Journalism, Representation and the Public Sphere

JOURNALISM, REPRESENTATION AND THE PUBLIC SPHERE

Table of Contents

SECTION 3: PUBLIC SPHERE, SPACE AND POLITICS

SECTION 4: RETHINKING MEDIA STUDIES

SECTION 5: ACADEMIC PRACTICE

PART 2
THE EUROPEAN MEDIA AND COMMUNICATION DOCTORAL SUMMER SCHOOL 2014 AND ITS PARTICIPANTS

Employing a rhetorical approach to the practice of audience research on political communication

Magnus Hoem Iversen

Abstract

In the present chapter, I argue that the tradition of rhetoric includes certain perspectives that can be employed in the 'cultural tradition and reception analysis' – especially if one's area of inquiry is different forms of political communication. As originally practiced, reception analysis had a certain tendency to draw inspiration from the tradition of rhetoric. Consequently, there are certain shared perspectives, preconditions and conceptions between the two traditions. In the following, I argue that one should further examine how rhetoric can strengthen contemporary reception analysis. I present two approaches, or concepts, that I maintain are useful in this regard: a) a view of communication as intentional and b) a rhetorical view of argumentation. Integrating these tools into reception analysis will enable a further understanding on how traditional and emerging forms of intentional, political communication are perceived and interpreted by audiences. It will also encourage those practicing reception analysis to pay greater attention to the production of media texts, as well as engaging with the texts themselves.

Keywords: Rhetoric, reception analysis, political communication, argumentation.

1.   Introduction

Within the field of audience studies, reception analysis (McQuail, 1997: 18) has tended to draw inspiration from the tradition of rhetoric (see Merton, 1946; Morley, 1980; Gentikow, 1998: 153). Consequently, there are certain shared perspectives, preconditions and conceptions between these two traditions of scholarly interest. Mindful of this, we should examine how rhetoric can strengthen contemporary reception analysis. In this chapter, I present two approaches that I regard as useful for reception analysis: 1) a rhetorical view of intentional communication, and 2) the concept of rhetorical argumentation. I propose that these approaches are useful on two levels: Firstly, they can guide and inform the research questions and interview guides employed by audience researchers, and, secondly, they are beneficial in the actual analysis of informants' responses. Integrating these tools into reception analysis will enable a further understanding of how traditional and emerging forms of intentional, political communication are perceived and interpreted by audiences.

1.1. Classic inspiration and common ground

The idea of employing rhetorical perspectives in the exploration of audience response is not new. The tradition of cultural studies, which later evolved into "reception research" (Jensen and Rosengrehn, 1990) and which is also known as "the cultural tradition and reception analysis" (McQuail, 1997: 18), demonstrates this. Reception analysis has its origins in reactions to traditional audience studies' lack of focus on meaning construction, and certain perceived limitations concerning the methods that have hitherto been employed (Hagen, 1992: 42). One pioneering study for cultural studies was Merton's *Mass Persuasion* (1946). Morley explicitly writes about this study as a work of high sophistication and ambition in his cultural studies classic *The Nationwide Audience* (Morley, 1980: 3-4). In *Mass Persuasion*, Merton draws on the rhetorical tradition in an attempt to understand the changing media landscape of the 1940s, the new medium of radio, and what seemed like a singular case of mass persuasion at the time. This mixture of old and new is typical of Merton's methods in general (Simonson, 2006: 275). It is also a testament to the fact that, even in times of change, there are still some things that are fixed within human communication: "In every age, the artifices of rhetoric have moved men to act – or to refrain from acting" (Merton, 1946: 1). Another asset of *Mass Persuasion* is that it takes into consideration several chains of the communicative process. It combines a rigorous, qualitative analysis of persuasive communication with interpretations and analysis of both the socio-cultural context and actual audience response (Morley, 1980: 3-4; Gentikow, 1998:

159). This study is now somewhat outdated. Theory, tradition and methodology have evolved since it was published. However, the radical potential in *Mass Persuasion* has curiously not been followed through to any notable degree. Combining the rhetorical perspective with audience response could arguably help solve several problems in reception analysis research. Gentikow (1999: 153) mentions the twin traps of either paying too little attention to the persuasive texts themselves, reducing them to their readings, or paying too much attention to them, through placing too much emphasis on close reading. A third trap where reception research has been found wanting is that of neglecting the processes involved in the production of media messages (Hagen, 2006: 104, Morley 1993: 16).

1.2. Active audience theory and agency

A central perspective in reception analysis is the conception of the audience(s) as active, as co-creators and co-interpreters of media messages. Meaning is negotiated between producer, text and audience. This approach – often named the *active audience theory* - has also come in for its fair share of criticism. The notion of *polysemy* – that one text can have more than one denotational meaning, can be 'read' in different ways – has been much debated. Concerns have been raised around a tendency to overestimate the freedom of audiences in reception (see, for instance, Budd, Entman and Steinman, 1990: 169). But as Morley reminds us:

> *Hall's (1981) original formulation of the encoding/decoding model contained, as one of its central features, the concept of the preferred reading (towards which the text attempts to direct its reader) while acknowledging the <u>possibility</u> of alternative, negotiated or oppositional readings* (Morley, 1993: 13). (My emphasis)

Morley is critical of what he calls the "facile insistence on the polysemy of media products" and an "undocumented presumption that forms of interpretative resistance are more widespread than subordination" as well as an "unfortunate […] tendency toward an overdrawn emphasis on the polysemous qualities of texts […]" (Ibid). When applied to highly intentional or rhetorical communication, the term 'polyvalence' is more appropriate in some cases. 'Polyvalence' is a condition where there is a shared understanding of the literal meaning of the text, but disagreement about the evaluations of the literal meanings (Ceccarelli, 1988; Condit, 1989). Another important distinction here is that some texts are more polysemous than others. One can, for instance, expect a fiction film to be more polysemous than a political advertisement. Considering this, Hall's thoughts on encoding-decoding and Morley's explorations of these thoughts still provide some interesting insights, because they emphasize the idea of ne-

gotiation and the relationship between producers' intentions, manifestations of these intentions in the text and how these intentions are interpreted by audiences. This perspective is very much in line with the rhetorical perspective and the debate on *agency*. Leff (2003) discusses the ambivalence in the rhetorical tradition with regard to agency. Who is it who actually holds power in the communicative situation? Is it the speaker and the text, or the audience? Rhetoric can be said to contain a "strong, almost totalizing […] emphasis on the agency of the rhetor" (Leff, 2003: 136). A review of the tradition leads Leff to state that: "[…] rhetoric valorizes and centers itself on the individual agent" (Ibid: 138). At the same time, there are indications of the very opposite, because "the power to move and persuade an audience requires accommodation and adaptation to its sentiments […] if orators are to exert influence, they must yield to the people they seek to influence […]" (Ibid). In *The New Rhetoric* (1958) of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, what is central is a theory of rhetorical argumentation that is part continuation and part amplification of the Aristotelian tradition, together with the notions of *audience* and *adherence*. It is claimed that "[…] argumentation aims at securing the adherence of those to whom it is addressed, [therefore] it is, in its entirety, relative to the audience to be influenced" (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969: 19). In this view then, persuasion is seen as a modest attempt at gaining adherence from an audience (Gentikow, 1998: 153). Aristotle also puts considerable emphasis on audiences, as they represent the very *telos* - the goal, of the utterance (Kjeldsen, 2006: 33). This is a view that empowers the audience (Gentikow, 1998: 145). Continuing this thought, large parts of rhetorical argumentation can be seen as dialogical (Ibid). A *rhetor* must respect and listen to her/his audience, and put him/herself in their place, mentally speaking, if (s)he is to have any success at all (Kjeldsen, 2006: 21). The formation of arguments must build on shared beliefs and norms (*doxa*) between the speaker and the audience. One can argue that this grants a lot of power to the audience, and to their responses. Audiences will always be co-creators of rhetorical utterances (Kjeldsen, 2008: 55). In other words, the dialogical nature of rhetoric confers on the audience considerable power of agency. One can perhaps talk of negotiation, instead of mere persuasion.

2.   Approach A: A rhetorical view of intentional communication

As already mentioned, there has been a certain tendency within reception analysis to underemphasize the power and intentions of the producers of media texts. Morley, for instance, is wary of what he calls unfounded assumptions, claiming that: "reception is, somehow, the only stage of the communications process that matters in the end" (Morley, 1993: 15). The implication here is

that reception analysis needs to incorporate insights into production issues, as well as analytical insights into the text itself – in order to avoid reducing media texts to their readings. A rhetorical perspective on communication as intentional can be of use here.

In this chapter, when using the term 'rhetoric', I am referring to the theoretical, empirical and normative science of rhetoric – the study of (attempted) persuasive communication. In this view, rhetoric is the domain of "purposeful and effective communication" (Kjeldsen, 2006: 24-26). Not so far removed from the theories of speech acts of Austin and Searle (1958, 1969), language use is seen as "Acting with communicating" (Kjeldsen, 2014: 12). Rhetoric then can be seen as "[…] language-based communication consciously shaped to achieve a specific intent in the receiver" (Kock, 2012: 9). Central to these definitions is *the intent to persuade*. Language is seen as intentional – as something presented with a point and a purpose. It is the attempt to achieve certain goals in relation to a certain audience. Not all human language is intentional, of course, but some language is certainly more intentional than other types. Political communication is a case in point. The communication and language use of powerful political elites, for instance, political parties, can be said to be a domain of highly intentional language use. Examples include political advertisements, the work of spin doctors, press releases, politicians' speeches, the language used in debates, the visual and verbal language of a political party's web page, and so on.

Treating rhetoric in this way is called taking a *narrow persuasio* position (Kjeldsen, 2006: 18-20). In the *narrow persuasio*, one is studying and dealing with intentional communication that seeks to persuade. I would like to make use of this term in the argument I am making in this chapter, but would also like to introduce the concept of *broad persuasio*. In the *broad persuasio* sense, one is dealing with any form of communication that posits a subject in a way that an audience experiences or understands it. Such a perspective can be useful for analyzing works of literature or musical compositions, but can also be applied to the pedagogic skill of a teacher in a classroom – and to a wide range of other types of human communication (Ibid: 18).

3. Approach B: Rhetorical argumentation

Morley (1992: 121) suggests that the term 'decoding' within reception analysis masks several other processes, and that one should rather split the term 'decoding' into multiple other processes. For instance, one could operate with processes of identification, cognition and argumentation (to mention but some),

and study these phenomena individually. What rhetoric can offer reception analysis is both an apparatus and a number of analytical concepts for studying argumentation.

A rhetorical sense of argumentation differs from the logical and dialectical sense in several ways (Tindale, 2004: 4-6). Logic is concerned with "the products of statements collected in the relations of premises and conclusions". (Ibid) Argument is here seen as an outcome or a product (Ibid). The dialectical perspective of argument is interested in "the argumentative exchanges within a dialogue and the moves that might be involved" (Ibid). A dialectical perspective sees argumentation more in terms of a procedure. Rhetoric, on the other hand, sees argumentation as a process of interaction between speaker, audience and context: Attention is paid to the means used between the person making the argument and the audience addressed: "Questions are asked about the nature of the audience […]" (Ibid: 5). All three perspectives are valid and useful, but some argumentation is not about what is true, but about what to *do* (Kock, 2007: 180). When dealing with such argumentation, a rhetorical perspective can be usefully employed. Rhetoric is concerned with deliberations around future actions and future choices. It is "debate about choosing action" (Ibid: 188). What is important here is the clear focus on the audience, and thereby the introduction of subjectivity into argument appraisal (Ibid: 188-189). What is a valid or strong argument is dependent on the situation, the context and the audience.

According to Cicero, an attempt at persuasion contains several elements (Kjeldsen, 2006: 35), namely the dimensions of *movere* (moving or engaging), *docere* (informing) and *delectare* (pleasing). Cicero connects these concepts to the rhetorical proofs of logos, ethos and pathos, first described by Aristotle. Logos is concerned with intellectual stimuli, the logic of a message - ethos and pathos with emotional stimuli (Jørgensen, 2011: 14). When informing, the speaker should employ logos, the persuasion that is created through the arguments presented. When pleasing, the speaker should employ ethos appeals. Ethos is concerned with the persuasion that is created through the character of the speaker, judged through categories of trustworthiness of the speaker. For instance, to what degree does the audience feel they can trust the source, sender or producer of a message (Ibid: 14f)? As ethos is a continually changing factor, one usually operates with concepts such as 'initial', 'derived' and 'final' ethos (McCroskey, 2000 in Jørgensen, 2011: 15). When attempting to move or engage an audience, the speaker should employ pathos appeals. Pathos appeals attempt to put the audience in a certain frame of mind, for instance of anger, compassion or joy (Ibid). These categories are analytical concepts. From a rhetorical point of view, it is impossible to craft a message using solely emotion, or only credibility or logic. In the rhetorical perspective, each utterance will to some degree contain all three – but each of them can be more dominant

in some cases. It is also the case that researchers can choose to focus more on some than on others. That every utterance contains appeals to both reason and emotion is a central perspective that has been maintained since Aristotle.

4.   To what use can this be put?

At the start of this chapter, I stated that the two approaches of an intentional view of communication and rhetorical argumentation could be useful for both the formulation of research questions and interview guides as well as in the actual analysis of informants' responses. To briefly give an example of how useful this can be, I will use a study of the encoding and decoding of a political web advertisement as a backdrop.

In Norway, the use of political advertising seems to be growing in popularity among all political parties. This is especially true of advertisements distributed via radio, print newspapers, in cinemas and, last but not least, the Internet. A recent example is the campaign video "Taxi Stoltenberg", produced and distributed in connection with the Norwegian national elections of 2013. The advertisement was produced for the Labour Party by TRY/APT, the most acclaimed advertising agency in Norway. The advertisement shows a series of candid-camera shots taken in a taxi with the then Prime Minister, Jens Stoltenberg, playing the part of taxi driver. The advertisement "went viral" shortly after its release, sparking considerable media attention and debate both in Norway and abroad.

Considering Norway's unique position when it comes to both regulation and legislation of political advertisements on television, the results and findings of this study may very well be interesting to an international readership. Considering the ban on televised political advertisements in Norway, the whole genre is so to speak forced to migrate to other media, including the Internet.

More knowledge is needed about how advertisements make greater use of emotional arguments, and the visual components of political web advertising (Kaid, 2012: 44-45). The increased use of YouTube and other online video sites for political parties has been noted (see Ridout, Fowler and Branstetter, 2010, 2012). An increased focus on how political advertisements can go viral should also be noted. These strategies can be seen as necessary to combat the selective exposure-tendencies observed in "the current environment of remote controls, timer recordings […] and the transfer of advertising directly to the web" (Kaid, 2012: 44). However, as the 'Taxi Stoltenberg' episode illustrates, in Norway these phenomena are not only trends, but can be seen as necessities – given that there still is a formal ban on political advertising on television. How are we to understand this new form of political advertising? A possible means of reaching a better understanding is to utilize the combined strengths

of rhetoric and reception analysis. Such an approach has yielded good results in past explorations of changing media environments, as the work of Merton (1946) has shown.

4.1. Approaching intentions

Perhaps the most important contribution of a rhetorical view of communication as intentional is that such a view forces researchers to take multiple factors into consideration in their attempt to establish what is going on in the communicative process. In other words, this approach forces reception analysis to consider the entire process of communication to a much greater degree. In this manner, the concept of intentionality can help in the formulating of the research questions, and in the researcher's concern to incorporate aspects of production and textual analysis into their study.

In the case of political advertisements one can presuppose a high degree of intentionality. They will have been made with the purpose of achieving specific ends. In the broad sense, one goal may be to make someone vote for or against a particular person or party. The strategies for achieving this will be specific to situations and contexts, each of which will entail an attempt to persuade or influence voters. Those conducting a research study will then be able to examine these intentions, or at least the producers' own conceptions and explications of their intentions. The best way of doing this may be to go straight to the source: to conduct interviews with the producers of the political advertisements and, if possible, to observe them in the course of this activity. In so doing, one should try to establish what the intended function of the political advertisement is. How do the producers intend the advertisement to be read? Who do they think they are addressing? And if the advertisement comprises different components, how do the various components (visual, verbal and auditory) combine with each other to achieve their communicative effect? In short, what is it they are trying to accomplish?

Such explorations give researchers a yardstick for further research and inquiry. Intentionality can be compared across the communicative process. If one has established the intent of producers, one can begin to analyze the text itself to further explore how the intent can be said to manifest itself in the text. And most importantly, how do the intentions of producers compare with the actual reception by 'readers'? How do people react to the advertisements, and how do they evaluate them? What are the audiences own explications of what they see and how do they perceive the intentions of the imagined producers? Another question is whether advertisements are decoded in the way that the producers intended? If yes, then one should try to explain possible reasons for this success, and if no, one should try to understand why the producers and the

advertisements "failed" to get across their message. Venturing further into such misunderstandings and mis-readings can give many insights into the processes of attempted persuasive communication.

4.2. Approaching argumentation

As with the intentionality approach, if we assume that producers are making a case or arguing for something in their advertisements, then we can as researchers explore this form of argumentation. This perspective enables researchers to question the exact nature of the argument: how it moves through the chain of communication, how the argument is set up, how it is made manifest in the advertisements themselves. In addition, how is the argument perceived by different audiences and how do these audiences make sense of the arguments presented? How do audiences reconstruct the argumentation – if at all – and how do they form their own judgments if these chime with or are opposed to the arguments they extract from the political advertisement? Asking such questions, researchers can gain insights into the kind of appeal producers are attempting to encode in their ads. Are they making appeals to emotion, credibility or the audiences' 'common sense', or something else? Do producers attempt to move, to inform or simply to please the electorate? If they are trying to create emotions of trust with regard to a particular candidate, what kinds of argument are inserted into the advertisement, explicitly and implicitly, to achieve this? On the audience side, researchers can explore the informants' explications of their cognitive evaluations of these appeals through interviews or by other means. Argumentation analysis, and reconstructing rhetorical arguments from statements made in advertisements, is also a useful procedure for making the implicit explicit. This makes this approach useful for researchers who want to examine the assumptions, norms and values that might underlie such utterances. The rhetorical perspective on argumentation is not concerned with true statements, or deliberative norms and the rules of the game – it is concerned rather with the sometimes highly subjective type of argumentation that people persistently use, including the type of argumentation that political parties use in every election. This makes rhetorical argumentation analysis useful for scrutinizing and analyzing informants' answers – from interview texts, for instance. Deciding how to analyze interview texts is a constant challenge in reception analysis (Gentikow, 1998: 154). In *The Nationwide Audience* (Morley, 1980), Morley uses a version of proposition analysis to analyze the interview tapes. Inspired by Gerbner, he aims to "make explicit the implicit propositions, assumptions or norms which underlie and make it logically acceptable to advance a particular opinion or point of view" (Morley, 1980: 35). This stance is quite similar to what rhetorical argumentation analysis is

aiming to do. However, as we have seen above, rhetoric is concerned with the domain of deliberations concerning future choices and as such with, the realms of probability rather than with those of truth-telling, traditionally attributed to logic or philosophy. Paired with the view of argumentation as a process, this is a good analytical position to take when the subject matter to be scrutinized is political advertising. Political messages produced in connection with an election are, after all, a very clear example of deliberating on future action.

5.   Conclusion

In this chapter I have concerned myself exclusively with political advertisements. Nevertheless, the approaches and concepts I have introduced are applicable to other areas as well. For instance, how do citizens perceive online political communication through pre-video-YouTube ads? What about the visual and verbal rhetoric employed on a political webpage? What strategies are devised and presented in the "ground games", the canvassing and door-stepping practised by political parties in order to 'get out the vote', and how is this type of personal political communication perceived by citizens who actually open their doors for the campaigners? Or leaving the narrow *persuasio* for the broader version, how are protesters and activists, the actual embodiments of bodily rhetoric perceived by audiences at street level and through media representations? And crucially: How do intentions reflect reception? How do producers make appeals through *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos*,– and how do voters respond to these appeals? How do producers try to construct *ethos* for their politicians, their parties and within their messages - and how do voters perceive these attempts? The field of reception analysis has something to learn from rhetorical scholars who "scrutinize words, texts, and utterances to see how people use language to act" (Kock, 2007: 179).

In this chapter, I have proposed two approaches: communication as intentional and argumentation as rhetorical. This is certainly not a one-way process. By undertaking such efforts, the tradition of rhetoric can gain further empirical insights into audience response, something that has been somewhat lacking to date. A rhetorical perspective in reception analysis, with a rigorous qualitative orientation, and taking into account the multiple parts of the communicative 'chain' can also have more general application in the field of 'political communication'.

References

Austin, J. L. (1962) *"How To Do Things With Words" The William James Lectures. Delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Budd, M., Entman, R. M., Steinman, C. (1990) 'The Affirmative Character of US Cultural Studies', *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 7(2): 169-184.

Ceccarelli, L. (1998) 'Polysemy: Multiple Meanings in Rhetorical Criticism', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 84(4): 395-415.

Condit, C. M. (1989) 'The Rhetorical Limits of Polysemy', *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 6(2): 103-122.

Gentikow, B. (1998) 'The Contested Power of Persuasion', *Nordicom Review*, 16: 143-158.

Hagen, I. (2006) *Medias publikum: frå mottakar til brukar?* Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.

Hagen, I. (1992) *News Viewing Ideals and Everyday Practices: The Ambivalences of Watching Dagsrevyen*. Bergen: Department of Mass Communication, University of Bergen.

Jensen, K. B., Rosengren, K. E. (1990) 'Five Traditions in Search of the Audience', *European Journal of Communication*, 5(2): 207-238.

Jørgensen, C. (2011) 'Hvad er retorik?', pp. 11-35, in C. Jørgensen and L.Villadsen (Eds.) *Retorik: Teori og Praksis*. Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.

Kaid, L. L. (2012) 'Political Advertising As Political Marketing: A Retro-forward Perspective', *Journal of Political Marketing*, 11(1-2): 29-53.

Kjeldsen, J. E. (2014) *Hva er retorikk? En håndbok*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Kjeldsen, J. E. (2008) 'Rhetorical Circumstances. Rhetoric in a Fragmented, Changing and Complex World', *Rhetorica Scandinavica*, 48: 42-63.

Kjeldsen, J. E. (2006) *Retorikk i vår tid: en innføring i moderne retorisk teori*. Oslo: Spartacus.

Kock, C. (2012) *Ordets magt: retorisk tænkning der holder – bind 1: før 1900*. Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.

Kock, C. (2007) 'Norms of Legitimate Dissensus', *Informal Logic,* 27(2): 179-196.

Leff, M. (2003) 'Tradition and Agency in Humanistic Rhetoric', *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 36(2): 135-147.

Merton, R. K., Fiske, M., Curtis, A. (1946) *Mass Persuasion: The Social Psychology of a War Bond Drive*. New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

Morley, D. (1993) 'Active Audience Theory: Pendulums and Pitfalls', *Journal of Communication*, 43(4): 13-19.

Morley, D. (1992) *Television, Audiences and Cultural Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Morley, D. (1980) *The Nationwide Audience: Structure and Decoding*. British Film Institute.

McQuail, D. (1997) *Audience Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, London and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Perelman, C., Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1958) *The new rhetoric. A treatise on Argumentation.* Notre Dame, London: University of Notre Dame Press.

Ridout, T., Fowler, E., Branstetter, J. (2010) 'Political Advertising in the 21st Century: The Rise of the Youtube Ad', paper prepared for the *annual meeting of the American Political Science Association*, 2-5 September 2010, Washington, D.C., USA, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1642853

Ridout, T., Fowler, E., Branstetter, J. (2012) 'Political Advertising in the 21st Century: The Influence of the Youtube Ad', paper prepared for the *annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association*, 22-24 March 2012, Portland, Oregon, USA, http://wpsa.research.pdx.edu/meet/2012/ridout.pdf

Searle, J. R. (1969) *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simonson, P. (2006) 'Celebrity, Public Image and American Political Life: Rereading Robert K. Merton's Mass Persuasion', *Political Communication* 23(3): 271-284.

Tindale, C. W. (2004) *Rhetorical Argumentation: Principles of Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, London and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Biography

Magnus Hoem Iversen is a PhD Candidate at the Department of Information Science and Media Studies at the University of Bergen, Norway. He is associated with the group for research into rhetoric, and is supervised by professors Jens Kjeldsen and Hallvard Moe. Iversen investigates political advertisements in film form in Norway – Their production, their content and their reception.

Contact: Magnus.Iversen@infomedia.uib.no