative in the process of syntagmatization; if not, what kinds of syntagmatic rules are practiced most often, and how these rules are associated with the society's cultural values or ideologies. In approaching this issue of the study, Levi-Strauss’s theory of binary opposition also performs as a major research tool since his theory of metaphorical transformation between binary oppositions is useful in determining underlying orientation of a story. According to my personal experience, for example, the opening of any particular news story very often introduces the
day's topic in more or less abstract wordings, but the anchor concludes the story in somewhat different way. After all, then, the issue tends to be "disappearing," only leaving fragmentary events behind, or the degree of importance of the issue in the beginning ends up being diminished. In examining this phenomenon of, as I call, "disappearing issue" or diminishing importance, the notion of binary opposition provides a useful tool. For the opening and closing states of equilibrium can be compared by examining the (homologic) transformation(s) of pairs of binary oppositions. To reiterate, this part of the investigation, that is, the examination of the syntagmatic principles embedded in television news making practice draws the primary interest for the present study. Therefore, through the extended analysis of some samples, this study attempts to show in detail how syntagmatic rules in cooperation with paradigmatic principles contribute to leading and controlling the overall flow of the narrative. Accordingly, this part of the analysis makes up the major body of the findings.

**Discourse Dimension**

In the study of "discourse" dimension of news narrative too, however, the study's major concern is still the same as in the case of "story (textual)" dimension, that is, how the deep and surface levels of news narrative structure are practiced in terms of distinctive binary oppositions. This time, however, the study concerns the relationship between the major (framing) narrators as well as (embedded) story characters and the story being told in general, and how the framing narrators (the anchors and reporters) are presented in their unique relation to the whole story in terms of narrative
orientation or point of view in particular. As pointed out earlier, the credibility of television news narrative mostly depends on its two features embodied in narration, the visual representation of the story events and the display of news personnel. The study of discourse dimension then examines the relationship between the visual/aural expression and the "orientation" or "point of view" of the narrative as a whole; that is, how camera work, editing, lighting, music, sound, etc. are related with the overall point of view, and so on.

The visual presentation which mostly consists of news-camera work in particular seems to function as a determining role in embodying a point of view in the television news narration. Although television's "institutional" relations require the news events to be narrated without adopting the point of view of any party or person, as Hartley and Montgomery (1985) argue, the news narration cannot escape the self-embedded effect of the visual codes of television narrative. Due to these unavoidable restrictions resulting from its "formal" relations, "All shots have a point of view, whether it is internally motivated by the placing of a character, or externally motivated by the positioning of the imaginary observer (viewer)" (p. 246). The proper understanding of the visual then, as pointed out in the section of semiotics of the visual in Chapter 2, requires studying how various signs as a total signifying system work in the narrative. To accomplish this task, it is required in the first place to examine some basic structural coding systems such as camera distance, angle and orientation to characters, sound and editing in their relations to the visual presentation of the characters. It is assumed, however, that the overall statistics regarding these semiotic
elements can only give us a general view about how they contribute to constructing a particular version of reality. In other words, the quantitative data alone does not explain in detail how various semiotic elements are selected and chained together in constructing the specific meaning of the narrative. In order to examine this semiotic operation of meaning systems in detail, the present study attempts to show the ideological narrative process on the dimension of discourse in the section of extended analysis. For the time being, it should be acknowledged that the observational visual categories and their definitions (see Appendix C) have been drawn from previous theories and research works in the area of television news analysis (Bentele, 1985; Hartley & Montgomery, 1985; Kervin, 1985; Tuchman, 1978) and from information which is already available in the existing television production handbooks (primarily from Zettl, 1984).

Method: A Procedure of Analysis

It should be acknowledged first of all that in order to reconstruct the structural description of the television news narrative, the present study has been motivated by technical devices developed in the disciplines of literature studies, linguistics, and general semiotics. Viewed in its relation to the purpose of the present study, the use of the above disciplines is to explore the formal rules of television news narration, which are always addressed in sign systems and by which the story events are rendered meaningful and understandable.
Sampling

The present study deals with television evening news coverage of the homeless people in America during the period from 1985 to 1991. It was the early 1980s when the mainstream American journalism first used the term "homeless" in their indexes. The New York Times Index first indexed 5 articles under the heading of homeless during 1981 and 1982 and as a research shows (Campbell & Reeves, 1989), 61 and 99 articles in each 1981 and 1982 were dealt with under "vagrancy." Thereafter, the number of stories under homeless has dramatically increased, reaching up to 82 in 1983, 159 in 1984, and 235 in 1985. According to my research of the index of television evening news (Television News Index and Abstracts) published by Vanderbilt University since 1968, the heading of "homeless" was first used in 1982 and during that year, 5 newscasts regarding homeless were found, 4 under homeless and 1 under "street people." The number of news stories thereafter, like in The New York Times, also increased, albeit not largely, by 10 in 1983, 18 in 1984, 23 in 1985, and 57 in 1986; Since 1986, the number of stories has not shown any dramatic change up until 1991, moving up and down and marking the average of 50 stories during 6 years.

During the period of 1982-1991, a total of 358 homeless news stories (NBC, 118; ABC, 116; CBS, 124) were identified. Since it appeared that the whole 358 news stories would be impossible to watch repeatedly for the present study, a certain amount of stories had to be sampled for the study. Finally, I came up with a decision that would allow me to focus on, as it may be called, "mini news-magazine" segments in the evening network news programs; Among these mini news-magazine segments are NBC's "Special
Segment," "Weekend Journal," "Assignment America," "Focus" and "What Works," ABC's "Special Assignment" and "American Agenda," and CBS's "Inside Sunday," "The Best of Us" and "Eye On America." Following Gans's (1979, pp. 161, 165) comment that all these segments are close to the newsmagazine format and thus each story covered usually includes a lead, a narrative, and a closer, it is not surprising to call them "mini newsmagazine" segments. All such series are more or less copies of the "Segment 3" feature NBC had first introduced in its evening program in 1977 (Bliss, Jr., 1991, pp. 316, 500n45; Gans, 1979, p. 165). They commonly deal with currently controversial topics as well as the traditional tell-stories such as stories about working parents and frauds committed against the elderly or about investigative reporting moral disorder, etc. They report a single topic in more depth, lasting for about between 3 and 8 minutes, than other customary stories on the evening news which last about half a minute to 5 minutes.

In consequence, the sample size ended up with 51 stories which relate to the issue of homelessness one way or another. 29 stories among these had to be excluded again, however, since their relations to the issue, "homeless," are too minimal to be considered as samples for the present study. ABC's story of Pope John Paul II's visit to U.S. covered in "Special Assignment" segment on September 9, 1987, for example, dealt mostly with such political issues related to his visit as American Catholic's diminishing support for Vatican, Pontiff's perception of U.S., precautions about the possibility of his assassination, etc. In spite of the segment's comment on the impact of Pope's stay on shelter for the homeless, it was so minimal and short that the whole segment of 6 minutes and 40 seconds had to be taken out of the final sample.
For another example, NBC, in its "Assignment America" segment of May 19, 1989 evening news, covered a story of "Outward Bound" of New York City, a social program which allows the inner-city children and corporation executives to face survival challenges and thus build confidence. Even though this segment described, as a part of the story, how the program participants lived like the homeless people, it was not considered worthy enough to be selected for the sample. In other words, if any story was not directly related, that is, not dealing with the issue of homelessness as the primary topic of the segment, it was excluded.

After the careful reading of all the abstracts of those initially sampled 51 stories in the *Television News Index and Abstracts*, a total of 25 stories in 22 segments (NBC, 8; ABC, 15; CBS, 2) covered during the period of 1985-1991 were selected for the final samples for analysis. Among the sample stories were: ABC's 6 episodes in the segment title of "Special Assignment" and 9 in "American Agenda": NBC's 5 in "Special Segment," 1 in "Focus" and 2 in "Daily Difference: What Works"; CBS's 2 in "Eye On America." The total length of the sample is 106 minutes and 36 seconds: NBC, 36 minutes and 2 seconds (72%); ABC, 59 minutes and 7 seconds (55%); CBS, 9 minutes and 27 seconds (9%). The basic information about the final sample segments is in the following section.
## Sampled News Segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Headline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/23/91</td>
<td>C (CBS)</td>
<td>5:49:50-5:54:20</td>
<td>Eye On America (Economy: Middle Class &amp; The Homeless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/07/91</td>
<td>A (ABC)</td>
<td>5:53:30-5:58:00</td>
<td>American Agenda (Homeless Veterans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/03/91</td>
<td>N (NBC)</td>
<td>5:44:30-5:48:20</td>
<td>Daily Difference: What Works (Homeless Housing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/16/91</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5:42:30-5:46:00</td>
<td>Daily Difference: What Works (Housing: Cottages For The Homeless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/04/91</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5:49:00-5:53:30</td>
<td>American Agenda (Economy/Medicine: The Homeless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/07/90</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5:43:10-5:48:30</td>
<td>Focus (Hostility Towards The Homeless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/17/90</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5:47:30-5:52:20</td>
<td>American Agenda (Economy: Homeless Housing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/09/90</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5:49:30-5:53:30</td>
<td>American Agenda (Economy/Family: Homeless Teens In Hollywood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/25/89</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5:49:20-5:53:50</td>
<td>American Agenda (Medicine: Mentally Ill Homeless)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

9. It was found that the actual duration of each episode was different from that can be drawn from the Archive's program time recording. For the minimal unit of duration that Archive used is 10 seconds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/15/89</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5:48:00-5:52:50</td>
<td>American Agenda (Economy: Homeless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/88</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5:49:40-5:54:50</td>
<td>American Agenda (Homeless and Families)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/88</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5:42:00-5:47:20</td>
<td>American Agenda (Homeless AIDS Kids)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/88</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5:48:50-5:53:00</td>
<td>Special Segment (NYC Homeless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/05/87</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5:42:00-5:46:30</td>
<td>Special Assignment (The Homeless) (Part II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/87*</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5:46:00-5:53:50</td>
<td>Special Assignment (The Homeless) (Part I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/86</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5:44:00-5:48:00</td>
<td>Special Assignment (Homeless Families)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/86</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5:50:30-5:58:00</td>
<td>Special Segment (The New Homeless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/20/86</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5:54:00-5:58:10</td>
<td>Special Segment (Young &amp; Homeless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/85</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5:42:40-5:47:40</td>
<td>Special Segment (Homeless &amp; The Mentally Ill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/85</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5:53:50-5:58:10</td>
<td>Special Segment (The Homeless)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

10. Please note that this particular sample episode consists of 4 individual episodes whereas each of the others includes only one. Consequently, the total number of episodes has turned out to be 25 virtual episodes out of 22 segment episodes.
In viewing the sample of 22 "mini news-magazine" segments, two types of viewing sheets (see Appendix B) were utilized in an initial attempt to have an general idea about the nature of the sample. First of all, I identified each segment by (1) broadcasting date, (2) network, (3) length of segment, (4) segment title and episode title (the latter was usually manifested by the visual or verbal presentation; if not so, it was able to be identified as it was implied in the story itself), (5) the anchor(s) and reporter(s). I also identified topic(s), setting(s) and major characters involved in each episode. This procedure helped in providing the initial clue for interpreting the discourse dimension of television news narrative later on. In addition, I summarized the plot for each episode in terms of its chronological structure by identifying the states of equilibriums (opening, body, and closing) by means of abstracting their representative binary oppositions. The number of pairs of oppositions identified for each of the opening, middle, and closing states did not necessarily have to be limited to one; the number of pairs sometimes exceeded one, especially for the body part of the story. This initial information finally led the discussion into the story dimension of television narrative: its paradigmatic and syntagmatic practices and the homologic (metaphoric and metonymic) transformations in the story development.

The analysis then moved on by transcribing all the sampled television news episodes into so called written "protocols." At the first level of protocol, the structural units of story events were broken down into "episodes," "sequences," and "shots." It should be acknowledged here that the following definitions of these units of analysis were modified from the model of Todorov's literary criticism (Cited in Scholes, 1974, pp. 112-113) in cooperation
with Bentele's (1985) and Metz's (1974) works in order to be fitted to the television news analysis. The working definitions of these units are the following:

1. An **Episode** refers to the highest unit of analysis that normally consists of at least one sequence but many sometimes. In television news, an episode usually has the anchor's opening and closing statements. The homeless coverage on a single mini news-magazine segment then normally included at least one episode, but sometimes more than one. ABC's "Special Assignment" segment broadcast on February 4, 1987, for example, consisted of 4 episodes, of which the themes were: (1) Congress action on behalf of homeless; (2) Homeless and mental illness; (3) Federal funding for low income housing; (4) Runaway teenagers.

2. A **Sequence** is a complete system of propositions, a little episode in itself in literature. In television news, a sequence then is defined as a single thematic presentation which contains a story structure by itself. So, it is a correlated succession of shots. A sequence may consist of one shot in the extreme case: Following Metz's suggestion (see Chapter 2), the opening shot of each sample episode was identified as "an" independent sequence.

3. A **shot** is a basic narrative sentence, and is structurally equivalent to a sentence or independent clause in literature. In the present study of television news, a shot was a minimal unit of analysis and normally referred to a single cut of action or movement which itself did not have any thematic structure.

In the meantime, it was necessary to make the transcripts of all of the verbal parts for the samples, which included what was said by the
anchors/reporters and the other characters involved in the stories. As I agree with Bentele (1985) in that it is impossible to transpose all of the information as such contained both in the verbal and visual narrations into a written form, however, the transcripts has turned out to be little more than a text. Therefore, as suggested by Bentele (1985, p. 171), the transcript included neither the "paralinguistic" features such as intonation and other suprasegmental elements, nor such performance features as pauses, gestures, facial expressions and body motions. These character features will be dealt with in discussion form in an extended analysis section later on, however. Combining the samples of Bentele (1985), Hartley and Montgomery (1985) and Kervin (1985) with a slight modification, the protocol at the secondary level consisted of the following: (1) editing techniques, visual aids, and other related features; (3) cinematographic properties such as camera distance, camera movement, and camera angle; (4) description of scene, sound, movement, names, etc.; (5) the entire spoken text. As mentioned before, the working definitions of the terms used are provided in Appendix C.

On the basis of the initial survey results, this study finally provided an extended analysis of three selected samples to locate, in detail, the shaping (structuring) and containing (structured) binary oppositions that served as the fundamental basis for constructing the whole news stories. Specifically, along with interpreting the metaphoric and metonymic transformations of the binary oppositions mostly on the paradigmatic dimension, the study explored the symbolic patterns of syntagmatic narrative process by which the social problems (homelessness in this case) were identified and culturally resolved. The present study, after all, has attempted to see how the process of television
news narrative as a socio-cultural practice constructed our reality, the world of homelessness in particular. For a concluding remark for the present chapter, I confess that I had to move back and forth among the sample segments an uncountable number of times to reexamine and confirm the initial findings before getting into an extended analysis.
CHAPTER V
DISAPPEARING ISSUE: TWO STRUCTURAL DIMENSIONS
OF TELEVISION NEWS NARRATIVE:

In concluding an episode, "The New Homeless In America" (12/05/86), Tom Brokaw, one of our contemporary prominent news anchors, told us that "...it [the homeless families] is not a seasonal phenomenon. It won't go away in the spring or the summer of 1987. This is a fixed pattern now." This statement sounds very ironical any way if it is put in the context of my findings from the study. For the time being, the major concern of this study was to see if there was any consistent, structural pattern in the practice of television news narrative across the sample stories. On the whole, it was found that, with few variations, all samples followed a "fixed pattern," without which the stories would hardly have made sense of "the homeless." To state one more interesting point which relates to this "fixed pattern," of the total of 25 sample episodes, more than 70% (18) were broadcast during the winter season (November through February). In addition, the initial sample for the present study before its size was reduced to a manageable one, showed that the number of homeless stories covered during the three month period alone (November through January) reached almost 50% (174 out of 358) of the total. The point is that while Tom Brokaw is right to say that the homeless phenomenon is "not" a "seasonal," but "fixed" pattern, it is also right to argue
that the television news's telling of "the homeless" stories is a "seasonal" phenomenon with a "fixed" pattern now.

In a broad way, the whole discussion of this chapter will be about: "What is that "fixed" pattern, then?" and "How does it work to organize narrative structure and make sense of the homeless?" for the present sample episodes in particular. The following discussion, on the basis of basic statistical findings, begins with describing basic characteristics of the sample as a whole for a background knowledge about the "discourse" (cultural) mode of signification. It will then move to a brief discussion of narrative "pattern" which has been found in relation to the "story" (textual) mode of signification which, of course, includes in them both paradigmatic and syntagmatic structural considerations. Finally, through an extended analysis of the structural "pattern," the chapter will examine how all of these cultural and textual modes of semiotic elements as a whole help structuring the story and thus constructing "a" reality of the homeless.

Outline: "Discourse" Dimension

First of all, out of 22 "mini news-magazine" segments aired during the period between 1985 and 1991, 25 episodes were identified. These 25 episodes then consisted of 15 by ABC, 8 by NBC and 2 by CBS. While only 2 CBS's episodes were sampled for the present study, this does not necessarily mean that CBS has been negligent in reporting the "homeless" stories. For, in the initial sample prior to its reduction to its manageable size for the present study, it was found that each of three networks aired an almost even amount of "homeless" news items: 116 by ABC, 118 by NBC and 124 by CBS for the
total of 358. Returning to our sample, while the basic nature of all episodes as "mini news-magazine" stories has been maintained, some changes have been made during the sample period in terms of their segment titles. ABC aired 6 episodes in the title of "Special Assignment" during the period between 1986 and 1987, but has used "American Agenda" for the following 9 episodes since then. For NBC, "Special Segment" was used for 5 episodes until 1988, and thereafter, "Focus" and "Daily Difference: What Works" were used for 1 episode in 1990 and 2 in 1991. For those 2 CBS's episodes in 1991, the title of "Eye On America" was used. As far as I know, NBC's segment is carried by another title now, that is, "America Close-Up" as of the time of this research, while ABC and CBS still maintain their latest titles.

For thematic categorization's sake, there was seen no consistent pattern in naming the episodes according to "headlines" used in Television News Index and Abstracts, while either "The Homeless" or "Homeless" was used in 3 out of 25 stories. After reviewing the sample a considerable number of times, I came up with 6 topical categories for all samples. They include (1) 9 episodes by "General Description of the Homeless," (2) 4 by "Mental Illness and the Homeless," (3) 4 by "The Homeless Teens and Social Disorder," (4) 3 by "Hostility towards the Homeless," (5) 3 by "The Homeless and Housing" and (6) 2 by "The Homeless and Rehabilitation. One interesting point is that 7 out of 10 episodes in the earlier sample period of 1985 through 1987 were devoted to the category of "General Description of the Homeless." This category, as implied in its naming, refers to those that described the homeless people in a general sense without relating the episode with any socially controversial aspect of the issue. In any case, these episodes dealt with the
issue mostly by describing in a trivial way the homeless's everyday life at the common sense level. Thereafter, however, the topic regarding the "homeless" issue tends to have been diversified depending on its specific relation to society. This point may reflect the society's increased concern about the issue or its increased newsworthiness for the journalists.

Going back to the reduced virtual sample for this study, its total length amounted to 106 min and 36 sec: 59 min and 7 sec by ABC (55%); 38 min and 2 sec by NBC (36%); 9 min and 27 sec by CBS (9%). The total number of "sequences" identified were 133, including 73 by ABC (55%), 49 by NBC (37%) and 11 by CBS (8%). The number of sequences for one episode ranged from 4 to 9. The total number of 1,216 "shots" were also distributed by similar rates for each network as in the case of "sequences:" 637 (52%) for ABC, 459 (38%) for NBC and 120 (10%) for CBS. These percentages being compared with those for the duration of the total episodes for each network, it can be argued that all three networks, on the whole, share the same pattern in "sequentializing" and "making use of shots" for making up of news stories, since the percentages for the number of sequences and shots match very close to those for the duration of the whole episodes. Similarly, another shared pattern for all networks is seen in their use of sequence and shot durations. On average, ABC apportioned 48.6 sec for a sequence and 5.6 sec for a shot, NBC 46.6 sec and 5.0 sec, and CBS 51.5 sec and 4.7 sec respectively. In short, all three networks tended to share the same pattern in making use of sequences and shots in terms of number and duration.

In the following section, a brief overview of the overall camera work will be provided in terms of its distance, angle and character orientation.
After this, the findings of the primary actions of characters which have been captured by the camera also will be mentioned. All of these elements provide the news-makers with semiotically significant tools in terms of their functions, which eventually contribute to construction of reality in a particular way. These are also important in their relation to the "orientation" of the narrative as a whole, insofar as they often play significant semiotic roles both on the metaphoric and metonymic dimensions by producing or transforming the meaning of a particular "event" into various shapes depending on the narrative's particular orientation. However, these findings do not tell much about how these signifying elements really work in collaboration in practice for each sample, while they give us an outline of the nature of the sample in general. And, the major goal of this study was not to be relying on the quantitative results, but rather to see the detailed process of operation in which semiotic elements function in combination as a total meaning system. The findings about their actual practices then, will be discussed in the section of extended analysis.

As Table 1 shows (see Appendix A), the use of medium range shots (medium close-up and medium shot) were the most frequent for all three networks, amounting, in combination, almost up to 40% of the total. Secondly, long-shot and medium/extreme long-shot were found to have been used almost evenly for all networks. For all networks, extreme close-up shot was used the least often. In the case of CBS in particular, only 1 out of 114 shots was taken in this range. According to Table 2, however, medium long-shot, long-shot and extreme long-shot combined were used much more frequently (more than 50% of the total) for the homeless, compared with
other characters with an exception of police officers. On the other hand, the homeless were given, comparatively speaking, fewer chances for medium close-ups, the most optimum type of shot, which can be called the"anchor" shot (in fact, the anchors were seen in this framing about in 74% of the total cases). Whereas it is, of course, not wise to attempt to generalize something out of these numbers, it can be roughly suspected that the homeless people along with police officers might have been portrayed not as autonomous individuals, but rather as "collectives" more often than other characters.

Speaking of camera angle, as indicated in Table 3, the normal standard (eye-level) angle shots were shared as the dominant style by all three networks, as their frequency averaged 82% of the total. Low angle shots were used the least often (about 4%). In regarding to the distributions of high angle shots (Table 4), however, the homeless’s 17% sharply contrasts to the other cases which range about 6% to 9%. Considering the negative effect of high angle shot in general, this figure may suggest that the homeless were given relatively more unfavorable images than the other characters. A high angle shot in general, tends to have an negative effect by which the authority and significance of the subject are diminished since the subject tends to be "looked down upon" by the viewer in an emotional sense (DeNitto, 1985, p. 22). This unfavorable effect is also true in the case of a character orientation to the camera for the homeless people. As seen in the comparison of Table 5 and Table 6, the homeless were more often portrayed in profile and less in facing-the-camera position than other characters.

Along with these relatively negative images given by camera work when compared to other characters, the homeless also received unfavorable
images in terms of character's primary "actions" captured by camera. As Table 7 shows what the characters were seen doing the most in individual shots, it may be suspected that in more than half of the total shots (about 52% in combination of 7 categories), the homeless were seen mostly in negative image categories such as walking (without any particular destination), sleeping, eating, digging in trash cans, weird body movements or gestures, panhandling, prostituting, and the most often, standing around on the streets without having a particular reason to do so. As will be discussed later in the extended analysis section, these features are semiotically productive since their repetitious presentations gradually accumulate their metonymic effects both at the intra- and inter-episodical levels.

Dealing with findings about the basic characteristics of signification on the discourse dimension, the discussion so far has been focused mostly on the homeless's side, how they were treated in terms of camera work and their primary actional appearances. Now, before moving into the discussion of the textual mode of signification on the "story" dimension, I will briefly describe how two major "framing" narrators in the television news narrative (with emphasis on the framing of the anchorperson) were featured in their relation to the viewer side. As already discussed in Chapter 2, the television anchor person, mainly due to his positional advantages, always occupies a position of top authority compared to other characters including the reporter. The anchor, simultaneously as an "extra-diegetic" and an "hetero-diegetic" narrator, is always seen to dominate the whole narrative practice by subjugating all the narrative elements, either verbal or visual, to his positional authority within a given framework. On occupying the most
superior position of authority, objectivity and reliability, he/she was seen, across all the samples, solely responsible for controlling and leading the flow of the narrative as a whole. This was possible in my sample partially because of his direct mode of address, which always maintained eye-contact with the viewer ("us"), and of the most positive camera work given to him. Above all, he/she was seen never leaving his/her studio desk, the headquarters of the narrative practice, which controlled all other elements in the narrative. He/she framed the topic, initiated the tension, drew the viewer's attention into the tense "reality," assigned the reporter and eased the tension by taking the viewer out of it after all.

In all sample stories, with the exception of one (NBC's "Special Segment" on December 5, 1986) in which the anchor also performed the role of field reporter, the reporter was assigned to perform both roles of "camera" and "framing" narrators, albeit at the secondary level. Unlike the anchor person, however, the reporter usually (not always) assumed two roles at the same time, one in terms of narrative level and the other in its relationship to the story. As a camera- and framing-narrator, he/she was virtually responsible for developing, elaborating and closing the story, although it was under the control of a given framework. While this task was mostly done by his/her voice-over narrations on actuality sequences (the field reportings), it was sometimes managed through the direct mode of address to the viewer. However, the quality of his/her mode of direct address was a little different from the anchor's. For, unlike that the anchor's direct address was always made in the studio, the reporter's was always performed in actuality sequences, thus, being accompanied with the background scenes. Meanwhile,
the reporter, often times, also took the role of character narrator, as he/she was engaged in the interviewing situations along with the "embedded" characters in the actuality scenes. Of the 25 samples, 15 episodes were carried with the role of the reporter as an "character" narrator, either by the verbal or the visual. In 11 samples among these, in particular, a direct address mode of narration as well as voice-over technique was used. In any case, it is true that the reporter did not ever lose her authority as a "framing" narrator even when he/she was actually engaged in the story itself. In short, the anchor and the reporter as "framing" narrators were featured solely responsible to have the narrative flow within a given framework towards a certain "point of view," while the other characters including such interviewees as professionals and ordinary people as well as the homeless were seen serving as a collective lubricant role for the smooth flow of narrative. Now, in the following section, the findings about the structural patterns on the "story" level are provided.

Outline: "Story" Dimension

To reiterate from Chapter 2, the story dimension concerns "the content or chain of events" whereas the "discourse" the "expression, the means by which the content is communicated" (Chatman, 1978, p. 19). Although the previous section has dealt with the importance of some basic semiotic elements on the "discourse" level, these elements were hardly able to render themselves meaningful if they were not selected and put together in a meaningful signifying system on the basis of paradigmatic and syntagmatic rules. Journalists do not simply transfer rare events from one place to
another, but they create their own accounts of those events. To borrow from Cohan and Shires (1988), "How and which events get narrated are therefore as important as--indeed, inseparable from--the way in which they occur" (p. 53). Based on this basic assumption, the present study attempted to abstract the underlying narrative structures both at the "paradigmatic" and "syntagmatic" dimensions, which in combination eventually turned out to be the overall structuring principle at the macro level of the narrative construction.

**Paradigmatic Structural Pattern**

For the present study, as proposed in Chapter 3, Levi-Strauss's theory of "binary oppositions" was used as an analyzing tool. Thus, it was assumed that the sample television news narrative, like Levi-Strauss's "myths," could be considered as an analyzable semiotic structure. It was also assumed that all sample news stories contained deep structural patterns being that they consisted of binary oppositions, which then could be abstracted from the actual texts themselves on the surface level. These binary oppositions were supposed to serve as a paradigmatic "rule" which functioned to control the "coherent" flow of a narrative all the way from its beginning to the closing sequences. Once these binary oppositions were identified, they helped in finding out what conflicts were really going on below the surface structure of the narrative.

According to Hartley's (1982) suggestion, one of the things we should do in analyzing the news story is to look for "what is not there," "what is absent, not selected, discursively repressed" (pp. 117-119). Therefore, the underlying meaning of news narrative is not to be found in the explicit
manifestation of the events, but instead in its "significant absence" (Brunsdon and Morley, 1981, p. 137). In regard to this "absence," Brunsdon and Morley argue that "what is rendered invisible by this style of presentation is the relation of...human problems to the structure of society," and that "the stress on 'immediate effects', on 'people', ...paradoxically confines" the news narrative "to the level of 'mere appearances'" (p. 137). As implied in this quotation, this structural "absence" is possible especially when the social origin of the issue is transformed into a simple personal matter which is easily comprehensible within the domain of our common sense. This moment of transformation from the social to the personal is "ideological." For this "ideological moment," as Hall (1984, p. 8) contends, is the moment at which both the journalists and the viewers are "least aware" that they are using a particular ideological framework. This concept of "absence" is particularly important for the present analysis of deep structural pattern of narrative, since it serves as a useful tool in abstracting underlying ideological system of "difference."

In applying this concept of "significant absence" to the present analysis, in any case, the finding of two homologic oppositions, "Us" : "Them" :: "The Ordinary" : "The Homeless" and "Absence" : "Presence" :: "Issue" : "Events" at the highest level of abstraction was unavoidable. These two oppositional sets were found as consisting of the most profound organizing principle in the sample news narratives. This finding is not new at all, however, since it has already been claimed as a kind of model for the news narratives more in general in studies by such scholars as Fiske (1987b), Hartley and Montgomery (1985), Hartley (1982) and Brunsdon and Morley (1981). For example,
Brunsdon and Morley (1981, p. 134), considering an underlying 'preferred' structure of British magazine program, "Nationwide," have proposed a ABSENT : PRESENT model as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ABSENT} & \text{PRESENT} \\
\text{world} & \text{leisure} \\
\text{production/reproduction} & \text{consumption} \\
\text{workers (functions)} & \text{individuals (bearers)} \\
\text{structural causations} & \text{effects} \\
\end{array}
\]

Hartley (1982, p. 116), in his study of the news about a particular industrial dispute, also suggests that the news proceeds on the basic "us" : "them" opposition in which the former includes the "culture," "nation," "public," "viewer," "family," "newsreader" and "news institution," and the latter, "striker," "foreign dictator," foreign power," "the weather," "fate," "bureaucracy" and "accessed voice," etc. In addition, he argues that "once an individual or topic has been stereotyped it will always be presented in terms of the stereotype, and further, it will never be selected as newsworthy unless it does or says something that fits the stereotype" (p. 116).

The typical example of such stereotyping practice in the present case of "homeless" news is that, as shortly discussed in the previous section about the findings on the "discourse" dimension, the homeless people, for the most part, were seen endlessly walking along the streets, sleeping in rags and eating something in the public places, just standing around there doing nothing, or sometimes digging in the trash cans, etc. The tension level in this "us" : "them" opposition tends to be rising, as Ferguson (1990) suggests in her report on homelessness, "when the economy worsens and the line between the
middle class and the poor becomes ever more precarious. Many people's need to maintain an 'us versus them' mentality seems all the more urgent" (p. 52). This type of ideological process operates, in Hall's (1984) words, "in the slow transformation of what appear to be the most plausible frameworks we have of telling ourselves a certain story about the world" (p. 8). In other words, it is so taken-for-granted and naturalized in our everyday life that it is very hard for us to be aware how it works in practice. It can be revealed however, if one is ready to use his/her conscious analytical mind in television viewing practice. What follows is an example provided as a demonstration that shows a way of analyzing and revealing how this ideological moment works in practice. The following is an extract from the opening part of an episode aired on February 12, 1985 by NBC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shot #</th>
<th>Visual</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Medium close-up of anchor; dark suit, tie; studio shot with plain light-blue backing; &quot;hanging&quot; box over the anchor's left shoulder features a medium close-up of an elderly homeless facing camera, with episode title, &quot;THE HOMELESS&quot; on lower part of the box.</td>
<td>DA Tom Brokaw (anchor): Special Segment tonight. The Homeless. In a way, this has been a year of the homeless in America. Television news programs, newspapers, news magazines, we've been all doing stories on the homeless, why there are so many in the midst of all of this bounty. What can be done to help? Tonight, Jennifer McLogan tells us a story of one member of this vast tragic population: Why he chooses to live this way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Extreme close-up of the same homeless;</td>
<td>(ambient sound)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OnS Homeless man:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
featuring in 45 degree profile; slight high angle.

You know, you might say, you can't just have what you never had. See, I never had a really close relationship with anybody, to anybody.

3 Establishing-shot of a street at night; cars passing.
(ambient sound)
VO Jennifer McLogan
(reporter):
Night comes to Manhattan's fashionable East Side.

4 Extreme long-shot of the same homeless across street; very dark; cars passing; camera zoom-in to long-shot of him, standing behind stack of cardboard boxes; objects not discernible; cars passing.
(ambient sound)
VO McLogan:
As thousands rush home, a fifty-two year old man settles into his make-shift room of cardboard and racks.

(Note: DA refers to "direct eye-contact mode of address" to the viewer as stated in Appendix C; VO to "voice-over" narration)

As is usually the case, this episode begins with the anchor's introduction of a topic for the day, "The Homeless" in this case. At first sight, as the anchor proceeds, it immediately sounds like a "personal" story of "one" homeless person. The viewer also hears that the homeless character in this story "chooses" to be a homeless by himself. However, the "absence" of structural cause is already built into this topic framing process.

"Homelessness" is not such simple an issue. As a social problem, it has been caused by a complex web of structural, socio-economic and politico-cultural problems. The point is that these hard aspects of homelessness are avoided by the anchor when he frames the story as a personal choice by a particular
person as to why this person is homeless. In other words, the "issue"
disappears back into the rear stage, leaving behind only a personal "event" in
the front line. As pointed out in Chapter 3, a group of critical scholars in
media criticism (Fiske, 1987b; Tuchman, 1987; Hall, 1981; Gitlin, 1986) have
already contended that this "personalization" is one of those common
journalistic routines that help avoid dealing with the hard issue head-on.
This interpretation then comes up with a homologic formula of "Absence":
"Presence" :: "Issue" : "Events" oppositions.

Moreover, this absence of structural causation tends to be reinforced by
such discourse devices as the anchor's direct mode of address to the viewer
and the anchor's frequent use of the term "we" as it helps identifying
"his/her" point of view with "the viewer's." As discussed in Chapter 2 and
in the earlier section of the present one, the anchor's direct eye-contact mode
of address creates an imaginary space of "here-and-now," which resembles the
everyday interpersonal situation. In this "shared" space, the temporal and
spatial gap between the addressee and the addressee collapses and thus what is
being said here and now by the anchor can appear to be "real" on the viewer's
side. In addition, the "imagined" reality created in this way tends to be hardly
resisted by the viewer due to its naturalness, taken-for-grantedness and
conventionality. In the meantime, the anchor's use of "we" referring to the
viewer as well as himself increases the effectivity of imagined reality. While
this "we" is uttered without any hesitation, its concrete referent is seldom
ominated. In other words, the actual subject of "we" tends to be
"exnominated," disappears from the scene and thus remains "abstract" and
"impersonal." The practice of these "impersonalization" and
"exomimation" is also implied in the "absence" of agent in the anchor's verbal, "What can be done to help?" Regarding the significant consequence which may be caused by "exomination," Fiske (1987b) argues that "That which is exominated appears to have no alternative and is thus granted the status of the natural, the universal, or that-which-cannot-be-challenged" (p. 290). In this regard, it can be argued that "we" disappears from the scene as an invisible dominant power that may be identified with the mainstream society in this case, while the homeless as a "collective" mass tends to be marginalized and thus relegated to a position of "them" which is characterized by its quality of "difference" and subordination. Hence an interpretation: "Us" : "Them" :: "The Ordinary" : "The Homeless" :: "Superiority" : "Inferiority" oppositions. These oppositional relations are again backed up by the reporter's voice-over in Shot 3 and 4, in which she metaphorically contrasts "fashionable East Side" to "make-shift room of cardboard and racks." The reporter's mode of narration is also significant here, since, as is always the case, the voice-over narration tends to dominate the visual particularly in terms of story "framing." While the visual of the "embedded" narrator functions as a "lubricating" role for the smooth flow of the narrative, the reporter's "framing" role controls and orients the flow of the story towards a certain direction.

On the dimension of visual representation, the above interpretation is also supported. Above all, the unusual extreme close-up and (extreme) long-shot of the homeless respectively in Shot 2 and 4 sharply contrast to an optimum medium close-up framing of the anchor in Shot 1. In addition, it should be noted that whereas the anchor was given a favorable image from a
plain light-blue backing and a good-lighting in the quiet studio, the shot of the homeless was taken in a setting of a dark street side with ambient sound and thus his appearance at a long distance is not clearly discernible. The contrast of "dark" and "light" in particular is important in this case. Semiotically speaking, this serves as a metaphoric signifier for a, I would call, The Undesirable ("evil") : The Desirable ("good") opposition, which appeals very easily to "our" common-sense stock of feeling. A more detailed examination of this will be provided later in the extended analysis section. In any case, this interpretation then contributes to the confirmation of an oppositional formula which has been previously established.

So far, I have demonstrated how the present study has established Us : Them and Absence : Presence oppositions as a deep structural principle, on the basis of which the orientation of the whole narrative was partially determined. This deep structure controls the whole paradigmatic dimension of the narrative, that is, the semiotic process of selecting both visual and aural elements in particular. However, the construction of "reality" (of the homeless in the present case) is not complete until these semiotic signifiers are horizontally chained together into a broader unit of syntagmatization, say, "sequence" a series of which eventually constitute a complete story. In the following section, a syntagmatic organizing principle of the sampled news stories, which has been abstracted from the overall analysis, will be discussed.

**Syntagmatic Structural Pattern**

While abstracting deep structural narrative pattern provides a good starting point in understanding "what" the news story is about, it is yet a half
of the total comprehension of what is really going on. Basically, the
abstraction of deep structural binary oppositions provides us with a
framework by means of which we can see through the news narrative to find
out what is "not" there, that is, the real conflicts hidden in the back stage. For
the present study, then, it is argued that what is "not" there are conflicts
between the mainstream society ("us") and the homeless community
("them") and between the structural/institutional problems and their
"effects" in our everyday life. At first sight, they "sound" and "look like"
(Hartley, pp. 72-73) stories about personal/familial conflicts and sufferings
such as family break-up, divorce, drug or alcohol addiction, mental illness,
etc., or stories about personal celebration of successful rehabilitation. Behind
these, however, are a web of socially oriented issues which are entangled
together in such a complicated way that they are not easily resolved.

When we consider news making as a form of social practice, however,
there is another dimension in it to be examined. On the one hand, the news
narrative, as a "structured" structure, implicitly reflects hidden social conflicts
and problems, as discussed above. On the other hand, it also, as a
"structuring" structure, activates the pre-established structure in constructing
and reinforcing a particular version of reality. What concerns us for the
present moment is the syntagmatic pattern which structures the flow of
narrative on the horizontal dimension. This pattern can be examined at the
level of individual shots, that is, within a shot or between shots to see how
semiotic elements are syntagmatically chained together as a total signifying
system at the micro level. For the present study, however, the focus of
attention was laid upon the level of sequences in which a series of shots were
put together to make up another independent sub-story. A sequence usually consists of several shots, but one shot alone sometimes makes an independent sequence. For example, in most cases for the present study, an episode begins with an anchor shot in which he/she introduces a topic and a reporter of the day, which is then followed by the first actuality scene. In this case, the first shot was considered as an independent, complete sequence, since it functioned as a complete situation in which both a beginning and an end were included. Metz (1974), in his study of film, calls this type of shot an "autonomous shot" in which "a single shot constitutes a primary, and not a secondary, sub-division of the film" (p. 124).

After numerous reviewings, it was found that every sample in the present study was comprised of at least 4 sequences and sometimes of up to 9. The bigger the number of sequences was, the bigger the number of sub-episodes usually with different characters was. The variation in the number of sequences, either 4 or 9, however, was not important for the present study, since, for example, one sequence alone, seen from the perspective of the overall flow of the narrative, sometimes marked a determining moment in terms of its functional significance in the syntagmatic development of the narrative.

In an attempt to identify a consistent organizing principle on the horizontal dimension, this study has finally come up with a structural pattern of four significant narrative moments for the present sample in general. I have labeled these four narrative "moments" as those of framing ("Here's our story"), differentiating ("Are 'they' really different from 'us'?" The, how?), reversing ("Who's to blame?") and closing (Here's our
solution"). This syntagmatic categorizing was based on each moment's narrative "function" that was abstracted for the most part from the verbal development of the narrative. Generally speaking, as already pointed out in this chapter, the verbal presentation tends to dominate the visual across the whole sample in terms of syntagmatic function. Put another way, whatever visual presentations are presented, they tend to be subjected to a given orientation of the narrative which is mostly controlled by the framing narrators including the anchor and the reporter. Careful reading of each sample revealed that in many cases, the visual presentation supported its counter-part verbal, mostly the reporter's voice-over, but sometimes, the visual did not match quite well the verbal, but only contributed to enhancing the sense of difference between "us" and "them."

Coming back to our four narrative moments, I will describe in brief what their functions are in their relationships to the flow of narrative as a whole. After this, an extended analysis is provided to demonstrate how they work in detail in selected samples. In the "framing" moment, the anchor brings up the day's topic in the form of, say, "Here's our story," a more or less abstract way so that the viewer is not yet sure about what the following story is going to be. Therefore, as has been already mentioned in the previous section, the story tossed here usually "sounds like" a story about usual, ordinary things around us at the personal level. As is often the case, however, it is this moment where the basic "us": "them" opposition is implicitly acknowledged for the first time. While the "framing" is usually done by the anchor's studio report, however, there is sometimes an exception. For example, NBC's "Special Segment" aired on December 5, 1986,
as mentioned earlier in this chapter, shows that the anchor begins the episode with a direct field report from the actual place of the event.

Secondly, in the "differentiating" moment, first of all, the topic is narrowed down from the abstract to the somewhat concrete level usually by means of "personalizing" the issue, that is, by focusing the viewer's attention on "individual" experiences, or what Brunsdon and Morley (1981) calls, "immediate effects." From this moment on, the structural context of an "issue" tends to begin "disappearing," leaving behind fragmentary "events" alone. This narrative moment is usually comprised of actuality films with the reporter's voice-over and, albeit not always, actuality interviews. What is more important, however, is that this provides a beginning moment of "differentiating" between "us (the ordinary)" and "them (the homeless)" as if it were asking "Are they really different from us?" As already discussed, this is an "ideologic" moment, as it serves as a lead-in role that connects the present moment to the following moment in which the relationship between the victim and the cause is reversed.

Thirdly, in the "reversing" moment, the narrative concerns the question, "Who's to blame?" There is a tendency that the status of the homeless ("they") as a victim is explicitly or implicitly transformed into that as a cause of the social problems. In the case of implicit "reversing" in general, while the "closing" moment of a story reaffirms the basic "us" : "them" opposition without blaming the victim, the story does not easily get away with its implication that supports the "us" : "them" :: "victim" : "cause" formula which has been gradually and ideologically established in an unnoticeable way.
Finally, the narrative provides a "closing" moment which usually reconfirms the basic binary oppositions which have already started in the beginning of the story. The closing moment sometimes suggests a way of resolving the conflict, but the shape of resolution always looks like serving the role of comforting and easing the tension of the conflict at the temporary, emotional level. After all, as Fiske (1987b) points out, "The syntagmatic chain of events may reach a closure, but the paradigmatic oppositions of character and situation never can" (p. 145). In any case, the most common form of the narrative closing takes a mode of the anchor's studio address to the viewer. In the present case, however, it is often the case that the distinction between the "closing" and the "reversing" moments is not very clear. For in many cases, the reporter's concluding remark served as a closing moment without the presence of the anchor for a studio report. Even when the closing studio shot was provided, the anchor often times did not mention anything for a conclusion. The point is that the "reversing" moment in some cases also functioned as a closing of the narrative.

Among the four moments, the "differentiating" one draws a particular attention for the present study. While it functions as a lead-in moment towards the closing of the narrative, that is, the moment of "reversing" the causal relation, it consists of the main body of the narrative and is often times seen to be prevailing across the whole narrative. The following demonstrates how it works.

Take, as an example, the NBC episode, "Going Nowhere" aired on January 22, 1988. This episode begins with an anchor's framing of a topic that "sounds like" a story about the homeless at New York City's port authority
bus terminal. Then, as is usual with most sample stories, the reporter in the following scene narrows down the topic by focusing our attention on the personal conflicts between the ordinary commuters and the homeless in the terminal. However, it is already a definite moment of "differentiating." To illustrate, in the beginning of the second sequence, the camera captures a scene in which lots and lots of commuters are seen busy passing by and a handful of homeless people are panhandling right in the middle of the passage. While the focus of the camera is on the standing homeless, it reveals an elderly man in shabby and dirty sweater, whose face with watery and bloodshot eyes on it looks unshaven, unwashed and diseased. On the other hand, the commuters are seen mostly wearing decent-looking clothing such as long formal coats with dress suits inside of it. This provides a very keen contrast between two parties, "us" and "them."

In addition, the following scene is comprised of actuality interviews of, we might say, "representatives" of both sides in a row. While both sides are framed in extreme close-ups, the young lady on the side of ordinary commuters is seen clean, civilized and "pleasant" (maybe partially due to her good make-up and nice red hat) in facing the camera on the one hand; On the other hand, the face of the homeless man on interview is framed in his profile orientation, in the left side of the screen, and seen, in a word, looking not very "pleasant" due to his unshaven face and dirty looking woolen hat. An interesting point is that if one puts the contrast between these two sides as a "Pleasant" : "Disgusting" opposition, these two words come directly from the interviewee's words: "pleasant" from the young lady and "disgusting" from the homeless man. At first sight, one may think that it is coincidental,
but it may not be that simple if the situation is considered in terms of narrative functions that the characters are supposed to assume. They are not accidental happenings at all, but rather what have been carefully selected and arranged in terms of their semiotic "functions." After all, it is very certain that "differentiating" has already started to function.

In the following section, an extended analysis of three sample episodes attempts to see in detail how two deep structural oppositions and four narrative moments virtually work in combination in the context of overall flow of the narrative. For this extended analysis, three sample narratives have been selected including each one from each network, ABC, NBC and CBS, which, at the same time, represent three different topical categories: "General Description of the Homeless," "Mental Illness and the Homeless" and "Hostility towards the Homeless." The selection of these sample stories was based on the following three reasons. First, despite the differences among the three networks in their sample sizes, each network has produced one sample, since this study attempts to see how all networks share a general pattern of news-making in terms of paradigmatic and syntagmatic practices. Secondly, the importance of each category's thematic nature fits the purpose of this study. In a broad way, this study purports to understand how the reality of the homeless culture is constructed by the television news narrative practice. In order to achieve this task, a selection of "General Description of the Homeless" category was necessary in the first place, since it was supposed to give us an understanding of how a synthetical conceptualization of the homeless in general was built by the news narrative. The major reason for the selection of the topic of "Mental Illness and the Homeless" was that it has
always been the most controversial issue among scholars who study the issue of homelessness. The research focus has mostly been on the issue that questions whether "deinstitutionalization" of the mentally ill patients since the 1950s has been the major reason for the growing number of homeless people in the U.S. Thus, an analysis of this topic may provide us with an significant understanding of how the television news treats this consistently controversial issue. Finally, the topic of "Hostility towards the Homeless" was taken because it occupies one of the most important homeless issues today as the public's antagonism against the homeless has been increased since the late 1980s probably due to so-called "compassion fatigue" or "intolerance" among the mainstream public. This analysis then concerns the question, how the television news narrative mediates between two different worlds or if it takes the side of so-called "victim blaming" perspective. Thirdly, all three samples were considered to be suitable for providing best examples with which the present analysis can demonstrate how the four narrative moments work.

An Extended Analysis of Narrative Patterns

The sample for this analysis includes: ABC's episode under "American Agenda" aired on December 6, 1988 from the category of "General Description of the Homeless;" NBC's episode under "Special Segment" aired on December 18, 1985 from "Mental Illness and the Homeless;" CBS's episode under "Eye On America" aired on December 23, 1991 from "Hostility towards the Homeless." Through a close, textual reading of these three episodes, this analysis provides an in-detail approach which illustrates how the syntagmatic
organizing pattern in collaboration with the deep structural binary oppositions works in the narrativistic construction of a particular version of "homeless" reality. Since the major concern of this study has been to understand the syntagmatic process of news narrative, the organization of the following presentation takes a format in which four narrative moments are emphasized while the analyzing procedure moves on sequence by sequence.

**General Description of the Homeless**

Segment title: "American Agenda"  
<12/06/88. ABC. 5:49:40-5:54:50 p.m. (5:13)11>  
(For key to abbreviations, see Appendix C)

This particular episode is a story about the homeless who have "happened" to be living without families due to their personal problems. By means of actualizing the topic, this episode tries to understand their desperate situations, how they have ended up like that and why their families can not help. The total running time of the episode is 5 minutes and 13 seconds, containing 5 sequences for 64 shots. The average length of each shot is 4.9 seconds. Sequence 1 runs 31 seconds and consists of 2 shots. Peter Jennings (the anchor) here introduces the topic of the day with help from a graphic drawing which shows many different faces of ordinary people, certainly symbolizing the value of "family." Sequence 2 includes 11 shots and lasts 43 seconds. In this sequence, the topic is realized through three actuality

---

11. The actual durations of sample episodes differ from those that can be calculated from the information provided in Television News Index and Abstracts. Since, the Abstracts recorded the duration by 10 seconds, not by every single second, the actual duration turns out to be a little longer or shorter than that indicated in the Abstracts.
interviews with the unnominated homeless who live without families. Sequence 3, the longest one in the present episode, contains 29 shots and runs 2 minutes 17 seconds. As the sequence moves, we are introduced three major homeless characters and one prominent homeless advocate as witnesses to the thesis of "difference." While the reporter (Rebecca Chase) elaborates the topic through holding actuality interviews with the homeless characters and their families, we are invited to realize that their personal problems such as drug-abuse, irresponsibility and mental illness are the very cause of their problems. In sequence 4, which runs 1 minute and 24 seconds for 21 shots, the episode finally introduces a successful case of, so-called, "Transitional House" program in Boston area as a "temporary" solution to the problem. In the last sequence, which contains 1 shot running 16 seconds, the anchor's eye-contact address draws our attention back to the normal.

SEQUENCE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shot #</th>
<th>Visual</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MCU, SA Jennings in LF; dark suit, tie; title of the program, &quot;American Agenda&quot; in &quot;hanging&quot; box; studio.</td>
<td>DA Peter Jennings (the anchor): Tonight, the &quot;American Agenda&quot; begins with this news from San Francisco. About a hundred mourners attended a memorial service today for 38 year old Joseph Eaton. He died over the weekend after being dragged out of a restaurant unconscious and left on the sidewalk. He was homeless. Eaton came from a prominent Boston banking family which makes a broader point. The homeless are not simply without</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
homes. Whatever their economic background, they are without families...

DA Peter Jennings:
...who can or will help. Here's Rebecca Chase.

SEQUENCE 2

3 Wipe to MS, HA a family; parents help kid reading a book.

VO Rebecca Chase (RC) (the reporter):
America's homeless. So many different faces.

4 Dissolve to CU, SA young black kid; face looking up.

VO RC:
So many different reasons.

5 Dissolve to CU, SA old man; very wrinkled face; red sport hat on.

VO RC:
But what they have in common is...

6 Dissolve to CU, SA young white woman; very pale; deep-set eyes; uncombed hair.

VO RC:
...loneliness, ...

7 Dissolve to ELS, HA man, sitting down and dozing just by escalator; face covered with hat.

VO RC:
...isolation...

8 Dissolve to LS, SA man, sleeping on street bench; face not visible.

VO RC:
...and alienation from their families.

9 Dissolve to CU, SA white woman; middle-aged; wears glasses.

OnS Woman 1:
I have four older children who I haven't really kept up very good contact with.
Dissolve to CU, SA black man.

OnS Man:
No, I haven't seen none of my family since seventy eight.

Dissolve to CU, SA black young lady.

OnS Woman 2:
So, why should I run back to my mother's home every time the situation like this, you know, occurs?

Dissolve to LS, SA Black woman with three kids in BC; walking down the road.

VO RC:
It used to be that in times of trouble people turned to their families, not the streets.

Dissolve to MS, SA reporter; formal suit; behind her, LS, BC group of HJs in line outdoor; TC name.

DA RC:
But the breakdown of the family whether because of divorce, disagreement or just distance is a major reason why there is more homelessness in the U.S. than in much poorer nations.

SEQUENCE 3

Dissolve to MCU, SA Hayes in office; dark suit, tie; behind him, books in shelves; TC name.

OnS Robert Hayes (National Coalition for the Homeless):
But, there is not the ethos within the U.S. right now to reach out and help family members in need, and it's a problem.

Dissolve to LS, HA HJs in line entering shelter.

VO RC:
Where are the families of the homeless? For the largest group single men, ...

MLS, SA white man sitting and sleeping against tree; hat on.

VO RC:
...too often the answer reflects how alcohol,...
ELS, SA three Hds; sitting, lying, sleeping on outdoor steps on sidewalk.

MS, SA old man in PF; gazing blankly; around him, backs of other Hs.

CU, SA black man; red hat.

OnS Homeless Man:
My mom couldn't deal with my problem, so...

OffS RC:
Which is...?

OnS Homeless Man:
Which is the drugs.

Dissolve to ELS, SA graffiti on concrete wall in grove, reading "GOD BLESS THIS HOME"; camera pan R to ELS Hs sitting inside tunnel looking messy and dark.

MS, SA two Hs sitting in counterlight in tunnel.

Dissolve to CU, SA Owens; old white woman; white hair; wears glasses.

Dissolve to LS, HA tunnel; dark; objects not discernible; camera ZO to ELS.

VO RC:
...crime and drugs...

VO RC:
...destroy family ties.

VO RC:
Where are the families of the homeless? For the 30 to 40 percent who have some kind of mental illness, many of their families want to help if...

VO RC:
...only they could get in touch.

OnS Lilian Owens:
I would like for her to come home, stay with me.

VO RC:
Lilian Owens reported her daughter Lois missing several months ago. But, Lois is living in this tunnel and doesn't want to leave her...
24  MS, SA Lois and her husband in tunnel; camera ZI/PR to MCU Lois in blue parka.

**VO RC:**
...new home.

**OnS Lois:**
This is my family now... This is my family. This is my husband.

25  Dissolve to LS, HA HLs including kids at meal around table; indoor.

**OffS Lois:**
This is my family.

**VO RC:**
Where are the families of the homeless with...

26  MCU, SA young white girl eating noodles carelessly.

**VO RC:**
...children? Even when their relatives care, too often...

27  MCU, SA another girl at dining table.

**VO RC:**
...there is no money or patience...

28  MCU, SA another girl at dining table.

**VO RC:**
...left to help them. That's the case...

29  MLS, HA Mayhew's family; outdoor; place unidentifiable, messy; parents help kids studying.

**VO RC:**
...with Jesse and Beverly Mayhew and their three children.

30  CU, HA Jesse; white male; unshaven, T-shirt.

**OnS Jesse Mayhew:**
I got one brother and one sister, and they don't care about us, either.

31  Dissolve to MS, SA Rodney's family in still picture; casual clothing.

**VO RC:**
Jesse's brother, Rodney says he tried to help even though he has his own family.

32  Dissolve to ELS, SA

**VO RC:**
Rodney and reporter in front lawn yard just by white Mazda pick-up.

He loaned his brother money and he even got him a job.

33 MLS, SA reporter in FC, red pull-over; Rodney in BC, casual shirt.

VO RC:
But, Rodney says his brother got fired for stealing, never repaid the money...

VO RC:
...and left town.

OnS Rodney:
I wouldn't help him do nothing, I mean, you know, they could be lying there dying. I wouldn't help them. I mean....

35 MS, LA Jesse's parents resting in swing chair at porch; casual clothing.

VO RC:
The one member of the family who would like to try to help is the grandfather who doesn't have the money or the capability.

36 Dissolve to CU, SA Jesse's father; wears glasses.

OnS Grandfather:
I love them kids.

37 MS, HA Jesse's son lying on outdoor ground; camera ZO to MLS, HA Jesse's family (back to Shot 29).

OffS Grandfather:
I even dream about them at night. I dream I'm with them.

38 ECU, SA Jesse's father; (back to Shot 36)

OnS Grandfather:
I wake up and, and, and they are not here.

39 Dissolve to ELS, HA, RF Jesse's family in same setting as Shot 37.

VO RC:
The Mayhew family,...

40 Dissolve to MCU, SA Lois

VO RC:
in Shot 24.

41 MLS, SA Gary in shelter;
black HL in Shot 19;
sitting on chair; camera
ZO to ELS broader view
of shelter.

VO RC:
...Lois and...

OffS Robert Hayes:
I don’t think you can wave a...

OnS Hayes:
...magic wand or throw dollar bills
into some kind of pie and come out
with a solution to how to make
people take better care of family
members.

SEQUENCE 4

43 ELS, SA kids playing
slide at playground.

VO RC:
A recent study confirms that
families become homeless...

44 LS, SA two black kids on
top of slide.

VO RC:
...because they have no support
network,...

45 MLS, SA kid crouching on
ground and playing with
soil.

VO RC:
...no one to turn to in a crisis.

46 Dissolve to OS, MS, SA
Bassuk (FC) and report-
er (BC); in office; BG
personal computer.

VO RC:
Havard psychiatrist, Ellen
Bassuk.

47 CU, SA Bassuk; formal
jacket with pull-over;
earrings.

OnS Ellen Bassuk:
I think the importance of the study
is it really highlights the necessity
of rebuilding supports for
homeless families that ultimately

Dissolve to MS, HA kid crying in crib.

VO RC: Bassuk believes that when families can't be put back...

LS, HA woman making bed; camera Pans L to reveal crying kid in crib.

VO RC: ...together, a long term solution to homelessness may be found in places like this,...

ES, LA outlook of transitional house; decent-looking two-story house.

VO RC: ...a transitional house in Brockton, Massachusetts,...

LS, SA babies and mothers in the room; comfortable, cozy and warm looking.

VO RC: ...where homeless families can stay as long as a year.

MS, SA woman feeding her baby by window; light coming through window.

OffS Kathy Maguire (Transitional House Director): We try to strengthen family wherever that's possible.

MCU, SA Maguire; white woman; white shirt, glasses; TC name.

OnS Kathy Maguire: If that's not possible, then we just try to help people to get a surrogate family.

MLS, SA young woman listening; camera ZO/PL to reveal another woman, a consultant at desk; office setting.

VO RC: Here, people find a kind of help that families used to give, whether it's looking for a job,...

MS, SA woman looking after baby in walker.

VO RC: ...taking care of the children,...

MCU, SA woman cooking, in profile; camera tilts

VO RC: ...or just someone to talk to.
CU, SA woman in kitchen. eggs being fried; in kitchen.

OffS Woman:
I think it would drive...

OnS Woman:
...me crazy if I thought of myself as homeless right now. I like to think of this as my home, and it is.

Dissolve to LS, SA elderly man on sitting on street bench; shabby clothing; in front of him, trash-can in RF and pigeon faltering.

VO RC:
So, for those who are living on the street, in...

LS, SA man sitting on subway stairs; besides his feet, vinyl bags.

VO RC:
...subways or in emergency shelters,...

Dissolve to LS, HA women baby-sitting in transitional house; light coming through window.

VO RC:
...the cure is not simply a roof...

MCU, HA woman in BC caressing her baby in FC leaning against her; good sun-lighting through window.

VO RC:
...over their heads, but creating substitutes for broken families.

Dissolve to ELS, SA women baby-sitting.

VO RC:
That may be more difficult than building houses, but...

Dissolve to MS, SA woman in profile holding baby in FC in arms while standing by window; camera slowly ZI to MCU; good-lighting through window; warm and cozy.

VO RC:
...just as essential.
Rebecca Chase, ABC News, Brockton, Massachusetts.
SEQUENCE 5

64 MCU, SA anchor at studio; dark suit, tie.

DA Peter Jennings:
Now that the weather is getting colder, volunteers in Boston tried to count the homeless last night to make sure enough emergency shelter would be available this winter. They've been doing it since 1983. The number of homeless in Boston increased 30 percent since then. Here our final report in just a moment.

Interpretation

SEQUENCE 1: Framing.
Verbally manifested in the direct address to the camera by Peter Jennings (the anchor), the story begins with setting up the following two homologic oppositional pairs: The Ordinary People: The Homeless :: With Families: Without Families, and Restaurant: A Homeless (Joseph Eaton) :: Offender: Victim. The visual message in the "hanging" box\(^{12}\) located over the right shoulder of the anchor also contributes to the establishment of a With Families: Without Families opposition. This "hanging" box is a common device used in television newsmaking, which provides the viewer

---

\(^{12}\) The term, "hanging" box is used to refer to the superimposed scene which is usually located over either the right or left shoulder of the anchor during his/her direct address to the camera. I acknowledge that this term has been borrowed from Morse (1986). This "hanging" box is a technique commonly used in news program for supplementary visual presentation of specific title of a program or for symbolic representation of the story's theme. While others may call this by different names, Campbell's (1986) "storybook" frame, for example, "hanging" box will be consistently used for the present study.
with supplementary information by means of symbolic representation which is directly or indirectly connected with the story topic (Morse, 1986, p. 70). In any case, the anchor's stress on the fact that Joseph Eaton was a homeless person "without families" before he died is in contrast with the visual image represented in the "hanging" box. Contrary to the case of Eaton who had broken family ties, the drawing in the "hanging" box depicts various kinds of faces side by side, which certainly connote the positive value of "family ties." Hence an opposition, With Family : Without Family. The oppositions set up in this way look very concrete and transparent to reality, and thus, at the same time, the viewer has a feeling that what will follow "looks like" and "sounds like" (Hartley, 1982, pp. 72-73) a story about some people without families.

However, it is not my concern here to learn how homeless people live without families. What concerns me for the present study, instead, is to look into the structural dimensions of the narrative and explain how structural patterns are involved in the syntagmatization of the story events in the overall context. As discussed earlier, Hartley (1982) argues, "meaning in news-discourse is not only determined by what is there, but also what is absent, not selected, discursively repressed" (p. 117). Therefore, what has to be looked out for is not the manifested part of the story, but what is semiotically repressed and silenced. What is this silenced discourse in our story then?

It seems that the anchor's report has already suppressed the other half of the story when he defines the topic by narrowing down the focus to the theme of "with families" and "without families." To define the story topic in such a way leaves behind the fundamental point of the issue which has to do
with the structural causation of the problem. How does our story get away
with this then? It is possible partially because the narrative makes an appeal
to the viewer's (supposedly "our") common-sense knowledge and
humanitarian sentiment. By turning our attention away from the complex
aspect of the issue to its "immediate effects" exerted in our everyday events,
the narrative gets away with the burden of proof. This argument leads us to a
set of the following oppositional relations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Absence} & : \text{Presence} \\
\text{Structural Causation} & : \text{Effects} \\
\text{Issue} & : \text{Events}
\end{align*}
\]

As discussed earlier, these binary oppositions, along with an \textbf{Us : Them}
opposition which will be discussed more in detail later on, are the most basic,
consistent structural principles that have been found in every sample for the
present study.

\textbf{SEQUENCE 2: Differentiating.}

By means of displaying general features of the homeless through
actuality sequences and interviews, the present sequence, first of all,
personalizes the \textbf{With Families : Without Families} opposition. Secondly, the
sequence begins to induce the viewer to see how "they" are different from
"us." The overall interpretation for this sequence is the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Us} & : \text{Them} \\
\text{Then} & : \text{Now} \\
\text{With Families} & : \text{Without Families} \\
\text{Family Unity} & : \text{Family "Breakdown"} \\
& \quad ("Loneliness," "Isolation")
\end{align*}
\]
and "Alienation")

In addition, what has "not" been told in the present sequence again is the structural causation of the issue, that is, the socio-economical and politico-cultural problems which are considered as a fundamental origin of the problem of homelessness. This absence of structural interrogation is not simply a result of professional negligence, but a matter of ideological practice, which has already been so deeply embedded in society that it can be also found in many other forms of social practices.

In any case, the present narrative's humanistic translation of the issue is also backed up by the reporter's direct address to the camera (seemingly to "us") in the ending part of the sequence, where the reporter attributes the major causing factor of homelessness to personal problems as the following, "the breakdown of the family whether because of divorce, disagreement or just distance is a major reason why there is more homeless in the U.S...." (Shot 13). The strategy of appealing to our everyday sense of "humanism" is semiotically very productive in constructing imagined "reality" due to the anchor's or reporter's direct mode of address. As discussed in Chapter 2, the form of direct eye-contact address by the anchor/reporter marks the heart of television news narrative's textual strategy. This strategy helps create an imagined, but "realistic" space of "here and now" (Berger & Luckmann, 1967, p. 29) in which the temporal and spatial distinction collapses on the part of the viewer. This happens so naturally and unaware that the "constructedness" of narrative is difficult for the viewer to realize.

Returning to our story, the reporter's verbal description of the nature of being homeless as "loneliness," "isolation" and "alienation" is supported
by its visual counterpart. The visual descriptions of the homeless in Shot 6, 7 and 8 sharply match the verbal in terms of ordering and timing: for "loneliness," a close-up shot of a awfully washed-out looking woman with matted hair and deep-set eyes staring in vain (Shot 6); for "isolation," an extreme long-shot in high-angle of a man with shabby clothing and hat on, sitting and dozing just by the escalator (Shot 7); for "alienation," a long-shot of one (his or her sex cannot be discerned due to covering of face by dirty blanket) sleeping on the street bench (Shot 8). The effectivity of this acute way of juxtaposing shots along with the reporter's voice-over contributes to confirming that what is being said is "real." Therefore, what is more real "here and now" is not the actual world out there, but the "textual" world created by the news narrative. In the meantime, the meaning of those voiceless pictures of the homeless people in the actuality report is "semiotically 'stolen'" (Hartley, 1982, p. 73) by the reporter's voice-over. Their realities are meaningful only within the overall flow of the narrative which has already been tightly organized and thus controlled both by the anchor and the reporter. To be meaningful within a given framework, they have been carefully selected and arranged in a certain order. Otherwise, they are fragmentary, meaningless visual signs.

The reporter's definition of the homeless is again confirmed in the following series of actuality interviews in which three homeless characters are given chances to have their voices be heard (Shot 9 through 11). Their accessed voices in these actuality scenes, just like the previous case where the homeless's pictorial meanings have been "stolen," hang in the air only to be used as a function to make the story flow. In other words, the chief function
of their voices, semiotically lacking in the quality of autonomy and thus being "embedded" in the narrative is to grant a credible, factual and realistic quality to the "textual" reality constructed by the reporter's direct address in the following scene (Shot 13). In short, their voices are again semiotically stolen, appropriated by the reporter and are devoted to a certain purpose of the narrative.

In addition, during the present sequence, no homeless, even those who are allowed to speak, has been nominated either visually or verbally, whereas the reporter has been visually nominated during the actuality report in Shot 13. There is another routine in the discourse dimension, which is commonly used during the reporter's direct address in actuality sequences. In the actuality report scene in Shot 13, the reporter, at the first sight, may seem to participate as a character narrator due to her plausible involvement in the scene with other homeless characters. However, the reporter, by keeping moderate distance between her and other characters featured behind her, in Genette's (1972/1980) words, "never...yields the privilege of the narrative function" (p. 247) to any other and thus "plays only a secondary role, which almost always turns out to be a role as observer and witness" (p. 245). Also, within the same shot, the optimum framing of the reporter facing the camera at a mid-shot range sharply contrasts to the background scene (behind the reporter) which provides a long-shot of the homeless people with their backs to the camera in low-angle. All of these discourse routines of "nomination" (the reporter), "unnomination" (the homeless) and considerable camera work turn out to be endowing the "textual" reality constructed by a "framing"
narrator (the reporter) with more of a quality of neutrality, factuality and authority.

SEQUENCE 3: Reversing.

The syntagmatic function of this sequence for the most part is to elaborate the "differences" between "Us" and "Them" rendered reasonable in the previous sequence and then to reverse the direction of the cause-and-effect relation between the offender and the victim. This functional process is again verbally and visually managed through the use of actuality film sequences and interviews.

First of all, in the elaborating process of the Us : Them opposition, as is always the case, the verbal (the reporter's voice-over in particular) is seen to dominate the visual. The visual presentation appears to have an enslaved life unless its isolated shots are semiotically connected to each other within the overall narrative scheme. The elaborated "differences" themselves are then deftly exploited and translated as the "cause" of the problem itself. Once again, the visual appearances of the homeless, even when their voices are accessed, function as a lubricating role for the smooth flow of the narrative. The professional's (in this case, Robert Hayes, the representative of National Coalition for the Homeless) accessed voice is of no exception (Shot 14). It seems that once his voice is semiotically deprived of its genuine quality, being confined to a limited reaction to the issue, it only tends to corroborate the reporter's control of the narrative. The findings regarding this functional transformation are provided in the following.

The dramatic elaboration of "their" differences (from "us") is seen particularly during the series of shots in the beginning part of this sequence
(Shot 15 to 18, and 20). During these shots, the characteristics of their "difference" previously marked by "alienation," "loneliness" and "isolation" are displaced with what is commonsensically implied in more radical terms including "alcohol," "crime," "drugs" and "mental illness." However, just as the arbitrary matches between the visuals and the verbals discussed in the previous sequence, what is seen in the visual narrative in the present sequence (Shots 16 to 18, for example) does not match the text of its verbal counterpart, that is, the reporter's voice-over. That the homeless are sleeping outdoor or standing on the street does not necessarily mean that they are drunk, alcoholic or drug-addicted. The same is true in the case of the reporter's later voice-overs in Shots 20-21 and 26-28. To illustrate, while the camera (Shots 20-21) captures the graffiti on the wall saying, "GOD BLESS THIS HOME," and the homeless inside the tunnel below the street, the reporter's voice-over reads, "...For the 30 to 40 percent who have some kind of mental illness, many of their families want to help..." The verbal presentation here tends to force the arbitrary meaning of the visual to be translated as an evidence of what is being said. Through these types of transitional shots, anyway, the homeless's differences tend to turn out to be targets for blame and thus become the very cause of the problem. Moreover, even the homeless's personal problems such as "lack of money" or "patience" (Shots 26 to 28) are converted into a cause of the problem. Again, the homeless issue is transformed as a matter of individual family business and the society becomes to be seen as the victim.

This dramatic reversal of the cause-and-effect relation which is based on the present sequence's thesis, "homelessness as a family problem," is also
achieved during a series of shots (Shots 36 to 38) which have followed the reporter's recognition of a "grandfather's" intention to help his son's family and of his financial incapability to do such (Shot 35). The grandfather's voice-over on the scene of his grandsons is just enough to appeal to the viewer's feeling of "sympathy" in the humanitarian sense. Visually speaking, the high-angle shots of Mayhew's (the grandfather's son) homeless family (Shots 29-30, 37 and 39) with the alternative use of close-ups and long-range shots are also semiotically effective in evoking the emotional movement on the viewer's side. For this kind of visual presentation tends to appeal to our sympathetic feelings towards the characters, while reinforcing the quality of inferiority on them. In brief, the frequent use of close-up shots (Shots 19, 22, 26-28, 30, 36 and 38) and (extreme) long-shots for the homeless subjects (Shots 15-17, 20, 23, 39 and 41) contrasts to the optimum shots of "us" (the reporter or the professional), and thus tends to create an inferior quality for the homeless's overall image or just to reaffirm how they are "different" from ordinary people. Eventually, this sequence ends up with producing the following formulaic oppositions:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Us} & : \quad \text{Them} \\
\text{Superiority} & : \quad \text{Inferiority} \\
\text{Effect} & : \quad \text{Cause} \\
\text{Victim} & : \quad \text{Offender} \\
\text{Normal Society} & : \quad \text{The Homeless Community}
\end{align*}
\]

In the meantime, while the narrative develops concretely into the "events" of "family business," the "structural causation," the fundamental
cause of the problem, has totally disappeared from the center of the stage. Hence the reaffirmation of the following binary oppositions:

- Absence : Presence
- Structure/Institution : Individual/Family Matter
- "Issue" : "Events"
- Cause : Effects

SEQUENCE 4: Closing I.

This sequence together with the last one (Sequence 5) provides a narrative closure as it reaches a moment of temporary resolution. This resolution, being based on the humanistic sentiment within the limitation of our common sense, only concerns the isolated cases of personal experiences. Thus, it only confirms the basic interpretation of the topic, an Us : Them opposition which has already started in the very beginning of the story. At the same time, the closure has not yet revealed the "absent" part of the issue and thus avoided, in a deft way, dealing with it head-on.

This sequence begins with the reporter's voice-over on a series of shots that reveal young homeless kids playing outdoor at the playground. The voice-over (Shots 43-45), referring to an exnominated source of information, "a recent study," confirms the thesis that stresses the family breakdown as a cause of being homeless. This confirmation is then supported by a follow-up interview with a professional psychiatrist, Dr. Ellen Bassuk, who also stresses "the necessity of rebuilding supports for homeless families." To actualize this thesis, the next scene introduces a witnessing case to us, a "transitional house" in Boston, Massachusetts, where a group of homeless families as a "surrogate family" (Shot 53) can stay as long as a year. This scene is visually
comprised of some routine shots of the inside of that house. These shots reveal babies and kids playing together with their mothers in mostly normal angle and mid-range shots (Shots 51-52 and 54-56), and two actuality interview scenes in normal angle and (mid-) close-ups (Shots 53 and 57), which emphasize our common-sense family values. One interesting point here is that during these scenes, no extreme camera work such as extreme-close-up, extreme-long and high/low-angle shots has been taken. This gives a keen contrast to the previous shots (extreme-long and high angle shots for Mayhew families in Shots 27, 37 and 39, for example) where the homeless are often viewed from weird angles or distances. That is to say, the orientation of the discourse has now been reaching a certain point of resolution that confirms the family value as its major thesis.

Finally, as the reporter is wrapping up the sequence with her voice-over narration that once again stresses the value of family unity as the "cure" (Shot 60) to the problem, the visual part presents typical homeless images of those who are on the streets (Shots 58-59). The visual image of these two shots suggests that the voiceless homeless on the street, not as autonomous individuals but as a collective, are no more than a collective symbol for the family breakdown. In addition, the last shot (S 62) just before the anchor's studio report in particular, demonstrates a dramatic effect as it features a woman holding a baby in her arms and looking out the window from inside the transitional house. The initial medium-shot of that woman in normal angle with warm and soft lighting is slowly zoomed-in and turns out as an optimum medium-close-up. This scene is semiotically very productive in supporting the narrative's temporal but ideological resolution suggested in
this sequence. Meanwhile, the structurally oriented issue has been translated as a matter of individual family "events" in the "absence" of institution from the scene. Thus the final interpretation of the closing sequence is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{US} &: \text{ THEM} \\
\text{Ordinary Society} &: \text{ The Homeless Community} \\
\text{Family Unity} &: \text{ Family Breakdown} \\
\text{Effect} &: \text{ Cause} \\
\text{Victim ("done-by")} &: \text{ Offender ("doer")} \\
\text{and} \\
\text{ABSENCE} &: \text{ PRESENCE} \\
\text{Structural Cause} &: \text{ Effect} \\
\text{(Institution)} &: \text{ (Individuals)} \\
\text{Issue} &: \text{ Events}
\end{align*}
\]

\textit{SEQUENCE 5: Closing II.}

Back into Shot 1, the anchor turns his eyes from the monitor and addresses to the camera ("us") his final words. As is always the case, this shot and Shot 1 are the only ones that are taken in the studio, which, as the most neutral and objective looking shots throughout the whole discourse, warrant the anchor's higher status as a real "heterodiegetic" camera narrator, compared to other characters including the reporter. Thus, the anchor's gaze functions as an ultimate window through which, in Morse's (1986) words, "all other 'views' of the world must be relayed, including the public's view of itself" (p. 67). Due to this authoritative, omnipotent and reliable quality of the anchor's "position," he is able to comfort the viewer and relieve the tensions accumulated throughout the narrative. His concluding remarks
sound as if he were saying to us "We have some problems out there. But don't worry. I'll take care of them. Everything will be fine with you. You have a good night."

**Mental Illness and the Homeless**

*Segment title: "Special Segment"*

<12/18/85. NBC. 5:42:40-5:57:40 (5:00)>

(For key to abbreviations, see Appendix C)

The total running time of this episode is 5 minutes devoted to 9 sequences for 57 shots. The average length of a shot is 5.3 seconds. On the one hand, this episode tells us a story about the homeless who are mentally ill in general. On the other hand, it also deals with the conflict between deinstitutionalization and reinstitutionalization. In any case, the anchor's (Tom Brokaw) introduction of the episode in Sequence 1, consisting of 3 shots for 35 seconds, proposes two questions to be answered in this particular episode, "how they ended up on the street" and "how we can treat them now." Sequence 2 and 3 run 35 seconds for 7 shots and 41 seconds for 12 shots respectively. These two sequences have been devoted to the actualization of the topic in terms of the "immediate effects" of deinstitutionalization. They introduce us two actual cases, while providing us with some basic historical and statistical background information about the issue of deinstitutionalization. Sequence 4 includes 4 shots for 41 seconds and Sequence 5, 7 shots for 27 seconds. As the episode moves on to this third stage, the "differences" between "us" and "them" are fully developed and witnessed through actuality sequences and interviews as well as the reporter's (Lisa Myers) voice-over narration. This establishment of "differences" then
leads us to the reversal of the cause-and-effect relation in the following 2 sequences. Sequence 6 and 7 consist of 10 shots for 43 seconds and 9 shots for 54 seconds respectively. In this stage, the victim's (the mental patient's) different appearance from "us" becomes to be translated as a cause of the social disruption. That is, their dangerous personalities and reluctant attitudes at medication are seen as the major concern for the moment. The closing sequences, Sequence 8 and 9 include 4 shots and 1 shot for 21 seconds and 3 seconds of running time respectively. The narrative closure here does not seem to suggest any resolution point for the topic. Instead, it only reaffirms the insolvable conflict between deinstitutionalization and reinstitutionalization by appealing to our sense of humanity.

SEQUENCE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shot #</th>
<th>Visual</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ES a partial view of Chicago over the frozen river; superimposed, 'Chicago. -2 '.</td>
<td>DA Tom Brokaw (the anchor): By this morning, there was no room left...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ES another view of Chicago by the lake.</td>
<td>DA Tom Brokaw: ...in any of the city's forty shelters for the homeless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MCU, SA Brokaw in LF; dark suit, tie; &quot;hanging&quot; box in RF, HL sitting on bench, with episode title, &quot;The Homeless&quot; at bottom of box.</td>
<td>DA Tom Brokaw: Of course, during winter storms like that one, we worry most about people who live on the street. And today the federal federal private foundation announced one hundred million dollar project to aid the homeless</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in this country. It will help eight
cities deal with the problems of the
street people who are mentally ill.
Authorities say that at least half of
all the homeless now are mentally
disturbed. On Special Segment
tonight, NBC news correspondent
Lisa Myers examines the difficult
questions, how they ended up on
the street in the first place and
how we can treat them now.

SEQUENCE 2

4 ES, SA run-down warehouse
over wire-fence near
camera; ambulance passes
by; camera fast ZI
towards CU window.

VO Lisa Myers (LM) (The
reporter):
(ambulance's "siren" fades away)
There are no bars on the window.
But, for many who pay fifty
dollars a week to live here,...

5 Dissolve to LS, SA lower
part of stairs; dark;
camera fast TU showing
LA steps and railings
towards ceiling.

VO LM:
...this run-down warehouse has
become a make-shift asylum.

6 Dissolve to CU, SA Mark
in Sil; face not discernible;
indoors.

VO LM:
Mark tried to kill himself twice.

7 LS, SA Mark and Terry
standing in LF, Sil; face
not discernible; wear hood-
jackets; shabby room.

VO LM:
He recently was discharged from
a mental hospital.

8 CU, SA Mark in counter-
light; half of face in dim-
light.

VO LM:
He says, he wasn't ready.

OnS Mark:
When he told me to leave, I was like,...I couldn't believe it. It was like, I shook all over, walked into my doctor's office and said, "Where am I gonna go?"

**VO LM:**
Terry also has been hospitalized before.

**VO LM:**
She recently tried unsuccessfully to commit herself again.

**OnS Terry:**
I don't know. I just figured out, I'd rather be in mental institution than on the streets.

**SEQUENCE 3**

**11**
ES, LA outlook old style mental institution over ground stone/cement embankment near camera; falling dead leaves in wind.

**VO LM:**
(wind howling)
A state mental institution.
Old style.

**12**
MS, SA female patient in dark; weird body gesture; indoors.

**VO LM:**
For twenty years ago, people like Mark and Terry might have lived indefinitely.

**13**
MS, SA legs of sitted man in dim-light; swaying back and forth.

**VO LM:**
But horror stories, the advent of anti-psychotic drugs and...

**14**
LS, LA group of inmates walking up and down; dark, indoors.

**VO LM:**
...economics prompted the decisions to empty the hospitals.

**15**
ELS, HA group of inmates
sitting around in room; light.

16 LS, SA man standing in a fix against wall; he/she wears strange white long wig; face covered with something black; woman passes by.

VO LM: Only 120,000 mental patients remain hospitalized nationwide. Government...

VO LM: ...estimates say, there is as many as eight times that number. Perhaps one million acutely and chronically mentally ill are...

17 MLS, SA man standing with hand raised onto head; weird looking; face blackened by superimposed mark; passer-by looks at him; on sidewalk.

18 Wipe to ELS, SA many Hls in shelter kitchen.

VO LM: ...in shelters,...

19 Wipe to ES, LA outlook of jail building.

VO LM: ...in jail,...

20 Wipe to ELS, HA man in sitting on bed; blue sport jacket; face not discernible due to camera distance/ angle.

VO LM: ...in run-down buildings or...

21 Wipe to MS, SA man on sidewalk among passers-by; he looks like music-conducting; face blackened by super-imposition.

VO LM: ...on the streets.

22 MCU, SA Dr. Talbott; dark suit, tie; against light color background.

OnS Dr. John Talbott (American Psychiatric Association): What we have today with thousands of people wandering around, mentally ill is much the
same as it was in really colonial times.

SEQUENCE 4

23 MS, SA reporter in front of old (hospital) building; red suit; TC name; camera slow ZI to MCU of her.

DA LM:
Closing down the hospitals and intriguing the people in the community was supposed to be cheaper and more humane. It has been cheaper because the array of community supports services was never fully developed. But, for many, it has not been more humane. And, national psychiatric task force says for the sake of the sick, it has been an indescribable disaster.

24 CU, SA Audrey; white, middle-aged.

OnS Audrey:
I thought somebody coming on to me. And I could see his face. And, and, he came on to me. I tell you, it's Jesus Christ.

25 LS, SA group of people discussing at table; peeped through door.

VO LM:
For 7 months, Audrey lost her reality and just walked. Now she is safe in a group home. But she remembers.

26 ECU, SA Audrey.

OnS Audrey:
I didn't wanna come out. I wanted to reside.

SEQUENCE 5

27 ELS, SA HLs in shelter; moving to somewhere.

VO LM:
Last year, a study of this Boston shelter...
28 LS, SA HLs in shelter; chattering around. VO LM: ...found that more than 60 percent of the homeless...

29 ECU, HA black male HL; woolen hat. VO LM: ...were schizophrenic or had some other severe mental disorder.

30 CU, SA hands; black hand receiving pills from white hand. Offs Man 1: You need to take this nip pill. Offs Man 2: Uh, um.

31 ES, LA upper part of old church-like building. VO LM: Across the nation, those who run shelters complain they become...

32 ELS, EHA HLs sleeping on mattresses in shelter floor at night. VO LM: ...make-shift mental wards. Offs Rev. John Steinbruck: All kinds of imagined nightmares, bizarre behaviors, confused...

33 MCU, SA Rev. Steinbruck; priest uniform with flannel shirt on. Ons Rev. Steinbruck: ...identities, everything that you can imagine existed in the mental hospital is here now. It's on the floor of the church.

SEQUENCE 6

34 MLS, SA three female VO LM:
inmates; standing woman talks (shouts) to the others sitting on chairs; inside hospital.

35 MS, SA (female) inmate; eating something in dark; not discernible. VO LM: ...ill be forced back into the hospitals...

36 MS, SA white female inmate; crouching on the floor; head in arms on knees. VO LM: ...for their own good?"

37 MCU, SA Dr. Cohen in light-brown suit, tie; talking to someone out of frame in RF; outdoor. VO LM: Dr. Neil Cohen thinks so.

38 MS, SA Dr. Cohen and woman in profile with hat on; having talk. VO LM: He sees mentally ill street people everyday, people like this elderly woman who says she owns the post office.

39 MCU, SA Dr. Cohen. OnS Dr. Neil Cohen: About a third of this people will benefit from asylum. They will benefit from being in a hospital. And the needs for the hospital will not diminish over time.

40 Wipe to ELS, SA lots of inmates in hospital hall; standing/walking here and there; camera pans L to reveal others. VO LM: But those who worry about the civil rights of the mentally ill warn that could mean a return to the bad old days...

41 LS, SA four inmates taking rest in sofas. VO LM: ...when people were warehoused and kept out of sight.
42  LS, HA lower part of body lying on sidewalk; peeped through cement structures; street pigeon staggering by him.

**OffS Lawyer, Darcy Dumont:**
State officials don't want to be stepping on them when they're doing the Christmas shopping.

43  CU, SA Dumont; white female; casual clothing; TC name.

**OnS Lawyer, Dumont:**
One quick solution is reopening the antiquated state hospitals.

SEQUENCE 7

44  MS, HA woman bending towards to talk to HL in card-board box beside bench in park; camera TU/PL to MS woman and Dr. Cohen; woman in sun-glasses, dark jacket and skirt.

**OffS Man:**
Don't bother me. Get away from...

**VO LM:**
Because the sickers of the sick often refuse treatment,...

45  MLS, SA woman walking R to L on sidewalk, weird gesture, raising hand up and down; passers-by; face blackened by super-imposition; camera PL to follow.

**VO LM:**
...psychiatrists also want the change or more loosely interpret commitment laws.

46  MLS, SA HL old man digging in trash-can on busy sidewalk; lots of passers-by in front/behind him.

**VO LM:**
Now people can be committed against their will only if they pose a danger to themselves or others.

47  MS, SA lower part of body in the dark on sidewalk; camera TU to upper portion of man's body standing / looking at something in L.

**VO LM:**
As interpreted by the courts, that generally requires attempted suicide or even attempted murder.
VO LM:
Until recently, psychiatrists insisted that mentally ill street people generally were not dangerous. But assaults have increased.

OffS Dr. Ellen Bassuk
(Psychiatrist):
I do think there's reason to be frightened.

OnS Dr. Bassuk:
You can't predict who's gonna act dangerously and who's not.

VO LM:
Still for the vast majority, the biggest danger is that they'll kill themselves through neglect.

OnS Dr. Talbott:
It is no freedom to freeze to death on a subway grate. It is no freedom to eat out of garbage cans.

OnS Lawyer, Dumont:
They have been involuntarily hospitalized and involuntarily medicated. And, they're not interested in doing that again.

VO LM:
(low, buzzing sound effect)
It is an extremely difficult choice.
54 Dissolve to ELS, SA inmates sitting/standing in hospital hall.

VO LM: Even if society temporarily takes away their freedom and...

55 MS, HA female inmate's legs walking R to L; camera TU/PL to MS, SA woman in BC; sport jacket; weird body movement.

VO LM: ...forces treatment, modern psychiatry can't guarantee that most will get better.

56 Dissolve to MLS, SA old woman in BC crossing street; sleeveless parka; camera ZO to ELS city view; street signboard reads, "Mass. Turnpike...."

VO LM: But leaving them alone condemns many to a life-time unheeded voices and endlessly walking the streets. Lisa Myers. NBC News, Boston. (ambient street sound)

SEQUENCE 9

57 Dissolve to LS, SA the anchor sitting at desk; chin in hand; in deep thought.

(signal music)

Interpretation

SEQUENCE 1: Framing.

The sequence begins with Tom Brokaw's introduction of the day's topic by the mode of direct address just as usual. As the anchor addresses, the story of this particular episode "sounds like" one about mentally ill homeless people. Closing up the present sequence, he proposes two questions to be examined by the reporter, Lisa Myers; the questions are "how they the mentally ill homeless] ended up on the street" and "how we can treat them now" (Shot 3).
Above all, as explicitly expressed in the anchor's address, "...during winter storms like that one, we worry most about people who..." as well as in the above wording of questions, what seems preliminary taken for granted is our basic opposition, US : THEM. In this particular episode, unlike the previous analysis, the above opposition seems quite clear from the beginning. Secondly, what is featured in the above quotation is an initial narrativistic shift of the viewer's attention from the hard aspect of the issue to our common sense. For the anchor opens his address by bringing to our attention the fact that some people have no place to go in such a stormy winter time, which touches very well our everyday sense of humanity. One more thing to note about the verbal presentation is that institutions are readily "exonominated" as a collective abstract "authority." By referring to "the federal government," "a private foundation," "eight cities" or "authorities" as information/action sources, the anchor appears to be telling the "truth" which is based on objective and reliable "facts" so as not to be questioned of its validity. On the other hand, as will be revealed more in detail, the "THEM" side in the US : THEM opposition is always represented by carefully selected individuals who are to be semiotically exploited only to tell the immediate effects of the issue, that is, "how they feel about being homeless or mentally ill."

On the visual level, above all, the first two shots serve as metonyms for signifying the urban areas in the cold winter season. The first shot in particular supports the anchor's verbal introduction of stormy cold weather as it shows a frozen river crossing the city with superimposed temperature information, "Chicago. - 2°" on the upper part of the screen. The partial views
of Chicago with frozen river and lake at long distances also have metonymic signification that refers to the whole city or to other metropolitan areas in general. The interesting point in this case is that while the visual presentation begins with pictures of Chicago, the place where the reporter has narrated the story is identified as Boston at the end of the episode. This demonstrates how the pictures of Chicago are metonymically used to refer to Boston. Secondly, these shots, due to their metonymic nature, function to limit the viewer's expectation of the story's setting to what would happen in urban areas, that is, the mentally ill homeless in big cities.

The visual presentation of a homeless person in the "hanging" box also has a metonymic function. That is, the portrayal of an elderly homeless man "sitting on the street bench" in shabby clothing is a typical shot of the homeless throughout the whole sample. As exemplified in most of the sample narratives for the present study, "sitting on the street bench" is one of those "regulars" very often used by the news-teams to signify "homelessness." Other "regulars" may include the scenes in which the homeless in dirty clothing are seen aimlessly standing here and there, waiting in soup lines, walking along the streets, pulling the grocery carts along the streets, sleeping on the sidewalks, digging in the trash cans and so on. These scenes are so typical that the viewers can not miss their signification once exposed to them previously.

**SEQUENCE 2/SEQUENCE 3: Differentiating I.**

Mostly at the verbal level, these two sequences focus our attention to the basic state of affairs including the present conditions of the mentally ill
homeless and their historical/statistical background. This is done mostly by the reporter's voice-over narration on actuality films and three actuality interviews with two former mental institution inmates, Mark and Terry (Shots 8 and 10) and a psychiatrist, Dr. Talbott (Shot 22). On the visual level, on the other hand, the topic is focused on the "immediate effects" caused by deinstitutionalization, that is, how the former patients feel about being out on the streets (Sequence 2). At the same time, it reveals how "they" (the mental patients) are different from ordinary people in terms of, so to speak, behavioral "abnormality" (Sequence 3). Whereas the overall theme for this particular sequences is interpreted as a Deinstitutionalization:

Institutionalization opposition, a typical metaphoric use of Dark : Light :: Evil : Good oppositions identified from actuality scenes is peculiar.

Most of all, the tension of a Deinstitutionalization : Institutionalization opposition is dramatized by the use of a complex combination of three semiotic, visual and aural elements including: "camera-work" such as fast-zoom, dissolve and fast tilt-up in a row; "lighting" remarkable in such techniques as counterlight picturings (mostly in Sequence 1: Shots 6-9) and dark room shots (mostly in Sequence 2: Shots 12-15); "sound effect" including "siren" (Shot 4) and "howling wind" (Shot 11). In the meanwhile, the above semiotic elements are selected by the news-makers not on a random basis, but on the basis of careful paradigmatic considerations to maximize their dramatic effects. And, they are webbed together in such a complex way that their strategical use in metaphoric and metonymic significations is not to be easily identified. The following discussion illustrates how this complex
semiotic web works to create certain ideological effects in the present sequences.

The first thing to note is that the opening scenes for both sequences dramatically resemble each other, as each of them creates a "horror" effect when particular semiotic elements are juxtaposed for the metaphorical and metonymical effect at the same time. To illustrate, in Shot 4, a scary-looking run-down warehouse building is seen at a long distance with an effect of ambient sound which is created by a "siren" of an ambulance that accidentally passes by the building. In addition, the building is seen over "wire fence" near the location of camera and from a diagonal perspective to its left side in a slight low angle. Similarly, Shot 11 features the mental institution by taking it from the same diagonal perspective at a long distance as in Shot 4. But this time, the building is seen in a lower angle than Shot 4 and over the top portion of stone and cement "embankment" on the ground also with a horror sound effect created by howling wind. What is interesting in these two shots is that "wire fence" and "stone and cement embankment" resemble each other in that both of them serve as metonyms to remind the viewer of such "off-limits" referents as prison, correctional camp, asylum and, of course, other mental institutions. This metonymic signification then functions as a metaphor for "abnormality" and in its extreme sense, for "evil." In addition, it should be noted that these two shots, once paradigmatically selected, have been arranged in a syntagmatic relation. The metaphoric use of the scene (Shot 4) for "abnormality" or "evil," once created previously, is then now metonymically related to a scene (Shot 11) which is simultaneously in a syntagmatic relation with the former. Once the
paradigmatic selection of semiotic elements including camera distance, angle and perspective in a particular way has been established for a certain image construction ("evil," for example in this case), these signifiers as a whole function as a metonymic element for similar scenes later on which once again metaphorically signifies the same image or concept, "evil."

The same is true to the symbolic use of ambient sounds ("siren" and "howling wind") in those two shots. At first sight, the "siren" in Shot 4 has a metonymic signification for something urgent which usually turns out to be bad or unfortunate according to "our" "common sense:" "accident," "death," "fire," "crime," etc., for example. On second thought, in its relation to the present narrative, "siren" also serves as a metaphoric signifier for referring to something more abstract which seems "undesirable" such as "abnormality," or "evil." This metaphoric use of "siren," along with the visuals, is then metonymically connected to "howling wind" in Shot 11. For we now know that just as "siren" did before, "howling wind" as an ambience also connotes, in its relation to the scene's context, something undesirable, which may occur in the dark side of life. In sum, as analyzed so far, the eventual effects induced in the visual and aural semiotics of these two scenes are very productive, and this is due to their "complex web" of semiotic devices including paradigmatic selections, syntagmatic arrangements, and symbolic devices of metaphor and metonymy.

In the meantime, returning to Sequence 1, the camera's fast zoom-in close to the building (Shot 4) and an immediately following dissolve to a low-angle shot of dark stairways and rapid tilt-up movement to reveal the steps and railings towards the ceiling inside the building (Shot 5), all of these, as
they occur in a short shot duration (about 9 seconds), also have a dramatic
effect in increasing the tension of a The Desirable (Good) : The Undesirable
(Evil) opposition.

Moreover, as Shot 4 is dissolved to a low-angle shot of dark stairways
inside the building, the The Desirable : The Undesirable interpretation is
metaphorically supported both by a visual discourse, "darkness" and the
anchor's counterpart verbal discourse which uses the metaphor of "make-
shift asylum" (Shot 5) for the run-down warehouse building. In the
following series of shots, again, the visuals of the former patients, Mark and
Terry are taken totally or partially against the light inside the building while
they are being interviewed. These counter-light shots in combination with
the warehouse shots display a successful use of Dark : Light opposition and
thus signify a common-sense Evil : Good opposition. Besides this, the
various strategies of camera work, low-angles (Shots 5-6), close-ups (Shots 6-9)
and subject's location in the left-hand side of screen (Shot 7) also contribute to
semitic construction of reality, help in increasing the tension and thus
arouse among the viewers an unfavorable feeling towards the characters.
What about Sequence 3 then?

Largely consisting of two verbal presentations, one being a reporter's
voice-over and the other, an actuality interview with a psychiatrist, Sequence
3 provides historical and statistical background information about the
emergence of mentally ill homeless people. Visually speaking however, all
shots, with exceptions of one establishing shot of outlook of a mental
institution and one interview shot, are devoted to actualizing the homologic
Dark : Light :: The Undesirable (Evil) : The Desirable (Good) oppositions
which have already been set up in Sequence 2. This semiotic effect of the visual is particularly true to a series of shots (Shots 12-14) just after the establishing shot of the mental institution in the beginning of the sequence. In these shots, the mental patients ("they") are featured as being different from "us" as they look like they are demonstrating their weird body movements and gestures in the dark. This scene consists of a low-angle shot of a group of those uneasily behaving patients at a long distance in the dark (Shot 14), a close-up of one patient's restless looking legs (Shot 13) and a shot of a female patient dancing weirdly (Shot 12). Ironically, most shots are not well matched with their counterpart verbals, that is, the reporter's voice-over narration which provides some superficial information as to the issue. Instead, it seems that they function only to reveal how those mentally ill are "different" from those who are normal and ordinary (presumably, "us"). Once again, the metaphor of "dark" for something "undesirable" and finally for the quality of "them" who are mentally ill is reiterated by means of syntagmatic arrangement of metonymic relations.

Moreover, just as "their" detailed appearances have hardly been able to be discerned visually so far, most of subjects's faces can not be distinguished due to superimposed black marks on them (Shots 17 and 21) or because of the use of long-distance shots. The implication of this is that "they" are again not to be identified as autonomous individuals, but only as a "collective function" that serves as a human lubricant for the "slick" flow of the narrative as a whole. The status of the professional character (Dr. John Talbott in this case) is of no exception, as it is also meaningful only within the overall context of the narrative. While he is given a comparatively favorable
semiotic framing in Shot 22 (a typical optimum shot in medium close-up and standard angle), his interview scene functions only as a lead-in role for the opening of the following sequence. All of these semiotic elements, put together, bring forth a following interpretation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{US} & : \quad \text{THEM} \\
\text{Ordinary People} & : \quad \text{The Mentally Ill Homeless} \\
\text{Normality} & : \quad \text{Abnormality} \\
\text{Light} & : \quad \text{Dark} \\
\text{The Desirable (Good)} & : \quad \text{The Undesirable (Evil)}
\end{align*}
\]

SEQUENCE 4/SEQUENCE 5: Differentiating II.

Through these sequences, the "abnormality" of "them" is elaborated and reaffirmed through the use of actuality scenes with voice-over and interviews. Sequence 4 begins with a reporter directly addressing the camera (seemingly to "us"), in which she states the government's failure in deinstitutionalizing the mentally ill; Yet, the reporter speaks mostly from a humanitarian perspective. The framing of the reporter in this shot is seen as contrasting sharply to the shots of the mental patients which have been discussed earlier. Contrary to such semiotic elements as the fast movement in camera work and long distance and low-angle shots with dark lighting given to the mental patients in Sequence 2 and 3, the optimum framing of the reporter with a slow zoom-in from the medium-distance to medium-close-up with good lighting endows her status with a natural-looking, rational, neutral and realistic quality.

In the meantime, the reporter's address is cut to an actuality interview of Audrey, a mental patient (Shot 24). During this shot, "they" have a chance
for "accessed" voice through an isolated example of Audrey. However, "their" voice is merely exploited to actualize their "difference," which eventually functions as a witness of the reporter's previous comment, "indescribable disaster" (Shot 23). Again, this interview shot serves as a lubricant for the flow of the narrative. The same is also true to the cases of Shots 29 and 30 in Sequence 5, where an unidentified homeless man is given an extreme close-up shot in high angle or a close-up of hands receiving pills from some one. While this person is uttering something, it is not heard by us at all (Shot 29) and only functions as an ambient sound (Shot 30). Due to his role as a "embedded" character narrator, like Audrey in Shots 24 and 26, he simply happens to be there, once being paradigmatically selected and syntagmatically arranged. Otherwise, his presence as an individual is not meaningful. Finally, Rev. John Steinbruck's actuality interview (Shots 32 and 33) wraps up the sequence while concretizing the US: THEM :: NORMALITY: ABNORMALITY oppositions by his verbal statement, "All kinds of imagined nightmares, bizarre behaviors, confused identities...is here now....on the floor of the church."

As an intermediate summing-up, the last 5 sequences are seen as dealing with the anchor's first question, "How they [the mentally ill homeless] ended up on the street" proposed in his introductory address. On the whole, it can be argued that the answer to this question has been avoided in a strict sense. Put another way, the structural, hard nature of the issue has been altered into a soft matter of humanism. To illustrate, it has been found that the focus of the narrative so far has been laid on actualizing how the government's decision of deinstitutionalization has affected those who are
involved in it. During this process, however, the issue itself, as is often the case, seems to have been "disappearing," since the narrative has been dealing with the issue in such a way that only provides us with some isolated examples to show the problem's immediate effects on the personal level. The major business of the visual presentations in particular, seems to have been dramatically displaying how the mentally ill people are "different" from "us." The visual presentations of those who are mentally ill have not been allowed to hold any autonomous meanings that could have their repressed and silenced voices be heard in society. Consequently, their "individualities" as human beings have disappeared while leaving behind only their impersonal collective "functions" which then serve as a lubricating role for the "realistic" flow of the narrative. In this way, the narrative has been as successful in mediating the viewer and "them" (the world of the mentally ill) as it has been in translating an unfamiliar world into a comprehensible one for the viewer. And this achievement has been possible partially due to semiotic exploitations both on the level of the visual and the verbal by means of metaphoric/metonymic transformations of the abstract into the concrete and the concrete into the abstract.

**SEQUENCE 6/SEQUENCE 7: Reversing.**

Syntagmatically speaking, these sequences are very important because of the quality of their role as a turning point towards the reversed direction of the cause-and-effect relationship between "US" and "THEM." Based on the definition of "differences" between "US" and "THEM" which has been built up so far, the present sequences are seen as having transformed the victim's
status formerly as an "effect" of structural problems into that of the cause of
the social problem itself.

As a skirmish of the turning point, Sequence 6 is mostly devoted to
establishing the reasonable context for the next movement. Above all, this
sequence calls the viewer's attention to the original issue of this particular
episode, which has been initially set up as a Deinstitutionalization:
Institutionalization opposition in the very beginning of the episode. This
awakening mission is then conducted through actuality scenes with the
reporter's voice-over narration and actuality interviews with two
professionals, Dr. Neil Cohen (Shot 39) and a lawyer, Darcy Dumont (Shot 43).
On the other hand, although the reporter's voice-over contrasts the merits of
reinstitutionalization to those of deinstitutionalization, the overall
orientation tends to favor the former. Both of the two professionals in the
actuality interviews are also seen as supporting reinstitutionalization. As we
have already discussed, these two professionals are not random samples for
interviews, but samples carefully selected and arranged in a particular way in
accordance with a well-planned overall scheme. As "embedded" narrators,
their voices are always subjugated to the voice of the reporter who assumes
the "framing" role of the narrative. In addition, the reporter's brief mention
about the other camp's claim which concerns the civil rights of the mentally
ill (Shots 40-41) is seen as serving as a verbal "inoculation" only for the sake
of the narrative's orientation towards the favor of "institutionalization." The
claim for reinstitutionalization is now seen as being immune to the danger of
being rebutted.
In the meantime, on the visual discourse level, no mental patient has been given a chance for "accessed" voice. Their visuals are used merely to reinforce US : THEM :: Normality : Abnormality oppositions. Without this functional role, they are not meaningful. The present sequence begins with a medium-close-up shot of some inmates in the institution, in which a female inmate's shouting voice (not figurable) immediately fades out. This shot is then cut to shots where the subject's faces are not discernible since one patient sitting on a chair is eating something in the "dark" and the other is crouching on the floor with her head in her arms. What the viewers see here are mere symbolically oriented objects that metonymically remind us of pre-established concepts of their "differences." As the viewers have become "familiar" with their abnormal features which have been shown many times, their clothing, weird behaviors and gestures as well as "darkness" are now a metonymic signifier as a whole for their "difference."

The same is also true to a later series of shots (Shots 38 and 41-43) in which unidentified subjects at indoor or outdoor setting are seen only as metonymic symbols. The metonymic symbol of a bird (a street "pigeon") in Shot 42 in particular gives us an interesting point. In this shot, a lower half of his body between blurred visions of cement pillars is seen lying on the street corner in a long-distance, high-angle framing. While his body is being peeped through like this, a street pigeon is also seen staggering beside him. The scene of the homeless with a bird like this is not unique here alone, since this kind of shot is seen in other places too. For example, in a typical shot of the homeless sitting on the street bench in one of CBS's "Eye On America" episodes (12/23/91), a pigeon is seen flying down on the ground just in front
of a crippled homeless person on the street. Similarly, one of ABC's "American Agenda" episodes (12/06/88) also features a pigeon staggering in front of a homeless person sitting on the street bench. A signification of a picture of "pigeon" here is then more than a bird as a neutral status. It is a metonymic signifier for "the homeless," which now works inter-episodically across the visual narratives about the homeless. Being exposed to this kind of "reiteration," the viewers have become accustomed to the unfamiliar scenes that have metonymically been transformed into the familiar. In addition, this "pigeon" also has a metaphorical meaning for the homeless while holding a metonymic significance. That is, as the homeless are juxtaposed with the bird within the same frame, his status is semiotically relegated to a part of the world of bird. This is, of course, different from a typical movie shot where an ordinary person is feeding the birds around him/her in such places as public squares or river-sides.

Moving on to Sequence 7, the reporter's verbal presentation (Shots 44-48 and 50) is seen again dominating the visual with the help of a professional's "inoculation" effect from actuality interviews (Shots 49 and 52). While visually reaffirming the narrative's pre-established thesis on "their differences," the narrative now moves on to a so-called, "victim-blaming" perspective, on the ground that the mentally ill homeless are "dangerous" since they "commit suicide" or even "murder" sometimes. The focus of attention is now given to the question of whether they are dangerous or not. The thesis of "reinstitutionalization" as a favorable choice being taken-for-granted now, the whole argument for this particular sequence is that the mentally ill not only "refuse treatment" (Shot 44) but also are the cause of
social disruption itself (Shots 48-50); If we keep them out on the streets, it is going to be a threat to the peace and order of society.

For the time being, the visuals of the homeless which are voiced-over mostly by the reporter function to reinforce the thesis of "difference" as they displaying the homeless as metaphoric (standing in the "dark" in Shot 47) and metonymic symbols (wandering in shabby clothing on busy streets in Shots 45, sleeping on the streets in Shots 45 and 50, digging in the trash cans in Shot 46, or causing disorder in Shot 48). In addition, they are rarely nominated during the access to the visual, which contrasts to verbal or visual nominations of other characters such as Dr. Cohen (Shot 37), Dr. Bassuk (Shot 49), Lawyer, Dumont (Shot 43) and Dr. Talbott (Shot 22). All of these semiotic elements as symbolic signifiers, function to confirm the mentally ill's (homeless) "collective" nature for the sake of narrative's flow. After all, the following summed-up interpretation has been met for this particular sequence:

**US** : **THEM**

The Orderly Society : The Mentally Ill Community

Victim : Cause

(Social Disruption) (Social Danger)

**SEQUENCE 8/SEQUENCE 9: Closing.**

The narrative closure here does not seem to offer any serious commitment towards a specific resolution for the original question, "How we treat them." However, it verbally confirms the thesis that the mentally ill homeless should be taken off the streets on the grounds of "our"
humanitarian morality, since "leaving them alone [on the streets]" is morally wrong because it "condemns many to a life-time of unheeded voices and endlessly walking the streets" (Shot 56).

The aural effect of Shot 53 in the opening of this sequence is peculiar as it is metonymically and metaphorically used to refer to "The Undesirable" which has been discussed earlier in the present analysis. While this shot features the scary looking mental institution with several windows in a dim-lit blue tone from its outside, the viewer hears a strange, heavy buzzing sound which can be easily identified by us as an artificial sound effect which has been added through the editing process. This shot, with its overall color tone and sound effect, reminds us of a typical scene out of a horror movie, which plays most of the time the function of foreshadowing some bad luck in the future. The metaphoric use of these semiotic elements for an abstract concept, "The Undesirable," or "Evil" has been already discussed in the analysis of Sequence 2 and 3. It also should be noted that these semiotic symbols, once used previously in the same narrative, serve as metonymic signifiers for the viewer's metaphoric imagination of specific signifieds.

Finally, the anchor's position in Sequence 9 relieves the viewer from the tension accumulated so far and gives us an impression that he really cares for "us," as he is seen sitting and pondering in his chair like Rodin's famous sculptor, "The Thinker" at his studio desk. This kind of framing for the anchor seems very rare. In fact, within my sample, this is the only one which shows a metaphoric use of the anchor in this way.
Hostility towards the Homeless

Segment title: "Eye On America"
<12/23/91. CBS. 5:49:50-5:54:20 p.m. (4:27)>
(For key to abbreviations, see Appendix C)

This particular episode tends to reflect the public's growing antagonism against the homeless people. This is then a story about the conflict between the middle class community and the homeless. The episode runs 4 minutes and 27 seconds in total consisting of 62 shots with an average length of 4.3 seconds for each shot. Sequence 1 includes 2 shots and lasts 18 seconds. As is often the case, this sequence immediately shows us that the way of dealing with the topic can be limited within our personal emotional level. To illustrate, Harry Smith's (the anchor) use of such terms, "compassion fatigue" and "intolerance" already indicates the nature of the following episode. Sequence 2 lasts 46 seconds and consists of 13 seconds. The major function of this sequence seems to differentiate the homeless from the middle class as the middle class community's rally defines the homeless as "back yard" people and "Bowery bums." The actuality films also support this thesis. Sequence 3 includes 19 shots for 85 seconds. As the sequence develops, we are invited to view more about the middle class's anger about locating the homeless into their neighborhoods. Throughout this sequence, four major characters who are "supposed" to be representing the middle class are introduced as they express their "feelings" in furious emotional tones. One interviewee, for example, uses a metaphor of "cancer" for the homeless. This marks one of those significant moments by which the homeless is blamed as the cause itself for the social problem. Interestingly, it is not until the next sequence that the homeless's side ever has its voice accessed. Sequence 4 includes 12 shots and
lasts 45 seconds. This sequence as a whole, is devoted to confirming the reversed causal relation between society ("us") and individual ("the homeless"). Although the homeless's side is allowed to speak, their voices function as an "inoculation" effect only to strengthen the given thesis. The last sequence lasts 73 seconds for 16 shots. As the reporter revisits the middle classes's "representatives" whom we have already met since Sequence 2, the episode moves towards the closing point. The narrative closure here basically reaffirms the binary oppositions which have already been started in the beginning of the episode.

**SEQUENCE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shot #</th>
<th>Visual</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MS, SA Smith in LF; dark suit, tie; &quot;hanging&quot; box behind him features title of segment, &quot;Eye On America&quot;; camera pans slowly R to L; MCU Smith in CF; &quot;hanging&quot; box being out of frame; eye-contact.</td>
<td><strong>DA Harry Smith (The anchor):</strong> Some people call it &quot;compassion fatigue,&quot; the state in which people feel they've done all they can for those in need. Others just call it &quot;intolerance.&quot; It's the new barrier that is rising before America's homeless people this Christmas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEQUENCE 2**

| 2      | Computer graphic of vertical stripes in white red and blue, with segment title on them. | **DA Harry Smith:** Bob Faw has tonight's "Eye On America." |
| 3      | Wipe to CU the U.S. flag; camera tilts down to | **VO Bob Faw (BF) (The reporter):** One reason homelessness in |
ELS, EHA inside huge shelter; TC name of producer on bottom part. America is such a big problem is because so many people are shouting...

4 ELS, EHA several HLs on beds. VO BF: "Don't put the homeless..."

5 ELS, EHA one HL in the midst of several beds. VO BF: ...in middle class America's back yard."

6 LS, LA a HL on street pulling grocery cart R to L and off screen. OffS Dorothy Fitzpatrick (resident): Let me tell you as a middle class citizen.

7 MS, SA Fitzpatrick giving a speech in a large auditorium; red formal jacket, necklace; TC her name. OnS Fitzpatrick: I am not ashamed to say I am, because I did it the hard way. I, God damn, worked for it all my life, and nobody's gonna take away my quality of life.

8 LS, SA audience applauding. (applause)

9 LS, HA audience applauding. (applause) VO BF: That full-throated roar...

10 LS, SA audience applauding. (applause) VO BF: ...has erupted from...

11 LS, SA a woman's speech at outdoor rally. VO BF: ...toniest Santa Monica...

12 CU of a picket reading "BUMS" with a black line vertically crossed on it and "MAKE SANTA MONICA SAFE NOW." VO BF: ...to the wealthy neighborhoods in Washington D.C.

OffS Woman:
ELS, SA a woman's speech among audience.

**OnS Woman:**
...is thoughtless and unfair.

MLS, SA audience applauding.

**OffS Robert Stranieri (State Legislator):**
No community...

Same as Shot 7 for Stranieri; dark suit, tie; TC his name.

**OnS Stranieri:**
...should have to endure the relocation of what we used to call Bowery bums into stable middle class community.
(applause)

### SEQUENCE 3

16  MLS, SA a HL man standing on sidewalk.

(appraise fading away)

**VO BF:**
If there is disagreement over what to do with the nation's homeless,...

17  ELS, SA other HLs standing on street; a bird flying down on the ground in front of one of them.

**VO BF:**
...there is no disagreement that...

18  LS, SA a HL man pulling grocery cart filled with miscellaneous things.

**VO BF:**
...what has been done--shunting them in the...

19  MS, SA a HL man standing on sidewalk; hat, in rags.

**VO BF:**
...run-down areas, often warehousing...

20  ELS, SA two HLs across street, pulling grocery carts somewhere; cars passing by

**VO BF:**
...them next to other programs for the down-and-out...
in front of them.

21  MLS. LA of cardboard box on sidewalk; apparently some one's sleeping inside of it.

VO BF: ...hasn't worked.

OffS Camillo Vargara (sociologist):
This is not an...

22  MCU, SA Vargara for interview on street; pull-over with formal suit.

OnS Vargara:
...efficient way of dealing with the problems. I mean--

VO BF: Not efficient, says sociologist Camillo Vargara,..

23  LS, SA a HL pulling grocery cart on street; hood; face not discernible.

VO BF: ...because it helps neither the homeless...

24  ES, EHA bird's-eye view of run-down buildings and streets; fast ZI reveals LS Vargara and reporter talking.

VO BF: ...nor areas where they are dumped.

OnS Vargara: At worst, you create an area where the problems are not just concentrated, but also expanded.

25  MCU, SA Vargara; wears glasses, sweater, suit.

OnS Vargara: It's a waste of lives and an expense of money.

26  ES outlook of run-down building on the street.

VO BF: But, when New York recently proposed not to repeat past mistakes...

27  ES another run-down building; camera pans R to residential area across

VO BF: ...and to locate 24 new shelters in mostly residential areas
the street.

28

Same as Shot 7 for Friscia;
red sweater; TC her name.

OnS Rosanne Friscia (resident):
No shelter! No Way! No How!

29

OS, MS, SA, FC Rivela; MS,
BC reporter; camera pans
L; ELS proposed site; piled-
up empty gas drums and
other things; look untidy.

VO BF:
Stormy opposition from otherwise
quiet uncomplaining people like
Diane Rivela who lives just one
foot from one of the proposed sites.

30

OS, MS, SA, FC Rivela;
casual jacket; MS, BC
reporter; casual jacket.

OnS Diane Rivela:
I'm afraid for my children's lives.
I'm afraid for my children's
health. I'm afraid someone is
gonna hurt my child.

31

CU, HA a book of signa-
tures; camera TU
to MS, SA Sorge at desk,
indoor; middle-aged;
wears glasses; red
formal jacket.

VO BF:
Lorraine Sorge is so upset. She
collected nearly 50,000 signatures
against bringing the homeless to
her neighborhood.

OffS Lorraine Sorge:
It's like a cancer.

32

Another view of Sorge;
MCU, SA.

OnS Sorge
They, they're spreading a cancer
into a healthy community, and
we're not gonna survive.

33

MCU, SA Donnelly; pull-
over with formal jacket;
TC his name.

OnS Harold Donnelly (resident):
Our communities, if you're to go
around, start digging in garbage
cans,...

34

LS, SA, BC a HL digging
trash can on sidewalk;
shabby clothing; head-scarf.

OffS Donnelly:
...people never seen it like that.
They....
SEQUENCE 4

35 MCU, SA Washington; indoor; dark suit, tie.  OnS Willie Washington
It's not gonna happen.

VO BF:
Willie Washington runs a homeless...

36 ELS, HA street through window; camera pans L to reveal LS, SA a group of people on discussion. VO BF:
...program in New York which is clean and which works. The key, he says: keep it small and be tough.

37 LS, SA guide with casual jumper, sport cap; indoor; many HLs in good order. OnS Guide man:
We're all going to Rockefeller Center. We'd like to see the lighting of the Christmas tree.

38 MCU, SA guide. OnS Guide man:
I expect that everybody behave like real adults.

39 LS, SA HLs moving R; shabby clothing; vacant facial expression; indoor. OffS Willie Washington:
Each client is occupied daily, full day, from the time they wake up until the time they go to bed.

40 Back to Shot 35. OffS BF:
And if he violate the rules, he's out?

OnS Washington:
He's out.

41 ELS, SA Christmas tree being lighted at Rockefeller Center; dark. (ambience: cheering/clapping) VO BF:
Run it that way, say...

42 CU, SA a black HL smiling at Christmas tree; sport cap. VO BF:
...city planners, all the terrible...
43 CU, SA another black HL smiling; brown parka. VO BF: ...things home owners worry about...

44 Same as Shot 41. VO BF: ...won't happen.

45 MCU, SA Hispanic Diaz in office; camera ZI to MCU-CU Diaz. OffS Raymond Diaz (NYC Human Resources Administration): Good programs...

OnS Diaz: ...historically have helped people take control of their lives and change their lives.

OffS BF: Would you want people like that living next to you?

OnS Diaz: (embarrassedly) Yes.

46 CU, SA Sorge; (Back to Shot 32) OnS Lorraine Sorge: That--dreaming. Let's get down to reality.

VO BF: America's...

SEQUENCE 5

47 MS, SA reporter; beige suit, pull-over; BG of ELS, EHA inside shelter; (basically same setting as Shot 3) (ambient sound)

DA BF: ...debate over what to do about all this has gotten so stormy because essentially it is a debate about who's rights should prevail--home owners entitled to live where they feel safe and comfortable, or
ELS, EHA HLs in shelter; another view of Shot 4.

Offs Mayor David Dinkins (New York):
What about the philosophy of breaking down...

LS, EHA a HL sleeping on bed in shelter.

Offs Dinkins:
...1,000 people who live...

MLS, EHA a HL moving R to L in the midst of beds in shelter; underwear, holding a sock.

Offs Dinkins:
...with two and half feet between the beds,...

ELS, EHA two HLs sleeping on bed in shelter.

Offs Dinkins:
...no privacy at all.

MLS, SA Dinkins giving a speech in auditorium; dark suit, tie.

Offs Dinkins:
The question is "what are we gonna do with our homeless people?" They're God's children, too.

CU, SA Friscia indoor.

Ons Friscia:
They are God's children? So are we.

MCU, SA reporter listening to Friscia with chin on hand.

Offs Friscia:
Who's gonna protect us?

(Return to Shot 53)

Ons Friscia:
Where do our rights come in? They have rights as citizens? So do we.

MS, SA, Sorge, Donnelly and Friscia in FC, and reporter in BC; around table for interview.

VO BF:
But, who comes first?
MCU, SA Donnelly.

VO BF:
Middle class...

MCU, SA Sorge.

VO BF:
...tax payers...

MCU, SA, FC Taylor among other HLs at the same setting as Shot 41; camera TR to PR Taylor.

(ambient sound)

VO BF:
...or the homeless like David Taylor?

Offs BF:
Do you have as much right...

ECU, SA Taylor; flannel shirt; indoor.

(ambient sound)

Offs BF:
...to say that as the home owner has to say "I wanna live without these people?"

David Taylor (homeless):
Yes, I was born and raised in this country.

Offs BF:
You have just as much...

Ons Taylor:
I've got just as much right as any home owner.

MS, SA Fitzpatrick on speech in auditorium; (Back to Shot 7)

Ons Fitzpatrick:
Forget the melting pot. You've got a boiling pot, and you better turn down the flame.

(audience applauding)

LS, SA a HL woman and two dogs in BC pulling two carts filled with her motley

VO BF:
Ultimately, it is a question about power and priorities.
stuff, crossing street towards sidewalk, FF scene; dissolve of computer generated color effect around the screen and program title, except the HL and her things.  
Bob Faw, CBS News, Staten Island.  
(program signal music fades up)  

Interpretation  

SEQUENCE 1: Framing.  
In this sequence, the anchor does not, either explicitly or implicitly, set up a basic Us : Them opposition. The anchor simply brings in the issue for the show by relating the topic with such emotion-related terms "compassion fatigue" and "intolerance." Therefore, at first sight, it sounds like suggesting that what the viewers are about to watch is a story about the conflict between "some people" with "compassion fatigue" and others who, instead, call it "intolerance," in other words, a story about different groups of "everyday" people.  
On second thought, however, it can be realized that the terms used here tend to fall within the domain of an emotional dimension which is very familiar according to "our" everyday life sentiment. The point is that the issue of homelessness, in the midst of the viewer's unawareness, tends to be translated as a matter of emotional conflict between two groups of people. This means that the structural cause of the problem at the macro level is readily absent from the scene. Therefore, it can be assumed that the narrative has already begun with the following homologic oppositions:

ABSENCE : PRESENCE  
Structure/Institution : Individual
SEQUENCE 2: Differentiating.

The reporter's voice-over on actuality film focuses the viewer's attention on the middle class's rally against the homeless. The rally, verbally and visually, signifies the middle class's antagonism against the homeless. This situation together with the opposition set up in Sequence 1 produces the following homologic oppositions:

Some People : Others
The Middle Class : The Homeless

These oppositional pairs are then metaphorically and/or metonymically, and verbally and/or visually transformed into more abstract concepts, that is, Us : Them. First of all, there is a significant visual connection between Sequence 1 and Sequence 2 that eventually contributes to locating the news team and the middle class's rally on the same camp. In the beginning of Sequence 1, as the anchor begins with his studio report through the mode of "direct address" to the camera, the title of the program segment, "Eye On America" is seen over his left shoulder in the frame as a part of the background visual. As the studio report proceeds, the anchor, who has been initially placed slightly left from the center of frame, is being slowly moved into the center. At the same time, the title of the segment disappears out of frame gradually as the camera pans slowly to the left. What is semiotically significant in this shot is the relationship between the segment title, "Eye On America" itself and the anchor's mode of address. First of all, the anchor's mode of direct address to the camera creates an imaginary space, which is to be mutually shared by the viewer and the narrator. As discussed earlier both in Chapter 2 and in the first sample analysis for the present chapter, this
imaginary space binds the viewer and the narrator together temporally and spatially as the narrator's address makes the viewer feel that the temporal and the spatial gaps between he/she and the narrator collapse, creating a common ground of "here and now." When the anchor uses the term "we" or "us" during the report, "Tonight, we will examine ...," or "Most of us think ...," for example, the anchor deftly locates the viewer's orientation in the same line as his. Therefore, the existing gap between the anchor's and the viewer's "points of view" disappears; This merge then eventually creates the collapse of the difference between the narrator and "you" (the viewer), and thus combines two parties into a single unit, "we."

On the other hand, the logo of the segment title, "Eye On America" seen to the back of the anchor has a significant semiotic relation with the collapse of points of view. In other words, there is another semiotic collapse between the "Eye" (the actual presentation of which is not a word but a symbol shaped like an eye) in the logo and the "eye" which has been established in the collapse of the "eyes" of the viewer and the anchor. That is, the "Eye" in the logo looks at "us" (the viewer) just the same way the anchor's "eyes" do; the actual gap between the "eyes" of the anchor and that of the logo symbolically collapses. Consequently, there is also a collapse of the viewer's eyes and the "Eye" in the logo. This means that the news's "Eye" on America is semiotically identified as "our" (the viewer's) eyes on America. All of these points so far made are very important, when they are considered in the overall context of the discussion that will follow. They provide us with the theoretical basis from which we can draw the most fundamental conceptual oppositions, Us : Them along with another Absence : Presence.
Back to Sequence 1, at the ending part of it (Shot 2), the computer generated flying particles gradually form a shape (with the title, "Eye On America" on it) which resembles the "stripes" part of the Stars and Stripes. As the visual of Sequence 2 opens, the previous computer generated graphic is being wiped out to reveal the close-up shot of the real big Stars and Stripes hanging on the ceiling of the huge homeless shelter. The camera tilts down then to hold a medium-shot of the reporter with an extreme long-shot in extremely high angle of the inside scene of the shelter as the reporter's background scenery. The scene is then cut to a series of shots that reveal a group of the homeless lying down or sitting up on their beds. Their faces are not yet discernible since the shots are taken still at long distances and in high angles.

What should be noted in this series of shots is the transition of the scene from the computer generated graphic "stripes" to the stripes of the real flag, and the optimum camera framing of the reporter with the background of inside shelter and a series of following shots of the homeless taken from a high position. All of these symbolically signify the superior (higher) position of the reporter and the viewer as the representative of "normal" America, in contrast to the inferior (lower) position of the homeless people. The reporter who is making a direct address to the viewer is seen at the medium-distance and in normal-angle. His voice-over narration here on the scene of the homeless taken at an (extremely) long distance and in (extremely) high angle endows the reporter with a higher status of authority, credibility and neutrality. After all, the semiotically drawn, thematic oppositions may be then formulated as follows:
Us : Them
Normal America : Abnormal America
Superiority/High : Inferiority/Low
The Anchor/Reporter/viewer : The Homeless
Optimum Framing : Unfavorable Framing
(MS/SA) : (ELS/LS/HA/LA)

In the meantime, the scene of the homeless in the shelter is then cut to a street scene in which a homeless person is seen at a distance strolling along the by-street with a grocery cart filled with his miscellaneous articles. While this homeless person is moving off screen to the left side of the frame, a woman's voice (from the anti-homeless rally) is fading in as if it were a voice-over narration on the scene. This voice-over-like quality functions symbolically to "dominate" the visual, thus creating an Dominance:

Subordination opposition. The street scene, with the woman's voice-over effect, is then bridged with a series of shots, which show, what they call, the "middle class" citizen's anti-homeless rally scenes from different places. This scene is comprised of 9 shots that show three rally speakers and the applauding audiences alternatively. It begins with a medium-shot of a middle-aged female speaker whose voice sounds very furious, and proceeds with three shots of the audience applauding the speaker. It is then followed by a series of 5 shots that also show furious rally scenes including 2 shots of speakers, 1 of outdoor picketing and 2 of the audience applauding. During the outdoor picketing scene, a picket is seen reading "BUMS" with a line diagonally crossed on it and "MAKE SANTA MONICA SAFE NOW!" To identify the homeless as "BUMS" is again verbally supported in the following
shots where the speaker uses the same term, "the Bowery bums." As the rally
speakers keep addressing themselves as the "middle class" "citizen" or
"community" and the homeless as "bums," one may come up with another
oppositional homology of The Middle Class : The Homeless :: "Citizen" :
"Bum." In addition, the reporter's verbal quotation in the beginning of
Sequence 2, "Don't put the homeless in middle class America's back yard,"
sets up a metaphoric interpretation of the opposition pairs, The Middle Class :
The Homeless :: Front : Back.

In addition, the matter of "nomination/unnomination" and "accessed
voices/silenced voices" is again semiotically significant in this sequence. The
reporter (Bob Faw), the news program producer (Jon Meyersohn) and two
rally speakers's names (Dorothy Fitzpatrick and Robert Stranieri as
"Resident") are verbally or visually "nominated" on the one hand, while the
homeless are not. And the former had "accesses" to voice, while the latter
did not. All of these verbal and visual modes of presentation then add more
elements to the homologic formula which has already started in the opening
sequence, as they connotatively confirm the basic Us : Them opposition.
Hence the following interpretation:

US : THEM

Normal America : Abnormal America

Superiority/High : Inferiority/Low

The Anchor/Reporter/Viewer : The Homeless

The Middle Class: "Citizen" : The Homeless: "Bums"

Front : "Back"

Voicing-over : Voiced-over
Accessed Voices : Silenced Voices
Names Nominated : Names Un-nominated
Optimum Framing : Unfavorable Framing
(MS/SA) : (ELS/LS/HA/LA)

One thing that must not be overlooked during the present sequence is that the issue of homelessness has been translated into the matter of conflict between the middle class and the homeless. It is to say that the Institution: Individual opposition, has been transformed into a practical, The Middle class: The Homeless opposition. This transformation has been made possible simply by the "absence" or "disappearance" of "structural" explanation of the issue from the story. The narrative's tendency of appealing to "our" common-sense sentiment also helps make the transformation easier. The hard part of the issue disappears when the narration turns the viewer's attention towards its immediate effects in "our" everyday life. Eventually, the focus of the narrative is turned on to the concrete and pragmatic experiences which are practiced mostly at the emotional level. This shift of focus has already been started by the reporter's verbal in Sequence 2 when he repressed alternative viewpoints and selectively quoted the middle class's complaint, "One reason homelessness in America is such a big problem is because so many people are shouting, 'Don't put the homeless in middle-class America's back yard.'"

SEQUENCE 3: Reversing I

This stage basically realizes the furious reaction by the "New Yorkers" to the City's plan to locate 24 new shelters in the middle classes's residential areas throughout the city. The visual and verbal aspects of the narrative
again reinforce the opposition already established in the previous sequences, but this time with more concrete and extreme sentiment indicated in the metaphorical use of such terms as "shunting them (the homeless)," "warehousing them," "down-and-outs," "digging in garbage cans" and "cancer" to refer to the inhumane quality of the homeless people.

The opening of the sequence begins with a series of shots of the homeless (Shots 16-21) at a medium or long distance. The primary actions of the characters include hanging around, standing in a fixed position with shabby and dirty clothes and rags on, going nowhere, literally floating on the streets and sometimes sleeping inside make-shift cardboard shelter on the sidewalk. These shots are now very typical and thus serve as metonymic symbols for telling how "they" are different from the rest of us in terms of clothing, behaviors and attitudes. Compared with the previous shots of the middle class people in decent clothing and attitudes, the juxtapositions of these shots give us the sense of "difference" that exists between "us" and "them." This constructed sense of difference is once more verbally confirmed by the narrator's voice-over which dominates the silent visuals. The use of slang and everyday language mediates between two worlds, one of the homeless and the other to which "most of us" belong and thus makes the unfamiliar familiar. Due to its ideological and magical power, on the other hand, it confirms our sense of "difference" and makes it more concrete and firm while eliciting our sense of sympathy for "them."

While these shots are followed by a professional's comment on the failure of the past housing policies (here again, the government policy makers are "exnominated") in an actuality interview shot, it functions only
as an "inoculation" effect that eventually strengthens (Barthes, 1957/1972, p. 150) the claims made by the middle class community. This "inoculation" effect is supported by the following actuality rally films and interviews of the middle class residents, of which the visuals and accessed verbals appear dominant compared to the other side where no accessed voice is allowed for the sake of its own interest. This is one of those major tactics commonly used throughout the whole sample that, in Barthes's words, "immunizes the contents of the collective imagination by means of a small inoculation of acknowledged" fact (p. 150). The voices that back up the homeless's side in most cases turn out to be "controlled doses" (Fiske, 1987b, p. 39) that allow the dominant ideology to set the limits on the positioning of the homeless characters in the news stories. The negative construction of the homeless is then again reinforced by the metaphorical use of the term "cancer" by Lorraine Sorge (a middle class interviewee) for the homeless, as she asserts, "It's like a cancer. They're spreading a cancer into a healthy community..." (Shots 31-32). As is familiar to most of us, as Sontag (1978) suggests, the metaphor of illness is often used to speak of the various kinds of dark sides in a society, for example, slums and pornography shops. "Cancer" in particular is one of those which is commonly used and thus popular to us just as in J. Edgar Hoover's favorite metaphoric use of the term referring to communism or the same use for Nixon's administration (Conrad & Schneider, 1980, p. 252). "When we have a sense of evil but no longer the religious or philosophical language to talk intelligently about evil," Sontag (1978) argues, "we search for adequate metaphors" in order to comprehend it; "And the cancer metaphor is particularly crass. It is invariably an encouragement to
simplify what is complex and an invitation to self-righteousness, if not to fanaticism" (pp. 82-83). By appealing to our "common sense stock of knowledge," the "cancer" metaphor for the homeless simplifies the complex nature of the homelessness problem and thus masks the structural causation of the issue.

Visually speaking, along with the absence of voices, the images of the homeless represented in shots which are taken mostly at long distances on the street with ambient sounds and on which the reporter narrates by voice-over, contrast sharply with those of the middle class people portrayed in optimum, medium close-up shots taken in a living-room looking place of which the surroundings are quiet and neat. This visual contrast only reinforces the image of inferiority of the former and that of superiority of the latter. Besides this, the voice-over-like narration by an interviewee, Harold Donnelly (Shot 34) displays the middle class's dominance over the homeless in the scene in which a homeless woman positioned with her back to the camera is seen digging in the street garbage can. On the contrary, the homeless themselves have never had a chance for their voices to be heard to defend themselves. After all, the homologic oppositions, The Middle Class: The Homeless :: Superiority (being dominant) : Inferiority (being dominated) can be brought forth for an interpretation.

Again, while the inquiry into the structural causation of the problem is absent, the issue has been relegated to the level of "events." And, by focusing on displaying the immediate effects of the issue in our primary, practical life situation, the present sequence results in a dramatic effect to reverse the direction of the causal relations between society and individual. In short, it is
suspected that the individuals now begins to be seen as a cause of the social problem. And, the following sequence mostly tends to confirm this suspicion when the homeless side is allowed its voice accessed only to defend itself that they are not the cause of the problem. This functions only as another inoculation effect after all. Hence the following interpretation for this particular sequence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US</th>
<th>THEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Middle Class</td>
<td>The Homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority</td>
<td>Inferiority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Dominant</td>
<td>Subordinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Healthy&quot; Society</td>
<td>Social Disease (&quot;cancer&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim (&quot;done by&quot;)</td>
<td>Cause (&quot;doer&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voicing-over</td>
<td>Voiced-over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessed Voices</td>
<td>Silenced Voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimum Framing</td>
<td>Unfavorable Framing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MS/SA)</td>
<td>(ELS/LS/HA/LA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEQUENCE 4: Reversing II.**

On the whole, this sequence is devoted to confirm the reversed direction of the cause-and-effect relation between society ("us") and individual (the homeless). While the homeless's side is finally allowed to speak for themselves, its passive defending style tends to turn out to be an "inoculation" that ironically strengthens the reversed causal relation. This "inoculation" effect is achieved by the newsmaker's deft selection of the shots and their timely arrangement in its relation to the overall flow of narrative.
The sequence now focuses the viewer’s attention on the side of homeless advocates, who are mostly seen busy defending themselves against the middle class’s worry about what the homeless might be able to cause. After more than a half of the whole duration of the narrative has passed, the homeless side begins to have its voices accessed. Yet, this only reaffirms the primary binary oppositions, Us : Them and Absence : Presence. To begin with, the accessed voices on the part of the homeless are not seen successfully claiming their interests, but only having the Cause : Victim :: The Homeless : The Middle class oppositions hardened.

As the sequence opens, Willie Washington, an homeless advocate, in response to the middle class’s complaints from the previous sequence, begins to defend the homeless side only by arguing that he applies very tough rules to the homeless people who participate in his program so as to have them under control and thus not to allow the things the middle class ("we") worry about to happen. And his claim is defended in the series of following shots, which seem to demonstrate how tough rules work in controlling the homeless. One interesting point is that the voices of the actual homeless are yet to be heard even though the sequence is especially arranged for defending the homeless. The homeless themselves portrayed in the visuals serve as an functional element which only helps reinforcing their "differences," and this is due to various camera work on the discourse dimension.

This seems to have been witnessed verbally and visually in an immediately following series of actuality scenes (Shots 37-39) and an interview sequence (Shot 40). That they are certainly under control is demonstrated in the visual presentation of the homeless who are seen in
good order through Shots 37-39 and the guide's tough leadership indicated in his verbal command, "We're all going to Rockefeller Center....I expect that everybody behave like real adults." The brief question and answer scene in shots 39-40 between the reporter and Willie Washington once more makes the viewer become fully convinced of the toughness and effectiveness of the rules:

[Willie Washington]:
Each client is occupied daily, full day, from the time they wake up until the time they go to bed.

[The reporter]:
And if he violates the rules, he's out?

[Willie Washington]:
He's out.

The reporter's question seems trivial since it does not get down to the nature of the issue, nor to the context of the problem, but only confirms that the homeless are always the part that initiates the social problem, not vice versa. It is also true in the case of the following interview scene (Shot 45) where Raymond Diaz from New York City Human Resources Administration is asked the similar trivial question:

[Raymon Diaz]:
Good programs historically have helped people take control of and change their lives.

[The reporter]:
Would you want people like that living next to you?

[Raymond Diaz]:
(embarrassedly) Yes.

Above all, the reporter's wording of the question here, being out of context, tends to arouse antagonism between the homeless and the rest of "us." At the same time, this trivial question, along with the former one with Willie Washington, only proves the journalist's routine of "personalizing" the issue, which eventually makes the narrative more melodramatic. As Hartley (1982) argues, "the accessed voices in the news...only achieve continuity through their function....In other words, accessed voices are routinely stereotyped to make them meaningful within the continuing saga of news-discourse. A routine shorthand for these stereotypes is easily obtained by personalizing events" (p. 115).

Back in our story, Raymond Diaz's diffident looking attitude in responding by a short "Yes" to the reporter's tricky question is then smothered up by the following shot in which the opponent, Lorraine Sorge, a middle class resident, shows her full confidence in reacting to Diaz by "That...dreaming. Let's get down to reality" (Shot 46). The juxtaposing of these two contrasting scenes is not coincidental again, since the narrative flow of the whole story is always under control of a well organized framework. Therefore, what the viewers see on the screen is only a group of fragmentary events which do not have real relationships to each other but produce meanings only after being knitted together and re-integrated by a higher level of authority.

In brief, again, the examination of the structural causation, the hidden state of affairs, is absent from the scene, while the focus of narrative has been put on the realization of the immediate effects of the problem both on the
middle class and on the homeless. What is unique in this particular sequence is that the narrative now has achieved the reversed version of cause-and-effect relation, and thus translated the homeless, a victim of social problems, as the cause of the problem itself (the "doer") and the society as the victim (who is "done by").

**SEQUENCE 5: Closing.**

The narrative closure here basically reaffirms the binary oppositions which have been initiated as early as in the very beginning of the narrative. In addition, Shots 47 and 46 tend to support this thesis since their settings are basically not different at all from the beginning shots (Shots 3 and 7) of Sequence 2.

While the reporter closes the narrative with a concluding remark that "Ultimately, it is a question about power and priorities," it merely sounds like it is hanging in the air since the power and priorities have already been sold out to the middle class to which "most of us" belong. The structural discussion of the "issue" has already disappeared, once again leaving behind only the fragmentary "events" on the front stage. The homeless have come to be blamed as the cause of the social problem. Hence the final interpretation of the story as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US</th>
<th>THEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Middle Class</td>
<td>The Homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority</td>
<td>Inferiority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Society</td>
<td>Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Victim</td>
<td>The Cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;done by&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;doer&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ABSENCE} & : \quad \text{PRESENCE} \\
\text{The Structural Causation} & : \quad \text{The Events} \\
\text{The Cause} & : \quad \text{The Effects} \\
(\text{Structural/Institutional}) & : \quad (\text{Individual Experiences})
\end{align*}
\]

The basic binary oppositions, US : THEM and ABSENCE : PRESENCE remain the same as the underlying structures which have been already structured even before the narrative itself.

The visual discourse also reinforces these oppositional relations in the closing sequence. On the one hand, a series of normal angle shots of the middle class people have been taken at the optimum range of medium shots without any ambient sounds or with, if any, the audience's cheering applaud. On the contrary, the shots of the homeless including David Taylor, the only homeless person who has been given an accessed voice throughout the whole story, in Shot 48 through Shot 51, were taken at a high angle view of the characters at a long distance. Finally, the mayor, David Dinkins's voice as well as David Taylor's has only functioned as a lead-in for the dramatic effect induced by a concluding metaphorical comment for the rally (Shot 61) by the middle class resident, Dorothy Fitzpatrick, that "Forget the melting pot. You've got a boiling pot, and you better turn down the flame." The location of this last shot just before the reporter's final comment signifies her importance in terms of narrative flow. She is the person who has actually set off the narrative flame in the beginning (Shot 6-7) and put it out at the end (Shot 61). Again, the juxtaposing of these two shots apart like this seems not accidental, but rather well-planned. Therefore, it can be argued that her
narrative function has helped in establishing a particular orientation of the narrative on the whole. Yet, within the given framework, she has also been playing a function that confirms the underlying dominant point of view that is not her own.
CHAPTER VI
FINDINGS, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The last two decades have been a period of struggle between two paradigms in the study of communication. It seems true that an alternative interpretive paradigm, which has emerged especially during the 1970s against the traditional behavioristic paradigm, has not yet exerted its influence in the field of communication. It may be said that the source of critical perspective in communication studies could be traced back to the theories of mass culture criticism in the early Frankfurt School, to the tradition of British culturalism during the 1950s and 1960s, and to the emergence of structuralist movement in the Continent. In American context, however, it seems that the alternative paradigm has been becoming popular with communication scholars since the 1970s. One of these new movements of approach in America could be seen in what James Carey (1975a, 1975b) calls "a ritual view of communication," which argues for the theory of "communication as culture" and therefore for the importance of cultural sharing and its role for maintaining the balance of society. Seen within this perspective, it is widely conjectured that television successfully plays the role of storytelling inherent in the nature of human life and that this narrative function of television could be understood better by turning our attention to television as a "form" rather than as a content.
Following this line of thought, the present study has attempted to apply major contemporary structuralist theories of narrative to the study of television journalism. The general goal of this study has been, thus, to contribute to enhancing our understanding of television communication as a ritual process by exploring "how" television journalism as a narrative form renders our reality meaningful and thus maintains the order of society.

The profound assumption behind this study was that "narrative" as an essential form of expression and experience in our everyday life provides us with an organizing principle which renders our chaotic reality meaningful. The fact of our own use of narrative as an essential "form" of our everyday existence, however, is hardly recognized as such by us, because it is so deeply embedded, conventionalized and naturalized in our life due to its unique nature of ubiquity and transparency. It was also assumed that television is one of the most powerful contemporary narrative medium by which our daily experiences are organized into a meaningful whole, and thus by which our reality is constructed, maintained and transformed. Television news in particular was considered as a dramatic narrative ritual through which a particular version of the world is created and maintained.

Bearing these basic assumptions in mind, this study attempted to explicate the narrative quality of television news and its operation through the analysis of a particular sample of news narratives. In order to achieve this task, it was required to examine the structural principles or rules of television news narrative at both "discourse" and "story" dimensions. This task then led the study first to determine the possible existence of structural patterns of the sampled narratives in both visual and aural representations on the discourse
dimension. The structural pattern on this dimension alone, as was assumed, would not be described in an adequate way since it was always related to the other aspect of narrative, the "story" dimension, all the way from the beginning to the closing of a story in an intimate and complex way. Therefore, an interpretation of the structural pattern on the discourse dimension in the first place was done based upon the overall quantitative and ballpark information regarding the camera work, actional appearances of characters and the narration style of the two "framing" narrators including the anchor and the reporter.

The virtual operation of this discourse pattern was to be explored in detail in its relation to the "story" dimension of the sample news stories. In the meantime, the next move of the study was to examine the paradigmatic structural principle on the "story" dimension. Once again, it was also supposed that the paradigmatic structure might not be explained in full without mentioning its actual engagement in the horizontal development of the narrative as a whole. On reviewing all of the sample stories numerous times at this stage, however, this study could delineate the general outline of the paradigmatic rules that seemed to be pervading across the whole sample. At the same time, the syntagmatic structural principle, the second half of the "story" dimension, was also outlined based on careful and intuitive examination of the horizontal development of all stories in the sample. Finally, the analysis moved into the main discussion part of the present study, the extended analysis of three selected sample narratives, in which all narrative elements and structural principles alluded above were rigorously tested in detail in their functional relations with the overall flow of the
narrative. The discussion of this extended analysis was framed largely based upon the syntagmatic functional categories of sequences included in each story. In the following section, I would like to offer a discussion about the general findings of this study, their implications and limitations.

As mentioned earlier in Chapter 1, this study aimed neither to criticize the contemporary television journalism for failing to maintain a certain degree of impartiality or objectivity in representing the world out there, nor to redefine what news is or should be. Instead, it purported to study how a particular version of reality in general and "a" reality of the homeless in particular were constructed in television network's "mini news-magazine" segments which are usually placed at the ending part of each evening news programs during the period between 1985 and 1991. In carrying this out, this study has utilized, both as theoretical and methodological bases, the structuralist narrative theories and theories of semiotics in general, as they were considered to be the most suitable for achieving the particular goals of this study. Based upon the suggestions by the media criticism scholars such as Fiske, Hartley and Hall in particular in Chapter 1, this study presupposed that there are sets of organizing principles which are structurally embedded in the news making process as an active social practice, and that they could be revealed by means of careful reading, although they are so routinely and habitually used by the journalists themselves that even the users of these principles may not be aware of their use of them.

First of all, this study examined the network's use of the semiotic elements on the discourse dimension in general in search of their patterned
use in representing the characters involved in the news stories. The findings suggested that there existed this "patterned" use of various semiotic elements such as setting, various camera work, lighting, sound effects and portrayal of characters's primary actions. This patterned way of visual encoding above all, tended to produce two types of representation of characters; Some characters were featured as individual "persons" and some as a "collective" mass. On the whole, both homeless characters and ordinary people tended to be portrayed not as autonomous individual "persons," but as a "collective" group at the non-personal level, compared with other characters. This is partially perceptible in network's relatively frequent use of long-range shots for these two groups of characters, whereas the medium-range shots were mostly reserved for those characters whose "authoritative" positional qualities tended to be socially recognized such as professional homeless advocates, doctors, lawyers and ministers. With regard to "depersonalizing" effect of extreme long-range shots in particular, Tuchman (1978) argues that "Public distance [corresponds to extreme long-distance shot range] is all but forbidden in recording events involving "individuals," .... [thus] depersonalizes, and is used only to show masses, not individuals" (p. 119). Moreover, it was relatively frequent that the homeless were seen on the streets, mostly standing around, walking up and down, sleeping and so forth, while the authoritative professionals were shown for interview in their offices. The silent appearances of the homeless without proper visual "nomination" or "accessed" voices also contributed to the construction of their image as a "collective" mass.
On the other hand, the use of high camera angle more frequently for the homeless than for the other characters suggested that the homeless were often seen as "emotion-oriented" characters rather than "rationality-oriented" ones. In addition, while it was not greatly different that most characters, except the anchor/reporter, were given close-range shots, the homeless were framed the least often in the most optimum, medium close-ups. This again tended to reinforce the image of the homeless as lacking the quality of "rationality" or "neutrality." Even in the case of close-ups, the effects were different depending on who said what. In other words, it should be differentiated between the effect of close-ups of the homeless people and that of the other characters in terms of their virtual image constructions. To illustrate, in most cases, what was said by the professional characters sounded like that it was merely delivering the general, public opinion and thus seemed to represent the society in general. In other words, what they were saying sounded like that their opinions were not their own but the general public's, as if they had been based on the position of "neutrality" and "rationality." On the other hand, what we heard from the homeless characters tended to be confined within their personal emotional reactions to their own everyday experiences and hardships, that is, those "immediate effects" of the fact of "being homeless." In this pattern of ironical representation, anyway, the "emotionalizing" effect did not seem to raise the homeless's "individuality" as an autonomous human quality at all, but tended to function only as representing them as a "group" on the margin of mainstream society. To quote Tuchman (1978) again, "These displays do not function as an attribute of the individual. They are social indicators of the
plight of a group, whether the group is parents with incurably ill children, wives of soldiers missing in action, or families made homeless by a natural disaster" (p. 123).

In contrast to all the "embedded" character narrators, in the meantime, the anchors and the reporters as "framing" narrators were shot in the most optimum modes of presentation such as medium-distance, standard eye-level angle, facing-the-camera orientation, plain backing in the studio (the anchor in particular), good lighting and decent formal dress. As has been suggested in Chapter 2, their direct eye-contact mode of address along with the optimal visual framing contributed to establishing their positional quality of intimacy, neutrality, objectivity, credibility and authoritativeness. As Masterman (1985) quotes Hood, "All these persons have one thing in common. They are there to give us information which we are asked to assume is accurate..., unbiased and authoritative....They...can be described...as 'bearers of truth'" (p. 172). As such "bearers of truth," they were seen as playing the role of "impersonal" (Kervin, 1985, p. 243) objective information agent who simply delivers the viewer the "truth" as it is. As Hartley (1982, p. 110) has suggested, their "institutional" appearances and voices were the only ones which were so fully "naturalized" that their constructed and transparent-looking nature seemed hard to resist. Moreover, this impersonal, objective quality of their voices was again supported by the anchor's and mostly reporter's "voice-over" narration on actuality sequences as to the homeless characters and also by the use of various graphical presentations of related information. For example, the shape of one of ABC's computer-graphical devices for information presentation, so-called, "FACT FILE" (February 4, 1987),
resembled that of an actual paper file folder. While it was used for presenting statistical data about the demography of the homeless and other related information, it certainly contributed to increasing the "realistic" quality of news-team's own account of the "homelessness" phenomena.

In the meantime, the present study has assumed that these distinctive discourse patterns discussed above would not come into their full bloom until they are meshed together into the whole course of a narrative, that is, into the "story" dimension. The full understanding of the sampled news stories would not be met unless we deconstruct the complex working relationships between such "discourse" dimensional tendencies as impersonalization of the framing narrators and depersonalization, collectivization and emotionalization of the homeless on the one hand, and the "story" dimension's paradigmatic and syntagmatic structural patterns on the other hand. I have explored these structures in terms of binary oppositions, by which we help ourselves to make sense of the world around us particularly when we are encountered with some unfamiliar happenings around us. It was assumed that these oppositions could be abstracted by careful investigation of what was mostly not directly visible and explicitly claimed in the narratives themselves at the surface level.

To begin with the paradigmatic rules in the news making, "US" : "THEM" and "ABSENCE" : "PRESENCE" oppositions were abstracted as the basic principles that dominated in selections of visual or aural narrative units in most paradigmatic categories. This finding suggested that the reality of the homeless was made meaningful when the television narrative provided us with this primary set of deep structural rules as a system of, I would call,
"differentiating" ritual. In the first place, the abstract principle cast into "US" : "THEM" opposition was then metaphorically transformed and materialized into the concrete level in the present study. Its realizations included such oppositions as "us" : "them" :: "ordinary people" : "the homeless" :: "normal behaviors" : "abnormal behaviors" :: "middle class community" : "homeless community" :: "indoor (home)" : "outdoor (street)" :: "healthy community" : "diseased community" :: "social order" : "social disorder (prostitution, AIDS, drug, alcohol, crime, etc.)" and so forth.

On the other hand, it was found that on the basis of "ABSENCE" : "PRESENCE" principle, the presentation of "structural causation" tended to "disappear" from the front stage, and only its "immediate effects" on both homeless and other "embedded" characters in their everyday concern were seen. Accordingly, what was seen by the viewer was not the presentation of structural and institutional problems regarding the issue, but merely that of fragmentary "events" which tended to look transparent to reality and thus easily comprehensible. These "events" were rendered meaningful by means of mediation performed by a limited number of "framing" characters including the anchors and reporters. Successful mediations were achieved through the careful selections and arrangements of both visual and aural semiotic components within a pre-established framework that led the narrative into a meaningful whole.

However, it was assumed in Chapter 1 that these structural rules are not just what can be produced in the course of a particular narrative story. Instead, they are considered as a system of reference that has already been structured, embedded and naturalized so deeply in society as a whole that it is
not easy for "us" to become conscious of it. At the same time, this frame of reference tends to provide a strong ideological force that operates in every corner of our daily life and thus contributes to maintaining our "ordered" sense of reality. The "distinctions" constructed by these principles, an opposition of "US" : "THEM" in particular, are not essential, however, but rather represent arbitrary and naturalized relationships between two oppositional sides, which are actively practiced in our culture. For the time being, the system of "differentiating" could be compared with Bourdieu's famous concept of "habitus," which, as Mander (1987) reads, is "both a socially constituted structure of cognition and a motivating structure as well" (p. 429). The system of "differentiating" as a "habitus," as I have discussed earlier in Chapter 1 and Bourdieu (1972/1977) himself has manifested, provides us with both "structuring" and "structured" structures which generate and structure practices and representations (p. 72). In addition, Bourdieu argues the following:

Every established order tends to produce...the naturalization of its own arbitrariness...Systems of classification which produce, in their own specific logic, the objective classes, i.e. the divisions by sex, age, or position in the relations of production, make their specific contribution to the reproduction of the power relations of which they are the product, by securing the misrecognition, and hence the recognition, of the arbitrariness on which they are based: in the extreme case, that is to say, when there is a quasi perfect correspondence between the objective order and the subjective principles of organization...the natural and social world appears as self-evident. (p. 164)

This paradigmatic principle, along with the syntagmatic one which will be discussed later, constitutes the profound basis for our practice of cultural
understanding and production of television news narratives as a whole, which eventually controls our making sense of reality.

On the syntagmatic level, four narrative moments were abstracted, each of which representing its unique contributing function to the smooth flow of the news narrative as a whole. Four corresponding syntagmatic functions of these moments were what I call, framing, differentiating, reversing, and closing. These four syntagmatic moments with the cooperation of the paradigmatic rules helped make the whole narratives meaningful, understandable, and thus ideological to the viewer. Since the whole process of these four moments are done in such an unnoticeable and very "smoothed-out way" (Hall, 1984, p. 5) that it tends to be difficult for us to recognize that we are actually participating in that process, which eventually leads into a construction of reality of and for ourselves. Hall (1984) calls this taken-for-granted process "ideological" (p. 8) when he sees a general tendency that both the news makers and the viewers are rarely aware that they are actively using a particular framework in their understanding of what is going on in the world. This ideological flow of the narrative in my study was achieved in the process of displaying various representational forms of visual and aural semiotic elements as well as other actuality film extracts and interviews, graphics, sounds, etc, all of which, when put together, contributed to rendering the fragmentary events as a whole realistic and meaningful.

To illustrate, the socially and politically controversial issue of "homelessness" framed in the beginning of the narrative by the anchor tended to be immediately transformed into a matter of everyday "events" which appeared to be hardly related with "real" cause of the problem. That is,
the structural conflicts between institutions and individuals were explained away when they were "displaced" by descriptions of two or three individual experiences within the context of common sense. In addition, the questions asked to those in actuality interview situations tended to be confined to trivial "down-to-earth" ones, not dealing with the issue head on, which in turn were seen appealing well to our commonsensical humanistic sentiments. Among the examples of this type of questioning were: "What's the hardest thing for you with your kids?", "What's the worst part of now living out here?", "Are you happy?, "Do you feel lonely?" and so forth. In this way, the structural/institutional questions regarding the issue simply disappeared, only leaving behind our sense of humanity. After all, all that remained were negative images of the homeless which might have been able to be drawn from such scenes in which "they" were seen standing in soup lines, sleeping on the sidewalks, eating foods outdoors, searching for foods in the trash cans, endlessly walking along the streets, etc.

In most cases, it was found that the closing of the narrative tended to end up with reaffirming the basic set of binary oppositions, "US" : "THEM" and "ABSENCE" : "PRESENCE," which had been set up from the beginning and elaborated during the middle part of the narrative. Furthermore, it was found that the status of the homeless tended to be transformed, during the "conversing" narrative moment, from that of victim of the social problems into that of cause of the social disruption itself. This transformation seems to have been achieved particularly when the narrative closures slipped away from the "burden of proof" and then joined the "populistic" sentiment which only functioned as confirming our common sense stock of knowledge. This
ideological process was possible partly because of the natural and objective-looking quality of the narrative, as the construction of overall meaning of the news narrative mostly depended upon the "framing" narrators who always appeared lacking human quality, but rather having "impersonal," objective and institutional one. With regard to the overall effect of this ideological process, Brunson and Morley (1981) argue the following:

The social dimensions of the problem are consistently excised--they are constantly re-presented as the problems of particular individuals, deprived of their social context. Moreover the horizon of the problem is set in terms of what can be done about it immediately--by charitable work, by individual voluntary effort, or by 'new technology'. The systematic displacement of the discourse to the level of individual effort make logical, as one of its consequences, this stress on practical, pragmatic remedies. This is not to deny the importance of these matters, but to point to the absence of any awareness of the need for social and structural solutions to structurally generated problems. (p. 138)

Generally speaking, it was found that the homeless as well as other "embedded" narrators tended to be given those functional positions that would not be meaningful unless they were syntagmatically arranged within a overall framework, whereas the anchors and reporters were usually placed in advantageous positions for controlling the overall flow of narrative. With this subordinate functional role, the homeless characters were not in the front stage for the syntagmatic flow of the narrative, tending to be remaining as "instantly" commutable units in paradigmatic character categories. Unlike this, it seemed that there were not other alternative paradigmatic units that could be displaced for the positions of the anchors and reporters. In other words, they were seen only options for certain paradigmatic categories. Because of this advantage, it was possible for the anchor to define the topic
and assign the reporter of the day, and for the reporter to lead the syntagmatic flow of the narrative by presenting evidences of their thesis, reinforcing the pre-established definition of the homeless and wrapping up the story in accordance with a given framework. Put another way, the news stories would have not been called "news" without the presence of the anchor and reporter, while it would have not mattered whatever kinds of "embedded" characters were present on the scene. For the anchor's and the reporter's verbal presentations, particularly the latter's voice-overs on the visuals played a role of dominant force in leading the story as a whole from the beginning to the closing. In short, it might be argued that television news story is a narrative of which the overall flow is dominated and controlled by the "verbal" narration of the "framing" narrators, to which the visual presentation tends to be subjected.

To reiterate, this study began with an assumption that television news stories contain analyzable narrative structures which can be interpreted by utilizing the structuralist narrative theories with help from the theories of semiotics of the visual. While this study attempted to render the whole structural patterns both at the visual and aural levels, it tended to rely more on the character's verbal narrations than on the visual presentations. For it has been initially revealed during the pilot examination stage that the visuals alone can not establish the "coherent" flow of the narrative without the verbal part's control. A similar point has been made in other studies. For example, Ekdom (1981), in her study on news programs, argues that "In general I found that the visual aspects of television news items--graphics, videotape segments, and film segments--reinforced and complemented the
verbal text" (p. 165). Similarly, Campbell (1986), in his study on a news magazine program, *60 Minutes*, states that "*60 Minutes* is carried along primarily by its narration and secondarily by its visual representations. The first could exist as a narrative without the second, but the visual images would not tell a coherent story without the dominating influence of the reporter's narration" (p. 326). If this should be the first limitation of my study, I would like to make a suggestion that when a researcher puts a more rigorous attention on the visual dimension of the television news narrative in a more systematic way, it would produce a more comprehensible interpretation of the narrative structures of the television news, particularly on the discourse dimension.

Secondly, it should be mentioned that the narrative structures generated from my sample news stories, four narrative moments on the syntagmatic dimension in particular, are not necessarily able to be applied to other television genres such as sitcoms, serial and series dramas, and advertisements. In addition, even within the same news programs, this formulation of four narrative moments also needs to be tested against other regular news segments if they are to be claimed as such at a more general level. For the sample of the present study has consisted only of, what I call, "mini news-magazine" segments of which the format tends to bear resemblances to that of other regular news magazine programs such as *60 Minutes* or *20/20* in which the beginning and the closing of a story are relatively more discernible than other short news items. In fact, some news reports about the homeless were found lasting only as short as 40 seconds while the average duration for each segment in my study lasted 4 minutes.
and 16 seconds. In addition, as Gans (1979, p. 4) has pointed out, the "mini news-magazine" segments tend to emphasize the role of the major reporters whereas the anchors tend to dominate in short regular news items. As far as the lack of the beginning and the closing and the different role of the reporters are suspected, a different formulation of the narrative moments would be possible.

A third limitation of this study is in that my interpretation of the narrative structures embedded in the sampled television news stories is not necessarily applicable to the viewer's decoding pattern. This study has limited its subject of examination only to a half of an entire communication process, while concentrating on discovering the encoded structural patterns in the sample. In general, it is one thing that how the news makers utilize the conventional visual or aural signifying devices into constructing reality, and it is another that how the viewers would read those verbal and visual representations in comprehending the story as a whole. In addition, my study has not conducted field observation to see how television journalists actually select and arrange story events and semiotic visual and aural elements in their news-making routines. Therefore, a more comprehensive understanding of television news culture could be reached when research is done in three areas of television culture, production, text and audience in combination.

As a fourth limitation, this study has not dealt much with sociological aspects of the issue of "homelessness," since the dominant purpose of the present study has been to understand the television news medium's social practice in the construction of a particular reality of the homeless. In order to
achieve a full understanding of the issue in its relation to the mass media's representation of its culture, a virtual inter-disciplinary research might be required, by which even a television news critic can discern what television journalists actually rely on in actualizing the issue on screen. In doing so, it would be also useful to conduct an ethnographic study of the homeless's culture itself to examine how the homeless people really feel about society or their own status in comparison with other parts of the public. In this respect, it is meaningful that Fiske (1991) (which is the only one in regard to the issue of homelessness, as far as I have been able to ascertain), partially relying on the participant obervation method, has attempted to relate his interpretation of material conditions of homelessness with that of the homeless's cultural practice of "watching television" (specifically, a film Die Hard). Fiske contends that "the cultural analysis studies instances of culture in order to understand both the system that structures 'the whole way of life' and the ways of living that people devise within it" (p. 469).

Besides the above limitations, this study has not investigated the inter-textual relationship of television news programs with other popular cultural news forms such as news magazines and newspapers. It would be necessary to compare the would-be different narrative structures embedded in various mass mediated cultural products, if one attempts to understand homelessness as a minority culture in mainstream society in its full mass mediated social context.

Finally, this study has not been based upon objectivistic, positivistic, or scientific methodologies. Instead, this study is a subjective interpretive approach to the reading of television news narrative in an attempt to
understand, not to predict, the structural encoding principles which have
been consciously or unconsciously practiced in the television journalists's
news making process. The nature of this study then resembles, what Geertz
(1973) calls, an "interpretive" study, which has its unique characteristics as
Geertz claims in the following:

> it is interpretive; what it is interpretive of is the flow of social
discourse; and the interpreting involved consists in trying to rescue
the "said" of such discourse from its perishing occasions and fix it in
perusable terms....But there is, in addition, a fourth characteristic...:
it is microscopic. (p. 21)

Therefore, this study has attempted to "interpret" the flow of television news
narrative as a social discourse by means of "rescuing" what has been really
said in its process from what it has looked and sounded like. In applying
Geertz's insightful "interpreting" methodology into a study on news stories,
Ekdom (1981) also contends that "Interpretive studies are not systematic
treatises; they do not begin with a set of observation and subsume them
under a law. Rather, interpretive studies begin with a set of signifiers--here
the contents of news stories--and attempt to put them into an intelligible
frame" (p. 9). Seen from this perspective, my study is not "privileged," but
just "particular" and thus "intrinsically incomplete" (Geertz, p. 9, 29); it is
also open to challenge from different interpretative practices; it is thus open
to validity and reliability claims.

Despite the above limitations, one of the strengths the present study
has is that it has opened up an alternative way of reading our mass mediated
cultural text, particularly by providing an example of how to abstract an
syntagmatic structural pattern by means of thorough and extended analysis of the television news narrative shot by shot and sequence by sequence. I would also like to suggest that when this kind of text reading is extended to the study of other topics related to various social deviant groups which may mark the moments of the socio-political and cultural crisis in our society, it will help us understand how we consciously and unconsciously practice marginalizing and alienating these groups of people as a whole and thus participate in constructing our reality in a more adequate way.
Table 1

Distance from Subjects* to Camera (by Networks)
(In percent of total number of appearances)
(For key to abbreviations, see Appendix C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>ECU</th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>MCU</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>MLS</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>ELS</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>(660)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>(114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>(440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,213)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. When the camera zoomed, panned or tracked, the beginning and the ending distances were both included.
*Subjects refer to characters only. Therefore, non-character shots such as shots of street, building, or other shots which were not identifiable as character shots were excluded. This note must be applied to all of the following Tables.
Table 2

Distance from Subjects to Camera (by Subject Types*)
(In percent of total number of appearances)
(For key to abbreviations, see Appendix C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>ECU</th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>MCU</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>MLS</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>ELS</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anch</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>(62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>(52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>(880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>(62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>(85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>(62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total:

(n) (47) (153) (224) (243) (191) (174) (181) (1,213)

Note. When the camera zoomed, panned or tracked, the beginning and the ending distances were both included.

*Anch means the anchor; Rep, the reporter; HL, the homeless; HA, homeless advocate including such characters as shelter directors and workers, characters from "homeless coalitions", social workers, etc.; OR, the ordinary public; PR, professionals such as doctors, lawyers, psychiatrists, ministers, public service personnel, etc.; PL, police officers. This note must be applied to all of the following Tables.
### Table 3

**Camera Angle to Subjects (by Networks)**
(In percent of total number of appearances)
(For key to abbreviations, see Appendix C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100.0 (625)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.1 (373)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>100.0 (111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n) (158) (936) (47) (1,141)

**Note.** When a shot contained more than one angle due to camera's movement, both angles were included.
Table 4

**Camera Angle to Subjects (by Subject Types)**
(In percent of total number of appearances)
(For key to abbreviations, see Appendix C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anch</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>100.0 (812)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100.1 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>100.0 (105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.1 (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>(158)</td>
<td>(936)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(1,141)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** When a shot contained more than one angle due to camera's movement, both angles were included.
Table 5

Subjects's Orientation to Camera (by Network)
(In percent of total number of appearances)
(For key to abbreviations, see Appendix C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>X*</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>100.0 (621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>100.0 (416)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>99.9 (111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(580)</td>
<td>(145)</td>
<td>(88)</td>
<td>(318)</td>
<td>(1,131)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. When camera holds a group shot of lots of people, the shot was not included because it was regarded not significant for the purpose of the study. *When a character was seen from more than three designed orientations due to his/her movement/action, it was recorded as X.
Table 6

Subjects's Orientation to Camera (by Subject Types)
(In percent of total number of appearances)
(For key to abbreviations, see Appendix C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>X*</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anch</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0 (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>100.0 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>99.9 (812)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>100.1 (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>99.9 (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>100.0 (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>100.0 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (n) | (580) | (145) | (88) | (318) | (1,131) |

Note. When camera holds a group shot of lots of people, the shot was not included because it was regarded not significant for the purpose of the study. *When a character was seen from more than three designed orientations due to his/her movement/action, it was recorded as X.
Table 7

Subjects' Primary Actions*
(In percent of total number of appearances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Anch</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>HL</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(179)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>(329)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>(280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td>(1,130)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** When a two- or three-shot contained more than one actions, all of these were included. If a shot contained too many people, a shot of crowds in the bus terminal, for example, it was not counted since it was considered not significant for the purpose of the present study.
*DA means direct address to camera; ST, such unfavorable actions as standing/sitting around, looking around, etc. without doing productive things; WA, walking; SL, sleeping; EA, eating; DI, digging in the trash can; PA, disordering actions such as panhandling, drug-dealing, prostitution, involvement in arrest, policing, and other unfavorable events; WB, weird behaviors typical of mental patients; PL, actions including positive or normal actions such as reading, having conversation, playing, singing, etc.; IN, involvement in interview situation; OT, others.
APPENDIX B
SAMPLE VIEWING SHEETS
SAMPLE "STORY" VIEWING SHEET (I)

Sample No. __________________________ Network __________________________
Air Date __________________________ Total Running Time __________
Segment Title __________________________
Episode Title __________________________
Anchor(s) __________________________
Reporter(s) __________________________

Categories

Binary Oppositions

Topic:

Settings:

Characters:

Plot:

(1) Opening/Introduction:

(2) Middle/Conflicts:

(3) Closing/Resolution:
## SAMPLE "DISCOURSE" VIEWING SHEET (II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seq.</th>
<th>Shot</th>
<th>Graph</th>
<th>Edit</th>
<th>Camera Work</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SpokenText</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>Dist Ang Move</td>
<td>scene, sound, movement, name, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>secs</td>
<td>secs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


APPENDIX C

KEY TO THE VISUAL AND AURAL ABBREVIATIONS
2S  A shot of 2 characters.
3S  A shot of 3 characters.
Anch  Anchor person.
B/G  Objects and characters appear in background, having a tendency not to dominate the scene.
B/W  Image in black and white.
BC  Characters are seen back to camera, having a tendency not to dominate the scene.
BG  Background picturings behind characters; usually seen behind the anchor or the reporter.
C  Cut; the most frequently used editing technique by which one image is cut to another.
CF  Center frame; Objects or characters are located in the center of frame, tending to dominate the scene.
CU  Close-up shot; a shot of character's head and neck; sometimes used to capture other parts of the body, hands and legs, for example.
D  Dissolve; an editing technique; a gradual transition from one image to another as two images temporarily overlap.
DA  The anchor's or reporter's direct address to camera; eye-contact with the viewer; creates an imagined interpersonal communication situation.
DI  Dolly-in; "dolly" (camera support) moves the camera toward the objects or characters).
DO  Dolly-out; "dolly" (camera support) moves the camera away from the objects or characters.)
ECU  Extreme close-up; character's face fills the screen completely, or is cut off by the frame; tends to produce unfavorable image of character.

ELS  Extreme long-shot; character's facial features are barely distinguishable; destroying sense of individuality of character.

ES   Establishing shot; outdoor shot used to reveal a surrounding setting from a long distance away.

F/G  Objects or characters appear in foreground, tending to dominate the scene.

FC   Character faces camera, tending to dominate the scene compared to BC or PF.

FF   Freeze frame; a special effect added in the editing process; arrested motion, which is perceived as a still shot.

FI   Fade-in; an editing technique for the gradual appearance of a picture from black.

FO   Fade-out; an editing technique for the gradual disappearance to black.

Fol  Camera follows objects or characters as they are moving; typical of arresting scene with the use of hand-held camera.

GS   A group-shot; more than 3 characters are seen in a shot.

HA   High-angle shot; camera looks down on the objects or characters.

HL   homeless person.

Int  Interview; characters are seen being involved in interview.

L or LF Objects or characters appear on left side of frame.

LA   Low-angle shot; camera looks up at objects or characters.
LS  Long shot; character's entire body is seen; character's facial features are usually discernible with such exception as the shot at night or under weak lighting.

MCU  Medium close-up; a typical anchor shot revealing character's head to about middle of chest; frequently used for interviewees.

MLS  Medium long-shot; character is seen from head to slightly below knees.

MS  Medium shot; character is seen from head about to waist.

OffS  Off-screen dialogue; usually used in interview situation while the other party is seen on screen; must be distinguished from the reporter's VO.

OnS  On-screen dialogue; character is seen on screen while talking; must be distinguished from the reporter's VO.

OS  Over the shoulder shot; usually in interview situation; reveals the back of one character (mostly in LF, RF, or F/G) and the front of a second character in MS or MCU (usually in CF).

PF  Character's in-profile orientation to camera, tending not to dominate the scene, compared to FC.

PL  Pan left; camera pans left.

PR  Pan right; camera pans right.

R or RF  Objects or characters appear on right side of frame.

Rep  Reporter.

S  Shot; what the camera actually reveals to viewers on screen between each edit point or "cut"

SA  Standard-angle shot; camera's normal, eye-level angle shot of objects or characters.
**Sil**
Silhouette shot in which objects or characters are seen in counter-lighting; character’s facial/body features are not discernible; tending to produce unfavorable image.

**SP**
Still picture of character or object.

**Super**
Superimposition; an editing technique for simultaneous showing of two pictures on screen; mostly used for showing title of the program, name of character or other informational drawings.

**TC**
Title card; a kind of superimposition; used for showing title, name, date, etc.

**TD**
Tilt down; to point the camera down.

**TR**
Trucking; normally, camera moves parallel to a moving (walking or riding) object; sometimes, camera moves in any direction to reveal or follow (moving) objects or characters.

**TU**
Tilt up; to point the camera up.

**VO**
Voice-over narration; generally used for the reporter for adding information verbally on the visual; must be distinguished from OnS or OffS dialogue which usually happens in interview situation or is used as the camera films the visuals.

**W**
Wipe; an editing technique; a special visual effect whereby a bar, for example, moves across the screen "wiping" off image while revealing a new one.

**ZE**
Zoom-Effects: used as a transitional device: While one image is being zoomed out, another one zoomed in.

**ZI**
Zoom-in; camera perspective moves gradually closer to objects or characters.

**ZO**
Zoom-out; camera perspective moves gradually from close range to longer one.
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