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Abstract

This project analyzes conversations between men and women podcasters in a contemporary work setting. I specifically analyze questions, attention getting strategies, interruptions and overlaps, minimal responses, and the use of statements. These fundamental linguistic features are essential to conversation analysis and relevant to understanding the distribution of power within a conversation. The frequency and rate at which these specific linguistic features occur is recorded in each individual podcast and the results are compared. The results provide insight into how male and female podcasters interact.

This project replicates a 1978 earlier study by Pamela Fishman: She recorded three white, middle-class, heterosexual couples in their private homes and concluded that women work much harder than their male counterparts to participate, to be heard, and to gain control of the conversation. My project differs in that I do not look at interactions between intimate couples. Rather, I study interactions between three sets of podcaster hosts: two males, two females, and a male and a female. The podcasters include black, white, gay, lesbian, and gender-nonconforming participants from various political backgrounds. I analyze their discussions to determine who, if any, works harder in conversation than their co-podcaster. I compare my own findings to outside research and discuss the importance of the differences or similarities from a sociolinguistic perspective.
Introduction

Gender is no longer a static structure underpinning entire cultures; it is fluid and evolving and on-the-move. The shift is reflected in the clothes we wear, the food we eat, and the language we use to communicate. While some drag their feet and others catch up, language may very well be the only way to capture this monumental shift in society’s attitude and awareness. Gender is not new to the field of linguistics and language research. While it may be young—the first article being published just over forty years ago—the field experienced a boom of research with every great social movement since then. With the evolution of gender and sex in modern culture, new research is needed to accommodate shifting societal views.

This research project is a replication of an earlier study from 1978. Pamela Fishman conducted research that shed light on issues of gender discrimination and power dynamics between men and women. She studied three couples, or intimates, and analyzed hours of recorded conversations inside their own homes. Fishman’s goal was to determine which person in the couple, male or female, did the most linguistic work. She concluded that women have to work much harder than their male counterparts to participate, to be heard, and to gain control of the conversation. Her study was spearheaded by several other notable figures of the time, including Deborah Tannen, Robin Lakoff, Harvey Sacks, and Emanuel Schegloff.

Deborah Tannen explains how “The year 1975 can be regarded as having launched the field of gender and language,” and “Since that watershed year the relationship between language and gender has become the focus of a vast multidisciplinary literature” (3,4). Conversational dynamics between men and women
during this era were a topic of interest due to rising awareness of civil rights and second-wave feminism. Pamela Fishman’s article, titled “Interaction: The Work Women Do”, is one of many conclusive studies that focuses on the power dynamics between men and women, and continues to be a point of reference for many researchers today. This research project is a replication of Fishman’s study and my methods run parallel to hers.

Fishman discusses the importance of power in social relationships between men and women. She cites research by Berger and Luckmann, who define power as imposing one’s will onto others (Fishman 397). Analyzing power dynamics through conversation provides insight into social relationships and the societies people live in. Fishman claims that “Power is the ability to impose one's definition of what is possible, what is right, what is rational, what is real” (397). Therefore, understanding these power dynamics is vital to understanding others and the way we relate to one another.

Citing previous research on gender and sociolinguistics, Fishman explains how the male-female hierarchy is already prevalent in the English language with gendered suffixes and generic ways of referring to our species, such as all of mankind, waitress and mistress. She claims that “These studies of grammatical forms and vocabulary document the male-dominated reality expressed through our language” (Fishman 398). Her decision to study intimates was based on research by Berger and Kellner who claimed these relationships create reality-maintaining settings. In other words, people in intimate partnerships share their own experiences with each other and reconstruct everyday activities, tasks, and interactions in conversation. Further, “It is through this work that people produce their relationship to one another, their relationship to the world, and those
patterns normally referred to as social structure” (Fishman 398). Fishman follows this claim with a discussion about linguistic work and interaction.

Conversation and interaction is in and of itself work. It takes work to communicate, to respond to someone else, and to listen to what they are saying. Fishman reminds the reader of basic turn-taking in conversation; each turn is considered an attempt at communication. She explains how the “other person has the power to turn an attempt into a conversation or to stop it dead” (Fishman 399). For an attempt to be successful, the other person must be willing to do interactional work.

For her study, Fishman analyzed fifty-two hours of conversation between intimates in their homes. The three heterosexual couples she studied had been together for various amounts of time, however, she notes that “All were white and professionally-oriented, between the ages of twenty-five and thirty-five” (399). Additionally, two of the women “were avowed feminists and all three men as well as the other woman described themselves as sympathetic to the women's movement” (399). The next section of Fishman’s article, “Findings: Interactional Strategies”, goes into detail about the results of her study. She examines the use of questions, conversational openers, attention beginners, minimal responses, and declarative sentences in her research.

Questions are a point of interest for Fishman because they provide insight into the power dynamics between the speakers. Her study revealed that the women asked questions more often than the men: about three times more often. In just seven hours of recorded conversation, she counted fifty-nine questions from the men and one-hundred fifty questions from the women. Fishman attributes this phenomenon to, “women's insecurity, a linguistic signal of an internal psychological state resulting from the
oppression of women” (400). She explains that questions are a type of utterance that elicit a response from the listener. Asking a question “is a way to insure a minimal interaction-at least one utterance by each of two participants. It guarantees a response” (401). A question left unanswered is noticeable to the speaker and will likely be received negatively.

Conversational openers are the second linguistic feature that Fishman accounts for in her research. Similar to asking questions, conversational openers include phrases like ‘D’ya know?’ and are used to insure a response and capture the listener’s attention. She notes that this strategy is often used by children to acknowledge their restricted rights to speak and at the same time, ask permission to speak. She explains how these phrases or, “... sequences in interaction informs us both about the work of guaranteeing interaction and the differential rights of the participants” (401). She found that the women used this device twice as often than the men.

Attention beginners are used to establish that a statement or utterance has validity. Fishman discovered that the comment “This is interesting” (or variations of it) was used throughout the tapes. The use of this expression in conversation suggests that the speaker believes the utterance alone cannot be deemed worthy of the listener’s attention. In five hours of recorded conversation, the women used this ten times and the men used it seven times. Another attention beginner noticed throughout the tapes was the expression ‘y’know’. This expression is less forceful than the first, but still is an attempt to get the listener’s attention. It was used significantly more by the women: thirty-four times compared to three times by the men.
The minimal response was another interaction strategy used by both the men and women in Fishman’s study. However, they used it quite differently. Fishman noted that the men used minimal responses to fill a space in the conversation that needed to be filled while the women inserted them very frequently between breaths and openings. She explains, “a woman would make a lengthy remark, after which the man responded with ‘yeah,’ doing nothing to encourage her, nor to elaborate. Such minimal responses are attempts to discourage interaction” (402). Comparatively, the women used minimal responses as ‘support work’ when the men were talking. Rather them inserting them only when necessary (to insure the speaker that they have their full attention). Fishman noticed how skilled the women were at doing this; she said they never mistimed their insertions or caused an overlap in the conversation.

Finally, Fishman includes the use of declarative sentences in her analysis. While declarative sentences do little for the overall success of an interaction--since they are typically used to state facts--they provide an opportunity for the other person to comment, ultimately insuring the progress of the interaction. She made a point to include statements because the men produced them twice as much as the women. Additionally, the men almost always received a response from the women which was not the case when the roles were reversed. She found that the men would actually direct the conversation back to their own statements, sometimes completely ignoring or not commenting on what the woman had said.

The five interaction strategies or linguistic features that Fishman analyzed in her study are the basis for my own research. Rather than focusing on intimates and couples, I will be studying hours of pre-recorded dialogue between podcaster co-hosts (the choice is
further discussed in the Methods section). Using the transcribed data, I will record when
questions, conversational openers, attention beginners, minimal responses and declarative
sentences are used by either party during the conversation. One aspect that Fishman
mentions, but does not give its own section, is the act of interrupting and the occurrence
of overlaps. I will be analyzing the data for occurrences of these as well, because they
provide insight into the power dynamics during conversation.

Fishman’s study concluded that there is an unequal distribution of work between
men and women during conversation. While her study was limited to the three couples
she recorded, her research has been applied to the greater population. However, Fishman
conducted her study in 1978, exactly forty years ago. With the rate of social and
linguistic change, it is very likely that her research is no longer applicable to current
generations. Additionally, her study was limited by her participants. She mentions how
they were all, “white and professionally-oriented, between the ages of twenty-five and
thirty-five” (399). While this may represent a large majority of the United States’
population, it is far from being equal representation. Additionally, feminism existed in
the late 70’s but intersectional feminism, the LGBTQ+ movement, and gender fluidity
had yet to become household terms. Gender and sex are now recognized as two very
different aspects of the human condition, which was not the case at the time Fishman’s
conducted her study. My study will aim to address these gaps in her research.

**Interruptions and Overlaps**

Two issues Fishman neglects in her research are interruptions and overlaps.
Interruptions and overlaps (and the distinction between the two) play in important role in
conversational analysis. This is especially true when analyzing the power dynamics
between individuals. Previous research on this topic has spurred much debate among linguists, some claiming that conversational analysis was decontextualized or was performed to accommodate a biased feminist agenda. “Measuring Interruption: Syntactic and Contextual Methods of Coding Conversation” by Dina G. Okamoto, Lisa Slattery Rashotte, and Lynn Smith-Lovin sets the record straight. Published in 2002, this is newer research on the topic that explores the relationships between power, control, and identity within conversation.

The authors define two methods of measuring interruption during conversation analysis that I will use in this research project. They define an interruption as a speech act taken at least two or more syllables away from a possible turn-transition space (Okamoto et al. 39). The second method of measurement is situational and can be determined by contextual cues. They explain, “This latter conception of interruption also might be viewed as cultural because cultural rules deem when it is appropriate for another speaker to take the floor and when that taking is inappropriate (an interruption)” (Okamoto et al. 39). For example, an ‘interruption’ between two best friends cordially debating sports would be very different from an ‘interruption’ between a child and their mother during an argument. In other words, considering context during an analysis is equally important as simply differentiating between interruptions and overlaps (explored further in Sacks et al.). Their research provides useful insight into analyzing interruptions and overlaps accurately, which will be a key element to my own research of podcasts.

**Conversation Analysis**

Written in 1974, Harvey Sacks, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson published their research titled “A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-
Taking for Conversation”. Their study sought to systemize the organization of turn-taking in conversation. In other words, the researchers aimed to create a model of turn-taking that accounted for fourteen specific characteristics of conversation. Some of these traits being that speaker change occurs/recurs in conversation, typically one party speaks at a time, more than one speaker at a time is common but brief, transitions can include gaps and overlaps, that turn order is not fixed, and the amount of turns in conversation is not specified. Fourteen characteristics of conversation, including the ones mention here, compromise what Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson call their turn-taking model.

After six years of collecting data on conversation in real-life situations, they demonstrate how these specific characteristics are prevalent in conversation and the turn-taking model. For example, speakers have an innate sense for when a ‘turn’ occurs in conversation. For this research project, I am most interested in their method of analysis of interruptions and overlaps. While interruptions are almost always a demonstration of power, to gain the floor or assert dominance, overlaps are far more innocuous. They explain how overlaps can occur “when each [participant] projects his start to be the earliest possible start at some possible transition-relevance place, producing simultaneous starts” (Sacks et al. 708). This is just one rule-set proposed by Sacks and others, in accordance to overlaps and interruptions.

Their research on the topic is foundational to the field of conversational analysis and will be the model that I use when conducting my analysis. Discriminating between interruptions, overlaps, and the various types of overlaps will be necessary for understanding the power dynamics between speakers. Additionally, their research is necessary for establishing the basics of turn-taking in conversation and defining spaces
for turns and transitions. Finally, their research provides a model for analyzing conversation within various registers, such as podcasts.

**Power**

To better understand “Interaction: The Work Women Do”, it’s necessary to fully grasp what Fishman means by ‘power’ in interaction. She primarily cites Berger and Luckmann’s work, “The Social Construction of Reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge” as the foundation for her research. Sociologists Berger and Luckmann argued that people’s reality in society is socially constructed through variables such as institutionalized interactions, language, social knowledge and social roles. Power is one example of how language reinforces reality as a social construct. They claim, “power in society includes the power to determine decisive socialization processes and, therefore, the power to produce reality” (137). Similar to how the President of the United States enacts his own policies and legislation, people have the opportunity to exercise a similar power in conversation. While the sociologists are looking at power on a macro-scale, Fishman focuses on the implications that their work has on conversation. Whoever holds the power, which is evident through her research, is capable of producing and enforcing their version of reality.

Berger and Luckmann attempt to breakdown the effect of power on society regarding monopolistic situations. They use the example of conservative values and religion, claiming that power is established by an entity and perpetuated by the language used. They claim, “When a particular definition of reality comes to be attached to a concrete power interest, it may be called an ideology” (141). In the case of Fishman’s study, it could be said that the men were constructing and living their own definition of
reality, unconsciously imposing their own ideologies onto their partners through conversation. The unequal distribution of linguistic work Fishman noted in her research is just one symptom of Berger and Luckmann’s claim.

The work of Berger and Luckmann covers a great deal more than the dissemination of power among societies. However, their early research on the subject has guided many analyses in the field of linguistics, including Pamela Fishman’s and the analysis for this project. Their research is necessary for establishing the influence of power on our daily lives. To measure this influence, Fishman used techniques and principles from “A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation” by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson.

**Language and Gender**

Deborah Tannen is one of the predominant voices in the field of language and gender. With an endless amount of articles, books and essays, her essay titled “The Relativity of Linguistic Strategies: Rethinking Power and Solidarity in Gender and Dominance” is most pertinent to this study. In this essay, Tannen reexamines the use of power and solidarity in conversation and critiques previous studies on the subject. She claims, “although power and solidarity, closeness and distance, seem at first to be opposites, each also entails the other” (Tannen 167). In certain discourses, what seems to be a demonstration of power can actually be a demonstration of solidarity. Tannen attempts to dismantle the ambiguity surrounding linguistic strategies of power and solidarity.

Tannen’s first argument claims the relationship between power and solidarity is not ambiguous, but rather, polysemous. She explains how all linguistic strategies are
ultimately ambiguous depending on context. This phenomenon “occurs because (as I have worded it elsewhere) power and solidarity are bought with the same currency: The same linguistic means can be used to create either or both” (Tannen 168). For example, Tannen uses the example of a women asking a man: “Where’s your coat?” (168). The question could be interpreted as the women exercising her power or as friendly concern for the man’s wellbeing. She claims that there are intersecting dimensions of closeness/distance and hierarchy/equality within the power-solidarity relationship to consider. In other words, identical linguistic strategies for exercising power or solidarity will be interpreted differently based on the closeness of the two parties as well as their hierarchical or equal relationship.

Tannen argues that linguistic strategies cannot be removed from the context of the situation and properly analyzed. Strategies such as indirectness, interruption, silence versus volubility, topic raising, and adversativeness should be analyzed through an ethnographic lens. She explains how, “The interpretation of a given utterance and the likely response to it depend on the setting, on individuals’ status and their relationship to each other, and also on the linguistic conventions that are ritualized in the cultural context” (Tannen 175). As an example, she comments on the linguistic register of an interrogation. The interrogator does very little talking but holds all the power. Silence, as well as the other linguistic strategies listed above, are not always clear indications of power and solidarity within a discourse.

Rather than solitarily focusing on power and solidarity or dominance and subjugation within in a conversation, Tannen urges the reader to see both sides simultaneously. Only then, she claims, may we “at least succeed in switching from one to
the other rapidly and regularly enough to deepen our understanding of the dynamics underlying interaction such as power and solidarity as well as gender and language use” (184). Tannen’s proof of linguistic strategies as polysemous and context-dependent should always be taken into consideration when performing conversation analysis in the field of gender and language. If context is not taken into consideration, an innocuous overlap could be counted mistakenly for an interruption. Her research, therefore, is vital to the success and integrity of future research on the topic, including the research for this project surrounding language and gender within the podcast register.

If Deborah Tannen is a predominant voice in the discussion about language and gender, then Robin Lakoff is arguably the voice that began the conversation. Her seminal article, “Language and Woman’s Place”, was written the same year that Tannen brands as the “watershed year” when language and gender became “the focus of a vast multidisciplinary literature”, even calling Lakoff’s work a “touchstone for subsequent research” (4, 3). Lakoff’s work was the first recognition of the linguistic discrimination that women face in society. She claims that women face this discrimination in the way they are taught to use language but also in the way language-use treats them. Lakoff wanted to raise awareness about this issue and, at the same time, determine if social inequity could be changed through linguistic means.

Lakoff argues that women are held to a linguistic double standard. She illustrates a young girl being taught to ‘speak like a lady’, not to ‘talk rough’ with the boys. Eventually, the young girl will grow up knowing how to speak like a lady but will not know how to stand-up for her herself. In Lakoff’s words, “If she refuses to talk like a lady, she is ridiculed and subjected to criticism as unfeminine; if she does learn, she is
ridiculed as unable to think clearly, unable to take part in a serious discussion: in some sense, as less than fully human” (48). Her point poses concerns for women in all areas of daily life. Most importantly, this double standard creates an environment where “women are systematically denied access to power, on the grounds that they are not capable of holding it as demonstrated by their linguistic behavior” (Lakoff 48). Lakoff wanted to bring awareness to the double standard and the social inequity that follows, as well as engage in a discussion about what must be done to remedy the situation.

Lakoff’s article covers a plethora of problematic language used by and imposed onto women through societal expectations. She found that women employ several linguistic strategies that clearly demonstrate their subordinate place in society. Some of these include hedging, tag questions, excessive apologies, hyper-politeness, hyper-correction, and an avoidance of expletives. Many of these strategies fall under her theory of politeness; Lakoff claims that women are taught to be excessively polite. This includes not imposing on the other person, providing options for them, and curating camaraderie during the conversation. The attention that society has placed on women’s politeness ultimately places them in an inferior position; it strips away their potential power in conversation.

Lakoff recognizes that her research brings to light a deeper, more systemic issue in society that needs to change before social and linguistic inequity can be eliminated. In her words, “A competent doctor tries to eliminate the germs that cause measles, rather than trying to bleach the red out with peroxide” (Lakoff 73). Lakoff claims that correcting every grammatical form of sexist language would be an impractical approach to solving the larger issue. Rather, she urges the reader to “single out those linguistic uses
that . . . demean the members of one group or another, and [seek] to make speakers of English aware of the psychological damage such forms do” (Lakoff 73). Lakoff follows this statement with a discussion about specific linguistic-uses she believes do the most harm. Finally, she calls to action linguists to pursue sociology to better understand the effects of society and culture on language.

Robin Lakoff’s article, “Language and Woman’s Place”, is credited with introducing the study of language and gender to the world. While it has been foundational for subsequent research on the topic, it is understandable that over forty years later her revelations have become rather commonplace. New research needs to be done to continue the progress Lakoff began so many years ago. Does the modern woman still avoid expletives in daily conversation? Can we still consider her language a reflection of a woman’s place? These are some of the questions I hope to answer in my own research in the field of language and gender.

**Gender and Language Today**

Gender has seen some drastic changes in the last forty years since Fishman conducted her study. Until now, language and gender research has almost entirely focused on the dynamics between men and women, assuming that sex and gender were one in the same. One example of this is seen in Candace West and Don H. Zimmerman’s article titled “Doing Gender”. They are among those who consider gender an act of doing, a socially constructed achievement, but still discuss it terms of the man and the woman, masculine and feminine. They are careful to distinguish between sex and gender stating that sex is “biology: anatomy, hormones, and physiology” (West and Zimmerman 125). Therefore, gender is “an achieved status: that which is constructed through
They begin with the claim that societal genders have stereotypical displays communicated through behavior and language. These displays provide insight into the societal expectations and demands for that gender. Further, “Doing gender means creating differences between girls and boys and women and men, differences that are not natural, essential, or biological” (West and Zimmerman 130). While they cover a multitude of topics pertaining to gender and sex, they could not foresee the drastic change that gender would make in the coming decades. Deborah Cameron, however, made a point to research this topic through a modern lens.

In her article titled “Language, Gender, and Sexuality: Current Issues and New Directions”, Cameron bridges the gap from the 1970’s to modern day. She explains how “Gender is therefore not something you acquire once and for all at an early stage of life, but an ongoing accomplishment produced by your repeated actions” (Cameron 486). With this postmodern view of gender and society, Cameron explores its implications on linguistic research in the field of language and gender.

Cameron states that the postmodern view of gender has a large influence on conversational analysis. It affirms “that gender has no ‘ontological status’; it is not a fixed attribute of persons whose global influence on behavior can be assumed a priori in every case” (Cameron 487). In other words, research in the field now focuses on diversity over difference (the traditional binary interpretation of sex and gender). I maintain this view of gender in my own research and it is the reason I am replicating Fishman’s study.
Fishman’s study will always be relevant to its time period but this shift in cultural thought needs to be accounted for in modern research. Cameron goes on to discuss the implications of focusing on diversity over binary gender differences.

Cameron discusses the differences between modern generations and older ones. She points out that the current generation places a great deal of importance on individuality, which some people hypothesize as influencing the shift in gender norms. Another reason attributed to the shift could be the ever-increasing prevalence of people whose gender is not determined by sex or early socialization. Cameron applies this to, “transgendered and transsexual people who move from one category to the other during the course of their lives, individuals who alternate between gendered personas, people who refuse to be defined as either men or women but claim to be something intermediate or indeterminate” (Cameron 490). While there are many reasons for a cultural shift towards gender in society, the reality is that contemporary research in the field will (and should) reflect this change. That being said, Cameron’s snapshot into gender and language in the postmodern era provides a jumping-off point for my own research and other researchers alike.

Conclusion

It is clear from this brief literature review that the field of language and gender is fraught and complex. In my preliminary discovery of research on this topic, it is also clear that it has seen a sharp decline in research since its reigning era prior to the turn of the twentieth century. However, in the last twenty years gender, and societal views on gender and sex, have dramatically evolved. New research is needed to better understand the role that gender has on language in contemporary society. It is my hope that by
replicating a historical study, such as Fishman’s from 1974, and focusing on diversity rather than difference, this project will provide a poignant and insightful view into how our society has evolved over the past forty years.

Rather than recording and analyzing hours of conversation, I’m choosing to collect my data from podcasts. Collecting data through podcasts is simply another way to bring old research into the modern world and explore new areas of conversational analysis and linguistic study. Podcasts are not only a new form of media but they represent a new genre within the conversational register. Little linguistic research has been performed about podcasts, however, they are full of linguistic data ready for analysis. Therefore, the purpose of this research project is twofold: to contribute new research to the field of language and gender while also doing it through a new medium.
Research Questions

1. Are the conversational power dynamics between varied gendered podcast hosts (M:M, F:F, F:M) different from one another?

2. When compared to Fishman’s study, what power dynamics, if any, have changed between men and women?

3. What can a conversational analysis of podcast hosts’ interactions reveal about the power dynamics between genders in modern society?

Methodology

This research project replicates an earlier study conducted by Pamela Fishman in 1978, titled “Interaction: The Work Women Do”. For the original study, Fishman collected data from three intimate heterosexual couples. I chose not to focus on intimate relationships, but rather, on working relationships between both men and women given the changes that society and culture have encountered in the last forty years (see literature review). I chose to collect data from podcasts because they lend themselves to linguistic study, they are a vast database of readily available dialogue, and little research has been conducted using this conversational register. That being said, it was necessary to perform a register analysis to “not disregard important situational characteristics that might be crucial in interpreting the linguistic patterns” and to demonstrate how podcasts are related to the genre of conversation (Biber 47).

Before conducting an analysis, however, I pre-listened to a variety of podcasts using the Apple Podcasts application. To best replicate Fishman’s study, I needed to find podcasts that were more conversational than scripted. It quickly became evident that certain genres of podcasts were more conversational and suited to the purpose of this
project than others. Podcasts discussing pop-culture and current events were found to be the most conversational whereas others relied heavily on scripts and pre-determined talking points. For these reasons, three podcasts were chosen for data collection: “Stuff Mom Never Told You”, “Stuff You Should Know”, and “Nerdificent”.

All three podcasts are produced from the same company, “HowStuffWorks”, and focus on elements of pop culture, politics, and current events. More importantly, they are conversational and the hosts of each podcast reflect the diversity that was absent from Fishman’s original study. Where Fishman’s study took data from three white heterosexual couples, this study’s participants include three men and three women with various gender identities and sexual orientations. For example, Bridget Todd, co-host of “Stuff Mom Never Told You” is a woman of color who identifies with the LGBTQ+ community. Dani Fernandez, co-host of “Nerdificent”, is a Latina woman and Ify Nwadiwe, also a host of “Nerdificent”, is African American. These podcasts were chosen, in part, due to the diversity and representation they offer of the American public.

Once the podcasts had been chosen, the first step was to complete a comparative register analysis using the framework established by Biber and Conrad’s general guidelines of conversation and “Interpersonal Spoken Registers” (Biber 85). Performing a register analysis was crucial to this study because the results of the analysis clearly demonstrate the differences between podcasts and conversation, and therefore account for the variation between Fishman’s study and my own.

Biber and Conrad’s framework breaks down the linguistic elements of the conversational genre such as describing the participants, the setting, and the overall
purpose of the conversation. When analyzed, these elements become features of the register itself which are later discussed in a functional interpretation. The interpretation is necessary for understanding how specific features of the register, like setting, may influence the data or research. Using Biber and Conrad’s framework, I analyzed the conversational register of podcasts. The results of my analysis and a functional interpretation of the results are below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Register Analysis: General Conversation</th>
<th>Register Analysis: Podcasts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Participants</td>
<td>I. Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Addressor: speaker(s)</td>
<td>a. Addressor: podcast hosts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. single/plural/institutional/unidentified</td>
<td>i. Two hosts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. social characteristics: age, education, profession, etc.</td>
<td>ii. social characteristics: Hosts include three males and three females, ages unknown, of various genders, all employed as podcast hosts for similarly designed podcasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Addressee: listener(s)</td>
<td>b. Addresses: hosts and podcast listeners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. single/plural/un-enumerated</td>
<td>i. One host, unidentified amount of listeners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. self/other</td>
<td>c. Are there on lookers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Are there on lookers?</td>
<td>i. Yes, the recording studio operators and the producers in the studio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Relations among participants</td>
<td>I. Relations among participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Interactiveness</td>
<td>a. Interactiveness; very interactive between hosts, little interaction with listeners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Social roles: relative status or power</td>
<td>b. Social roles: both hosts are perceived to be equals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Personal relationship: e.g., friends, colleagues, strangers</td>
<td>c. Personal relationship: hosts are colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Shared knowledge: personal and specialist</td>
<td>d. Shared knowledge: hosts are not specialists but share knowledge about the topic being discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Channel</td>
<td>I. Channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Mode: speech/signing</td>
<td>a. Mode: speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Specific medium:</td>
<td>b. Specific medium:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Permanent: recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Permanent: taped/transcribed/printed/handwritten/email/etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Transient: face-to-face/telephone/radio/TV/etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Production circumstances: real time/planned/scripted/revised and edited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. The podcast episodes are recorded in real-time with little to no editing. The editing that does take place does affect the dialogue. Planning goes into each episode but dialogue between hosts is not scripted. The only scripted parts are quotes and statistical data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Setting</td>
<td>a. Is the time and place shared by participants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Place of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Private/Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Specific Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Time: contemporary/historical time period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Communicative purposes</td>
<td>a. General purposes: narrate/report/describe/exposit/inform/explain/persuade/procedural/entertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Specific purposes: e.g., summarize information from numerous sources, describe methods, present new research findings, teach moral through personal story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Factuality: factual, opinion, speculative, imaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Expression of stance: epistemic, attitudinal, no overt stance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Topic
   a. General topical domain: e.g., domestic, daily activities, business, workplace, science, education, government, politics, sports, entertainment
   b. Specific topic
   c. Social status of person being referred to

   I. Topic
   a. General topical domain: pop culture, politics, and current events
   b. Specific topics vary depending on the episode topic
   c. Social status of person being referred to: the hosts share equal social status

Functional Interpretation:

One of the biggest differences between conversation and podcasts is the insertion of quotes and statistical data into the dialogue. The podcasts chosen for this analysis incorporate data and quotes to support their claims; this is not a feature found in Biber and Conrad’s analysis of general conversation. Additionally, the podcasts all have a guided format. While conversation within the podcast is natural and unrestricted between hosts, it’s also guided by a general topic and preparation from both hosts. These elements of podcasts are important to consider when analyzing my data because preparation can sometimes influence the natural turn-taking roles in conversation.

Editing is another difference between general conversation and podcasts. While it is impossible to know specifically what was edited in each podcast episode, it is clear the dialogue between hosts is not altered. The rapid pace and natural path of discussion between hosts make it unrealistic to chop audio and combine various sections together. That being said, there are edited features of podcasts that are obviously unique to the register, such as music, introductions and greetings, special segments (such as answering fan mail), and commercial breaks. The podcasts for this study all include commercial breaks around one minute in length from various sponsors. The breaks are most likely to
interfere with the collection of data because they offer hosts a chance to regroup and collect their ideas without the audience’s involvement. This could potentially affect the natural turn-taking that occurs in conversation.

Unlike speakers in conversation, podcast hosts are very likely to address their listeners directly. Hosts address the audience through rhetorical questions, giving listeners the option to reply later via email or social media. For example, a host might say, “We want to hear from you listeners. What do you think about this?” Of course, the audience cannot interact with the hosts at the time the episode is recorded. When analyzing the dialogue for occurrences of specific linguistic features, such as overlaps and interruptions, this fact will not interfere with data collection and analysis. For example, if Speaker A interrupts Speaker B while they are addressing the audience, the interruption will still be counted towards Speaker A and will not influence the data. In that regard, when a host addresses the audience, it will not affect the analysis for this study.

Finally, it will be necessary to take into consideration the observer’s paradox. The podcast hosts are recording audio with the intent for people to listen to it after it is recorded, which is a significant difference from general conversation. In conversation, people do not monitor their speech, tone, inflection, etc., because they are only speaking to their listener. Podcasts, however, are designed to reach thousands of people at different times and in different contexts. For these reasons, the hosts are likely more aware of the way they are perceived by their listeners. This may affect the turn-taking process but should not affect the linguistic features being studied because the hosts were not aware at
the time of recording that their dialogue would later be analyzed for linguistic features relevant to this study.

Data Collection

The second phase of this project was transcribing the podcast episodes. Opening/closing segments and commercial breaks were not transcribed. Roughly 50 minutes (one podcast episode) of recorded material was chosen randomly from each of the three podcasts. Methods for transcription were taken from “A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation” by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. Each turn was characterized by the letter of the speaker’s first name and a new line was added when the speaker finished or started a thought, as seen in the example below.

“E: [yeah
B: I think that that can get lost when you're talking about glittery alisters
E: and we sometimes overestimate the power of glittery alisters as compared to the behind the scenes people who make decisions about what roles they're going to get
B: So yeah you look at these beautiful, successful, flashy alisters and you think they're so powerful”

In addition to transcribing, the second phase involved marking specific features. These include any instance of latching, overlaps and interruptions. I created specific transcription markers for all three and marked them during the transcription process. Latching occurs when the listener correctly anticipates the end of the speaker's turn or a pause in their turn, but no space is present between speaker A and speaker B. If speaker B
latched onto the end of speaker A’s turn, a tally was given to them for latching. Latching was marked with an equal sign, “=”, at the end of speaker A’s turn and the beginning of speaker B’s turn, as shown in the example below.

“B: But I do think you're right. I think the fact-I think for a lot of women fems gender non-conforming folks, many of us have gone through sexual assault, sexual harassment look at the numbers, it's a pretty common thing so I think you're right in that going through the process of watching that tape, having Trump become president, that kind of lit this anger that has been bubbling under the surface for so long, where all of us are like=

E: =no more

B: we're on alert=

E: =yeah=

B: =yeah=

E: =no more, like, no more sexual predators achieving success in this economy”

An overlap occurs when the listener anticipates the end of the speaker's turn but begins their turn slightly too early. Overlaps were marked by placing brackets, “[ ]”, around the word(s) that share airtime. An example of an overlap can be found below.

“I: where you were able to go to [comic con

D: [well my family is from san diego”

As shown in the example, it is clear that speaker D anticipated the question and took their turn too early. It should also be noted that simultaneous speech was marked by complete
brackets, “[comic con]”, but was only recorded to maintain the integrity of the transcription and had no bearing on the analysis.

Drawing a distinction between overlaps and interruptions was vital to the results of this study because they sound very similar in recorded conversation. West and Zimmerman discuss the issue in length in “Doing Gender”. They claim that there are typically three options at the end of a conversational turn or pause; “the current speaker may end his or her turn at talk by addressing a new speaker, another speaker may enter the conversation, or the current speaker may continue,” (Okamoto 39). When a turn is taken that does not follow this model, it is either an interruption or overlap. For this study, interruptions were measured whenever a speech act was taken at least two or more syllables away from a possible turn-transition space. Interruptions were distinguished from overlaps using contextual clues, such as the speaker’s tone and purpose for breaking the turn-taking model.

That being said, interruptions occur when the listener chooses to cut-short the speaker’s turn and begin their own turn. Interruptions sound similar to overlaps, however, context determines which linguistic feature is occurring. For this study, interruptions were marked with dashes, “-”, to link the turn that was cut short with the turn that was being taken. This process is shown below.

“J: yeah and we can make the case that he was kinda set up his own party-
C: [totally set up”

Finally, a linguistic feature for analysis was added once I began counting the occurrences of overlaps and interruptions. I noticed that simply counting each individually wouldn’t represent the data accurately because interruptions and overlaps
often coincide with one another. Counting the number of overlaps as part of an interruption, in addition to the separate tallies, provides insight into the power dynamics between speakers. It reveals whether the interrupted speaker struggles to win the floor back (by overlapping with the interrupter), or concedes to the interrupter’s attempt to win the floor. This feature was counted whenever a marker for an interruption and overlap occur together: “-[]”. An example is provided below.

“D: so funimation is the one that owns dragon ball z
so I remembered there booth and they had vhs tapes back then
that was the thing to buy was anime vhs tapes and get the voice actors to sign it
but yeah I believe they still had PlayStation
you know I don't even know if nickelodeon was there
now nickelodeon=
I: =oh yeah
D: so if you-
I: -[a huge presence
D: [so if you go to comic con now, yeah nickelodeon has a huge presence they normally have an interactive house you walk through=
I: =yeah”

A running total of linguistic features was kept for each podcast and each host individually to keep track of the features in question during analysis and the transcription process. If speaker B interrupted, overlapped, or latched onto speaker A’s turn, the tally was given to speaker B.
Analysis

The third phase involved analyzing the data for the other four linguistic features pertinent to this study. These include questions, attention getters, minimal responses, and statements/declarative sentences. In contrast to the process used in marking interruptions, overlaps, and latching, these features were analyzed after the data had been transcribed. Fishman claims that for her study, “Textual analysis revealed how interactants do the work of conversation. There are a variety of strategies to insure, encourage, and subvert conversation” (Fishman 400). The first strategy Fishman looked at was the use of questions.

Questions were analyzed by counting the frequency of question marks in the transcribed data. To insure accuracy, each instance of a question mark was individually reviewed before adding it to the total number of questions recorded. It should be noted that special attention was given during the transcription process to ensure that any instance of the speaker attempting to elicit information from the listener, with or without rising intonation, was marked with a question mark. Additionally, the category of questions entails the category of attention getters such as “You know?” That being said, not all attention getters were counted as questions.

The category of attention getters refers to a conversational strategy that can be employed to gain the attention of the other person. Fishman notes that speakers employ attention getters, such as, “Did you know?”, because they cannot assume “the remark itself will be seen as worthy of attention. [...] The user is saying, ‘Pay attention to what I have to say, I can't assume that you will’” (Fishman 401). For this study, any instance where the speaker made an attempt at getting the attention of the listener was marked as
an attention getter. This feature occurred in various forms such as “This is interesting” and “So one thing to note”.

Minimal responses reveal who in the conversation feels they need to demonstrate their participation in the interaction and who doesn’t. They occur in forms like, “yeah”, “jeez”, “right” and “oh yeah”. Latching and minimal responses often go hand in hand because the listener takes a turn to either provide support for the speaker, or more simply fill a pause in a conversational turn.

This study varied slightly from Fishman’s in the way minimal responses were analyzed as an interactional strategy. Fishman found that men and women both use minimal responses but in different ways. She says, “The women also made this type of minimal response at times, but their most frequent use of the minimal response was as ‘support work’ inserting them into the conversation, rather than at the end (Fishman 402). Considering that the job of the podcast hosts is collaborative in nature, the minimal responses were not examined for being fillers. The context of the podcast conversation doesn’t allow for the natural breaks that speakers take in interactions within, say, their own home. Therefore, the efficacy of minimal responses was purely determined based on the frequency that they occurred.

Finally, Fishman analyzed her data for the use of statements (otherwise known as declarative sentences). However, she failed to describe her methods of analysis for this particular feature. She states that, “Of course, a statement does some interactional work: it fills a space and may also provide for a response” (Fishman 402). She goes on to explain how the use of statements in interactions display an assumption on part of the speaker that it will be successful and elicit a response (Fishman 402). For this study, I
analyzed the data for statements by measuring the T-units in each transcription. An advantage to using T-units is that they’re measurable without concern for punctuation. T-units are defined by a main clause plus any and all additional subordinate clauses or non-clause features. To mark T-units, periods were placed at the end of every unit and then recorded. An example of this process is shown below.

“B: now for today’s episode, we have to have a trigger warning. it is about issues dealing with sexual assault, umm sexual harassment. so if that’s something that is tough for you, just know that that is what today’s episode is about. today we’re going to be talking about the viral campaign me too.”

The final stage of analysis involved norming the data to one thousand. For all eight linguistic features in question, the total number was divided by the total number of words and then multiplied by one thousand. For example, Emily had 15 occurrences of interruptions and the podcast had 9,518 words total; 15 was divided by 9,518 and then multiplied by 1,000. This process was repeated until every host and each podcast had their own data. While each podcast had a different word count, norming the data was essential for making the results comparable.
Results

The first data to be normed was the total count for each linguistic feature for each podcaster. Although the T-units are not a discourse marker, they were included with the other features to simplify the table. I began with the podcast Stuff Mom Never Told You (henceforth known as Podcast 1). Emily had higher counts than Bridget for all linguistic features except for the number of overlaps that occurred with an interruption, the number of T-units, and the number of attention getters. Bridget had more T-units than Emily but was interrupted more frequently. Emily used considerably more minimal responses than Bridget. Emily also had slightly more occurrences of latching than Bridget. As shown in the table below, the differences between all other features are minimal.

Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Emily</th>
<th>Bridget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interruptions</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlaps</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlaps w/Interruption</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latches</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Responses</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention Getters</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>19.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-units</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data for Nerdificent (henceforth known as Podcast 2) is more varied than that of Podcast 1. Iffy had higher counts than Danny of latching, minimal responses, questions, and attention getters. Danny had higher counts of interruptions, overlaps,
overlaps w/interruptions, and T-units. The number of interruptions is notably higher for Danny than Iffy at 6.11 interruptions per one thousand words compared to just 1.35 interruptions per one thousand words. However, the most significant difference is the number of minimal responses used; Iffy used 5.2 per one thousand words compared to Danny, who used 0.9 per one thousand words.

Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Danny</th>
<th>Iffy</th>
<th>Podcast 2: Nerdificent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interruptions</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlaps</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latches</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Responses</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-units</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlaps w/Interruption</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention Getters</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stuff You Should Know (henceforth known as Podcast 3) showed less variance than the other two podcasts. As seen in Table III, Josh had a significantly higher amount of T-units than Chuck. Josh used 22 T-units per one thousand words while Chuck used 14.98 per one thousand words. However, Chuck had more instances of latching and minimal responses—nearly three times as many as Josh. Notably, Josh and Chuck both interrupted each other 2.14 times per one thousand words. For all other features shown in Table III, Josh and Chuck remained relatively similar.
Table III

Table IV provides a visual comparison of the frequency of all eight linguistic features for each of the three podcasts. The numbers for each host have been combined to create a total for each podcast. Most notably, Podcast 2 has significantly higher numbers for all features except minimal responses and questions. Podcast 3 has the highest at 8.68 minimal responses and 4.99 questions per one thousand words. Podcast 1 has a significantly low number of overlaps w/interruptions occurring 0.73 times per one thousand words. Compared to Podcasts 1 and 3, Podcast 2 has a much higher frequency of interruptions at 7.47 times per one thousand words. More tables displaying the differences between the podcasts can be found in the appendix (4-12).
Table IV:

Podcast Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Podcast 1</th>
<th>Podcast 2</th>
<th>Podcast 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attention Getters</strong></td>
<td><strong>T-units</strong></td>
<td><strong>Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimal Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Latches</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overlaps w/Interruption</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overlaps</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interruptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Podcast Totals:
- Podcast 1: 33.72
- Podcast 2: 38.95
- Podcast 3: 36.99

Legend:
- **Attention Getters**
- **T-units**
- **Questions**
- **Minimal Responses**
- **Latches**
- **Overlaps w/Interruption**
- **Overlaps**
- **Interruptions**
Discussion
The most striking result of this study reveals that Podcast 2, the only podcast with both a male and female host, has the highest frequency of relevant linguistic features. This suggests that gender does play a role in determining the power dynamics between podcast hosts and, therefore, answers my first research question. If the data had been relatively linear across all three podcasts, then one could infer that gender has little influence over the interaction between hosts. However, it is quite clear from the results in Table IV (see above), that this is not the case.

Podcasts 1 and 3 have little to contribute to the discussion on gender and language because, when compared to Podcast 2, they had far fewer instances of linguistic features that would indicate a power struggle. However, Podcast 2 has the most occurrences of interruptions, overlaps, and latching. This suggests that either the two hosts were fighting against the natural turn-taking process, or they were overly excited to discuss their topic. Having listened to and transcribed the podcast myself, these results come as no surprise. From a listening position only, the podcast hosts tend to jump around and overlap each other quite frequently. At one point, Iffy (the male host) even apologizes for cutting Danny (the female host) off.

“D: -throughout, I mean internationally as well but here-
I: -[and to the seas too
D: [in north america yeah
I: sorry to cut you off but yeah, on the seas there's lots of cruise cons too.
and I think it's that effect that happens when you have something grow to a certain point it'll fork off and have its own genres within that genre.
so you have like doctor who cons=:”

It is notable that the excerpt above was the only time, in all three podcasts, that someone apologized for interrupting their cohost.
While Iffy may have been the only one to apologize, Danny interrupts significantly more than the other five hosts (see Table II). She also has the most occurrences of overlaps and overlaps with an interruption, suggesting that she either had a lot to say about the topic, or she was simply trying to get her message across. However, it is important to note that she has slightly more T-units than her cohost, meaning that she did in fact say more during the recording. When looking at her cohost’s data, Iffy tended to provide much more supportive feedback. Even though Danny was interrupting Iffy quite a bit more, he had the most instances of latching and the second highest amount of minimal responses. This reinforces the idea that Danny likely had a lot to say about the topic, rather than the idea that she was struggling to be heard.

It is also notable that Danny did the least amount of support work. In other terms, she had the least amount of latching and minimal responses. This could imply that she cared more about being heard than listening to or supporting her cohost. Interestingly, Danny asked the fewest questions and used the second to least amount of attention getters. This is in contrast to the results of Fishman’s study where women asked far more questions than the men and used many attention getters. She explains how asking a question “is a way to ensure a minimal interaction—at least one utterance by each of two participants. It guarantees a response” (Fishman 401). If this insight is applied to Podcast 2, it would seem that Danny is less concerned with getting a response than she is with making statements. In response to my second research question, these results prove that the power dynamics between men and women have changed since Fishman published her study in 1978.
While Fishman studied intimate relationships between men and women in the 70s, and this study is looking at podcast hosts in 2018, I believe an argument can be made for comparing the two. Podcasters demonstrate a working relationship. There is a level of professionalism and distance in working relationships that is not present with intimate couples. In other words, if there are problematic power dynamics between men and women in working relationships, they will be more subtle and elusive than with intimate partners. So while these two studies vary in that regard, insight into how society has evolved in the last 40 years can be gained by drawing a comparison.

That being said, Danny stands in contrast to the women in Fishman’s study because she doesn’t ask questions, but also because she does little support work. As mentioned previously, she has the least amount of latching and minimal responses. To further demonstrate how times have changed, Iffy does more support work than any other host. Second to Iffy is Chuck, another male podcast host from Podcast 3. Furthermore, Josh and Chuck in Podcast 3 asked more questions than any other podcast duo and used the most minimal responses. What’s more interesting is Podcast 1, with two female hosts, used the least minimal responses and support work.

It is clear from these results that the power dynamics between men and women in interactions have changed since Fishman’s study. But how exactly does gender influence the interaction? Because only one podcast provides insight into the male—female relationship, one can only infer, rather than definitively state, how gender may influence interaction. The results for Danny in Podcast 2 indicate that she was excited to be discussing the topic rather than she was fighting to be heard. It is possible, however, that
being a woman in a setting where she is competing for airtime with a male cohost motivated her to be slightly more aggressive.

Historically, women have had to work much harder in interactions with men to be heard. Fishman definitively states that “There is an unequal distribution of work in conversation. We can see from the differential use of strategies that the women are more actively engaged in insuring interaction than the men” (404). While that may have been true forty years ago, since then, efforts have certainly been made towards achieving equality in all spheres of society. A recent example is the Women’s March of 2017 that became a global phenomenon advocating for equal rights for all people, but especially women.

While gender inequality is obviously still an issue, it is quite possible that a heightened awareness has permeated the zeitgeist of current generations and is revealing itself in the way we communicate with one another. Answering my third and final research question, this awareness would explain the contrasting results of Fishman’s study and my own. Men are now doing more support work in conversation while women are using more statements and asking less questions. The work women have done in the past to be heard and the strategies they’ve employed in interactions has now become the equal work of many, men and women included.
Conclusions

When analyzing the results of the podcasts all together, it seems that today, gender plays less of a role in interaction than individuality. Yes, it is possible that the example taken from Podcast 2 suggests that women over-compensate for years of oppression when talking to men. But looking at the other two podcast results, it is even more likely that is a case by case scenario. The results of this study differ so drastically from Fishman’s conclusions about the way men and women interact, it suggests that men and women are more motivated by their own personal experiences. However, to really understand the power dynamics between the sexes, more research is needed.

At the time Fishman published her research there was a boom in the field of language and gender. Being over forty years ago, it is clear that much of the research is no longer applicable to modern society. Gender is no longer binary but is viewed by many as a spectrum, still in need of further understanding. Women and men have made progress with the Feminist Movement and continue to fight for equality for all people, and men continue to gain awareness of the privilege that has been handed to them throughout history. Language is just one way to measure social change and the effect it has on modern values and ideas. That being said, there couldn’t be a better time to revitalize research in language and gender than now.
Appendix

I. Podcast Transcript: Stuff Mom Never Told You
   a. Episode Title: #metoo
   b. Length: 50:40

Key:
=.....latching
[.....simultaneous
[].....overlapping
-.....cut off/interruption/self repair
xxx….. unintelligible

B: now for today’s episode, we have to have a trigger warning; it is about issues dealing with sexual assault, umm sexual harassment.
so if that’s something that is tough for you, just know that that is what today’s episode is about.
today we’re going to be talking about the viral campaign me too.
if you have facebook or social media, you’ve probably seen people posting me too.
this viral campaign actually came as a response to Harvey Weinstein who is this very very powerful Hollywood producer and filmmaker.
these bombshell bombshell bombshell that allegations came out that he has been sexually harassing and sexually assaulting women in hollywood for many many years
and that, a culture of silence a culture of looking the other way a culture of fear a culture of intimidation really allowed for a sexual abuser to fester in this industry.
and it took a lot of women standing up to have anything be done about it and even have a national conversation about it despite the fact that it seems like it's been an open secret in hollywood for quite awhile.
E: It really does seem like a watershed moment in this conversation.
I feel like the access hollywood bus conversation by our commander n chief was the match that lit a lot of this fire across the united states in particular around the everyday commonplace rape culture that we live in.
and now this sort of movement this energy this frustration this totally righteous anger is manifesting in this interestingly targeted way.
B: So I look back at that tape, and I think how did this guy become our president.
E: I don’t know.
B: -h-
E: -I thought that was the end.-
B: =oh my god-
E: -And I was so naive to think people cared.
B: But I do think you're right. I think the fact-I think for a lot of women fems gender non conforming folks, many of us have gone through sexual assault,sexual harassment look at the numbers, it's a pretty common thing.
so I think you're right in that going through the process of watching that tape, having Trump become president,
that kind of lit this anger that has been bubbling under the surface for so long, where all of us are like.=
E: =no more
B: we're on alert.=
E: =yeah=
B: =yeah=
E: =no more, like, no more sexual predators achieving success in this economy.
there is no way that xxx.
I think this is-where I always go back to like, capitalism can be good.
and I really wanna see people who are predators who are criminal in their use of power
coercion, sexual assault, rape
that they are not allowed to succeed that should be a deal breaker in terms of getting a job
getting a promotion running companies being successful like,
let's make that not possible anymore.=
B: =and even beyond that, for me it's not just make sure they're not successful, we
shouldn't get them on a stage and applaud [them.
E: [oh my god, yeah
B: [I think that's what bugs me so much about things like that xxx you're woody allen's of
the world.
not only do I want to see them have massive massive failures on a grand public scale
when I see them get trotted up on an oscar stage and like a standing ovation.
that's the thing, they should be shamed and voted off the island.
what are we doing that we allow these abusers to not just get financial and professional
success
but then we uplift them like oh they're so [great.
E: [yeah
B: what are we doing?=
E: =I don't know, I just think it's a weird distinction that people can somehow-and it kind
of is like problematic face, in that, you can hold someone's body of work separate from
the way that they conduct personally.
but a, we shouldn't be able look the other way when we're talking about serial predators
who commit assault, sexual assault, any assault really.
and be now we're talking sexual assault at work.
so now this isn't just some dark secret to sweep under the rug.
we're talking about people who are a threat to women in their offices
who are a threat to women and men in many cases by using their professional power as a
vehicle for control in a sexual do
main.
B: well that's one of the things I think is sort of glossed over in the Harvey Weinstein
situation
is that because we're talking about famous a-list actresses it can seem like is xxx like this
hollywood thing.
but at the end of the day these are women in the workplace and that even though they're
famous they're on tv they're a list or in magazines.
it is a sexual assault and harassment in the workplace situation [and.
E: [yeah
B: I think that that can get lost when you're talking about glittery a listers.
E: and we sometimes overestimate the power of glittery as listers as compared to the
behind the scenes people who make decisions about what roles they're going to get.
B: So yeah you look at these beautiful, successful, flashy a listers and you think they're so powerful
how could this happen to them like, surely people like gwyneth paltrow, this wouldn't be happening to her.
but you think about it you know when it comes to acting, these people who are a lot of
times just getting their start and just kind of working up the ranks of hollywood and so they actually didn't have that much power.
E: also it just goes to remind you it doesn't matter how successful you are you're still just
a piece of ass to somebody.
and the most recent everyday assault that I experience, which, I don't even want to go into
details because I'm not into the me too kind of assault sharing culture so much
wich we're going to talk about more
but it was just like a-an everyday stranger assaulting me basically groping me in public
umm
reminded me that like yeah I'm a boss.
like I am-I own my own company I feel on top of the world right now I'm like having a
great day I'm going through the world minding my own business
and I am still dehumanized by someone else.
It does not matter how successful you are
that is what assault reminds you of is that you are nothing it makes you feel like it doesn't
matter how much brilliance or gusto or power you feel like you have
you're still just a piece of ass to somebody.
B: And I'm horrified that that happened but the framing that you just gave I think is so
important because
I think as women we are taught that it is good to be a strong badass woman you know
no one's gonna mess with me blah blah blah
but we are still susceptible.
people look at women who project as very strong as very assertive
the kind of woman who would you know who would punch you if you did something
wrong=
E: =right
B: and those women are still being assaulted.
so it really doesn't matter what kind of woman you are what kind of person you are
sexual harassment and sexual assault happens to all of us.
E: and it happens in so many industries beyond the entertainment industry too
although the entertainment industry is uniquely poised for this kind of thing because
beauty and sexuality and sensuality are such a form of currency for actors really
given the nature of their work.
but you've seen this first hand in the world of progressive politics [right?]?
B: [I have] seen this first hand umm and so again the thing that really throws me about
the situation that I experienced first hand is that
you would think that progressive politics, you know, these are male feminists, these are
lefties, these are people you can really trust
that is definitely how I entered the world of progressive politics thinking
and I quickly realized that that is not case. and so
a few years ago I had this job at a consulting firm called fitzgibbon media here in DC we also had offices in california and new york.

we were this bustling progressive firm we worked with folks like ultraviolet
we worked with folks like move on

basically it was a whose whose of power players on the progressive left right, so big lefty organizations and our firm's founder Trevor Fitzgibbon ended up shuddering the firm under many many many allegations of systematic sexual harassment and assault by both coworkers and clients. and so how this played out for us is that we went to a retreat in austin texas

we were a remote office so we had people who worked from home worked from different cities but this is one of the first times we were all together physically in one room. and people started sharing stories and so

one person would be like oh well i got this text or oh this happened to me and before you know it everyone has a story.

and so it really was one of those things that snowballed where we all came in thinking oh was a one-off thing or this weird thing happened with me and then realized, oh my god

this is a systematic thing it's happening to multiple people.

E: and really what you're talking about is unwanted sexual advances from fitzgibbons the founding partner.=
B: =correct
E: and the people comparing notes and sharing stories were all the women in the office.
B: correct=
E: =ok so this is like, oh maybe he just invited me to his hotel late at night because he was like having a weird night and maybe you know, maybe it was just me.
something you can look past and then you start to compare notes and realize oh this is a thing.

these advances these unwanted assaults in some cases umm and granted these are accusations as they currently stand but you're office
like you've said in the past gossip became a very powerful tool for understanding that you were not alone in experiencing this kind of weirdness from your boss.

B: yeah and I think what is so fascinating to me about the situation is the way that none of us in that office were famous right?.

like none of us were hollywood a listsers.

but the way that the weinstein case really mirrored what happened with my progressive firm. and so-
E: -how so?
B: things like it just being an invite that you're like oh well that was unusual so one of the things that a lot of the women who made accusations against harvey weinstein pointed at is that it often started with meeting for drinks or an invitation to go to a film screening one on one that kind of thing and

trevor fitzgibbon definitely did that same kind of thing where it's an invitation for something that seems intimate but gives you pause but doesn't necessarily strike you as this person is trying to sexually assualt me [right?].
E: [right and well in weinstein's case they would show up and he would be in like a bathrobe at a hotel room.
B: so it would eventually would get that=
E: =right
B: but, so like lupita nyong'o actually writes when weinstein first came into her orbit she was still a student and it often you know early on was dinners invitations to see movies and how he did these specific things to make her feel like it was safe.
so it would be like oh come to this movie screening, you can bring a friend if you want or an invitation to dinner and when they get to dinner there's a female assistant there but then that assistant [leaves. and so
E: [right
B: its done in a way where you know it seems off but its not necessarily at least to start with overt enough to be like this is bad-.
E: -ok ok this is what I hate cause a, I think that one on one meetings are critical for everyone's career success.
plain and simple
b. I've been on many of these kind of hangouts with your mentor and then you're like oh god is he going to hit on [me-.
B: [-have you ever had
E: [is this-
B: [-a one on one
E: [oh yeah!=
B: =where you've-you bring your resume and it's a date?.
E: yeah!
I remember distinctly knowing that I was in trouble when this guy who was a senior consultant on a campaign and I was like the young intern on the campaign took me out to dinner.
I thought we were going to talk about work and career stuff and he made a point of showing me that is was a four hundred bottle of wine that he'd just ordered for us two to have and I was like I am in trouble, I am officially in trouble this man now feels entitled, to something in return for his return on that investment.
and I knew it then and I predicted the oncoming assaults that would follow in his car you know, like, I don't wanna tell people you can't have these meetings right?. That's pences strategy right?. like no closed door meeting without mother there you know [what I mean?.
B: [mother
E: like we can't not be able to have these meetings and yet, this is the tactic that people who are trying to assault others use and rely on our trust of people to not be evil.
B: that's exactly what the case was in my situation working at fitzgibbon and also with harvey weinstein. and so the ways in which predators use these things that we all understand as parts of having a job=.
E: =right!
B: you know, one on one meetings getting drinks things like that using those things to prey on people who are vulnerable and that you are in a position of power over.
one of the things I found so fascinating about gwyneth paltrow's story that really really mirrored my own is that when harvey W made an advance on her she talks about how stunned she was. she says I thought you were my uncle harvey she explains thinking explaining that she had seen him as a mentor.

and for me what struck me from that anecdote is this idea that predators they work by making you feel special or seen or chosen right. like when my boss suggested that we meet at a hotel room for a drink, part of me was like I should just be happy that he sees me and that he-you know-I thought he wanted to do that because he thought I was successful or talented or whatever. it's a way of making you feel special and chosen and that that can be used later on to get you to do something you don't want to do.

E: and did you, ever meet up with him?.
B: ahhh, well, funny story, so-well not funny- but so what went down in our case was that anyone who knew me at the time before I got hired at fitzgibbon knew that I needed a job right. like I was the girl who was miserable at her job and like was telling everybody get me out of here I'm so miserable. so he sent me a couple of facebook dms was like hey I'm in new york do you want to come get a drink at my hotel, that kind of thing=.

E: =yeah
B: and at the time I was like well, drink in a hotel this seems a little off, but then again, it's progressive politics. were-we can meet pretty casual.

so I ended up declining but only because I lived in brooklyn and he was in manhattan and [I was like

E: [that was thing!]
B: [I'm not, I'm not getting on that L.
E: [that was the dealbreaker for you!.
I remember [you saying that to me like uhhhh.
B: [but I'm not, I'm not making a complicated subway transfer here so I was like no thanks.

so then later when I ended up getting my job at fitzgibbon around thanksgiving, I lived in Richmond and he actually lived in richmond too and so he invited he was like oh we should get a drink while we're both in richmond and I was like cool=.

E: =oh yeah
B: I ended up showing up with my boyfriend and my brother and so I'm sure he was like xxxxx.

E: Touche
B: yeah! xxx

E: Bridget!

B: I mean I happened to be-I mean-this was all just happen stance. I certainly-looking back I wish I had the foresight to-

E: Didn't he like rage quit that drink too?
B: yeah, he basically was like, [well]
E: [umm bye]
B: yeah, I'll pay for the next round bye!.
but yeah, I mean, part of me, looking back, it seems so obvious, but I think that is what this is about right=.
E: =right
B: like, when it's happening you tell yourself oh like this is fine or maybe this is a little unusual but maybe he's just idiosyncratic [right?-.  
E:[-well you've got, i mean, the benefit of the doubt, I'm not opposed to it, you know what I mean  
because I have benefited greatly from male mentors in my life and I always tell women if we are only mentoring other women  
or if women are only being mentored by other women we're going to perpetuate gender wage gaps and gender based discrimination.  
that's not good for us right diversity and mentoring people who don't exactly resemble your entire life's experiences is important.  
and so people like harvey w and trevor fitzibbon give these decent men such a bad name and I hope it doesn't prevent us from meeting up for drinks with people who are powerful and can actually have influence over our careers.  
but it's a shame because there are predators out there too it's like what the hell are you supposed to do.  
B: so it's almost like a double edged sword where you don't want to feel like you're going to miss out on some sort of career opportunity that you should be able to have access to but because you're a woman you feel this extra added layer of concern about it because men are creepy=.  
E: =right and that's why we need all the non creepy men out there and women to actually call this stuff out right?.
because it's the silence it's the culture of complicity that keeps predators like fitzgbbons and weinstein rising to the top like it allows them to remain powerful and influential in a world that they should not be able to be.  
B: so really a notable thing i think that you see in situations, both the things like cosby and with wisenten is that you have this culture where a team of assistants and drivers and handlers and pr people all know the drill and they all function to allow this predator to operate and so it's assistants showing up for drinks and then knowing that they're supposed to leave after a certain amount of time leave=  
E: =yeah!
B: woman alone with him. or its drivers who are looking the other way while there's a woman drugged in his backseat while he's driving her home.  
it's things like this it's a culture where everyone knows their role and its a machine that allows this predator to continue doing what they do without really facing a lot of consequences.
E: and the other component that's common among so many of these stories is these power and influential people have not only this whole team of folks who are complicit in looking the other way but they also use retaliation as a powerful follow up to their assaults.
so whether it's threatening to blacklist celebrities like weinstein did or if its planting things in the sort of industry gossip papers about those who dare to speak out victims are made well aware that the risks of speaking out and reporting someone who is as beloved as and famous as some of these criminals are can come with huge risks and I think that's what keeps so many women silent including the women at fitzgibbon.

B: =definitely I mean-certainly worrying about retaliation was a big part of what happened at fitzgibbon. something I found very interesting about the weinstein case is that in lupita's piece in the new york times she wrote that after she rebuked his advances time and time again, that there was one incident at a dinner where he said let's cut to the chase. I think we should finish our meal upstairs and she was like no and that after she left she was like I felt like I needed to make sure that everything was good so I said, harvey are we good? and he said I don't know about your career, but you'll be fine and that she didn't know if that was a threat or not. and wha-

E: -uhhh that sounds like threat-

B: -yeah [I don't
E: [ jeez
B: yeah, I don't know about your career, but you'll be fine.
E: that's disgusting=
B: =yeah and and how i mean and thi- this happened when she was still a drama student at yale so she wasn't eve-. E: -oh this doesn't surprise me at all.
B: yeah
E: but like, what an inelegant threat, like how obvious are you going to be about his kind of thing that that kind of coercion is not even something that you're ashamed to be that explicit about.
B: well according to this new yorker piece by rogan pharoah, which if you have not read is like a bombshell must read piece harvey w actually had a thing about bragging about getting dirt put in gossip magazines and dissuading of studios from using certain actresses. like, he talked about how he had this power over hollywood to make things happen for people or not make things happen for people.

E: [I'm] like being triggered right now because this feels so much like politics=.
B: =it is! [and I think.
E: [this is so what campaign life is like=.
B: =and I think what you said is so important because it's important to, even thought, just like you were saying earlier in hollywood sex appeal and all of that can be a kind of currency it's not just hollywood its in so many industries its politics its medicine its law its=.
E: =yeah!
B: silicon [valley
E: [wall street-
B: -yeah if you if you listen silicon valley episode women being afraid to speak up because of retaliation was a hallmark of the abuse and harassment that those women face.
E: yeah, and I feel like this is causing me to just go back in my brain and go back in time like just thinking about all the men who I've come across who have used their power and influence to get what they want sexually to get what they want out of the people that they work with and who have been so unafraid to use that power and influence in a retaliatory manner. It's just-it's really is just blows your mind how every day and how relatable it is and I think that's why the whole me too campaign was so compelling because it made you do that it made you go back through every job you've ever had every off incident you've ever had every assault you've ever experienced and be like this is the experience of being a woman in this country.
B: So we're going to talk a lot more about the me too campaign and how it got started after this quick break.
And we're back, we were just getting very very angry thinking about some of the really inappropriate things that I think a lot of us have dealt with and sort of why it's now kind of a watershed moment under the me too campaign. if it seemed like everybody on your social media feed was saying me too that's probably because they were uhhh. and that's probably because sexual harassment in the workplace is so common. one in three women report being harassed in the workplace and one of four say they witnessed a coworker being harassed. and this data from a twenty seventeen poll that udub did where they survived almost 5000 people. and I think that these numbers really show this is an issue that most of us are dealing with right it's very very common either you've dealt with it someone you know has dealt with it you're friend your family, whoever. I think it's just this groundswell of voices being like no xxxx.
E: [yeah! exactly
B: [we've all like if you're like, if you didn't know this was happening where have you been.
E: and I think I've heard form the men in my life that that was even more eye opening for them to see all of this me too. for me it was like obviously, obviously me too. I think Alyssa milano after the weinstein story broke, she called on people on twitter to use that hashtag me too if they'd experienced assault or harassment in the workplace.
and according to intercept the hashtag me too has been tweeted well over a million times in 85 different countries.
basically milano was saying maybe if people knew how common this experience was we'd care a little more about it.
and that was certainly the experience that I felt but I also saw when everyone was using the hashtag I had this really weird mix of emotions.
I was experiencing sort of like, obviously duh like if you aren't aware that this is a widespread issue where've you been?
but also exhaustion at the need for us to again be sort of again trotting out our war stories our wounds to be like tell me I'm valid tell me this is a valid issue.
and I don't know I felt very conflicted over the popularity of the hashtag which by the way was initially a movement started by a black activist Terrano berk
who back in 2006 on myspace actually started this me too campaign as a grassroots movement to aid sexual assault survivors in underprivileged communities
where quote according to ebony, rape crisis centers and sexual assault workers weren't even going.
B: so one thing to note that when started this campaign she wasn't thinking that it would be a viral campaign or a hashtag that was short lived here today gone tomorrow.
but she says that she's really really happy to see what's happening now, she says, what's happening now is powerful and I salute it and the women who have disclosed
but the power of using me too is always been in the fact that it can be a conversation starter or a whole conversation
but it was us talking to us.
and so she really started this as a black woman talking to other underprivileged communities
but then she writes on her website that she felt the need to take this conversation further and so
while she started it for underprivileged communities of color she realized just how prevalent this was and wanted to take that conversation on a more broader level.
E: I wonder if we're losing something in mainstreaming it? you know what I mean? I wonder if we also need to bring a more specific lense to the conversation around women of color and you know-we know that certain women get assaulted a lot more than other woman.
B: totally, and I think you know we talked about this in our episode for HBCUs uhhh=. E: =right
B: black women are much less likely to report sexual assault and sex crimes umm.
I think the conversation is great but I-I'm mindful of who it leaves out right.
so I think fright now the conversation seems to be very focused on like white powerful a list women.
actually it was jane fonda who made this point on msnbc=.
E: =yeah
B: so she says it's too that it's probably because so many of the women who were assaulted by harvey w are famous and white and everybody knows them.
this has been going for a long time to black women and other women of color and it doesn't get out quite the same.
and so I think she's right in that it is an issue for other communities but that, perhaps that-the mainstreaming of the me too campaign kind of leaves some of those communities out. I also think that we don't-we're not talking about gender non-conforming [folks.

E: [right

B: uhh, trans women get you know as we know, trans folks are much more likely to be assaulted than the general public=.

E: =right

B: ummm, I was so proud to see sarah mcbride who is the national press secretary for the human rights campaign and was actually the first trans person to speak at the democratic national convention.

so shout out to sarah=

E: =yes sarah-

B: -ummm so she wrote a whole piece for buzzfeed about how when you're trans sexual assault and sexual harassment has this added layer because we are told as a society that trans folks are gross disgusting and that no one could ever possibly want to assault them.

and that, the narrative around trans folks is this completely ridiculous stereotype of this trans person waiting assault somebody in a [bathroom].

E: [right, right]

B: [which we know is like not actually] happening.

so she writes, I stayed silent because I knew that while many survivors are met with disbelief and doubt when they share their stories trans survivors often also face a different kind of disbelief one rooted in the perception that trans people are quote, too disgusting to be assaulted.

alleged rapists and sexual harassers will sometimes insist that couldn't possibly have done what they've been accused of because the person accusing them is too unattractive to merit being assaulted.

we've even heard that defense from our sitting [president].

E: [exactly] our sitting president and said that

B: it makes me want to scream, it boiled my blood=.

E: =I know and there's a part of the me too campaign that I think was most effective in its consumption.

which is it got us all engaged again because of the sheer volume.

so where as we've lost some things in the mainstreaming that we need to reclaim like a special focus on the experience the intersectional experience of being a trans woman of being a woman of color and how it's not all the same for every woman we've also gained something in the mass participation which is a broader awareness of how commonplace this is. but

b I got engaged all over again and depressed quite frankly just seeing the onslaught you know what I mean?.

It just felt like too much, it felt like-I'm just-I wanna-I wanna find who all these people are and punch them in the face.

[you know what I mean, I'm angry.

B: [right, and I-and I think you're exactly right and I think you actually did see some people saying hey
if it takes millions and millions and millions of women saying me too for you to realize this is a problem, what the hell!?.
right?=  
E: =right  
B: why should we as survivors of sexual trauma sexual crimes sexual abuse sexual assault  
why should it be on us to split open our tramas for the world to see to get somebody to care right.  
this isn't the first time that we've had a viral campaign about sexual assaults around women like,  
remember hashtag yes all women?.  
E: right  
B: we've done this before [we've.  
E: [right  
B: been here before and so I think one of the criticism that I see and I think is frankly valid is that  
if you're the kind of person who needs to see this amount of trauma this amount of labor on the path of survivors to do something and see it's a problem like what is going on?.  
E: exactly, bridget and I think it's important to acknowledge that for every case involving sexual assault or harassment at work there's typically more than one party involved. so for every one of those hashtag me too tweet you know, where was the other player, where was the other person in that equation. and that's the spotlight that our pal liz plank, friend of the show=  
B: =friend of the show! [hey liz! 
E: [shout out to liz ummm  
she really shed light on a different take which was this hashtag him though, like what about him though. when are we going to talk about him though. and really pointing the microphone in a different direction of saying ok we've heard from plenty of survivors. now when are we going to hear from men, when are we going to hear from men on this.  
B:yeah and I think I'm a big fan of not just having the onis being on survivors to do the heavy lifting, unpacking, and all of that. but yeah, I almost felt a little bit exasperated seeing so many men saying I believe you, I believe you.  
first of all, I don't think we're doing this to have men believe us right=.  
E: =right  
B: cause I don't give xxx like, frankly, I'm like.  
E: I like what you were about to say [there.  
B: [yeah  
E: I like what you were about to say that, I agree completely=.  
B: =like we're not doing this because we want you to believe us. we're doing it because we want you to do something about it [right.  
E: [right
B: and so, I got a little bit irritated watching so many of my male coworkers and colleagues and friends
sort of, xxxx signalling by being like I believe you I believe you I believe you
but then, having it end there and so I'm not someone who is in to just giving validation
for a man saying I believe you.
I want them go further.
make a plan for what you're going to do when you see your homeboy do something out of line
make a plan for what you're going to do when you see sexual harassment in your workplace
even if you're an underling
make a plan for it tell me what you are going to do to help unpack this
don't just pat yourself on the back and be [like.
E: [right
B: hey woman, I believe you.
do something about it!
that's what I've found so interesting about that other hashtag that popped off from this.
I did that, [where
E: [right
B: the men actually saying you know what it turns out that in college I actually did make
a girl feel uncomfortable
or it turns out that I was-I did have more power over a woman and I used that to get her
to go on a date with me
or it turns out that I did exaggerate my status or my ability to make something happen for
a woman because I wanted to impress her.
and that was kinda gross like, it's so easy to pat yourself on the back and say I'm such a
great male feminist I believe you blah blah blah.
it's harder to be like here are the specific way that I have contribute to a toxic culture
wherein sexual harassment and sexual assault is commonplace=.
E: =right, and I think, it's on us has done a really good job of having that conversation
with young men about not only understanding consent
but understanding the responsibility of intervention when you see something happening
that is not ok and not consensual.
I think we need to have those conversations among grownups in the workplace and
making sure assistants are not ok with being the honeypot to set up a meeting like that
and making sure drivers are going to speak out because I think power and coercion in the
professional domain is so much more tangible because your salary is on the line
that that sense of power and the risk you face for speaking out is so real that there are
these systemic ways in which we are failing people.
sure we might be able to curb it on the college campus level with joe biden giving a hell
of a speech about maybe having sex with unconcious woman isn't consensual dudes.
like maybe we should all intervene when we see something like that happening
no xxx which is sort of every sort of emotion that I've come [out.
B: [no xxx
E: of the me too campaign it all comes back to no xxx umm,
but you know seeing the men in xxx life on my newsfeed who've said I've-just like the 
woman just like I was saying to you off air 
that this has caused me to go back and review every pseudo sexual encounter that this 
ever happened to me in the professional domain or in college or whatever 
and sort of examine, was that ok?. I think there a lot of men out there who are doing the 
same 
and if they aren't they should be and whether or not you're gonna tweet about it 
maybe just ask yourself, was that ok?. and if not, how am I going to do something better, 
how am I going to be better in michelle obama's words=.
B: =be [better]
E: [well that's yeah]
B: that's the thing something that I was really struck by while watching this campaign 
take over my personal feed was people saying things like 
oh I had a me too status earlier about being sexual harassed and the guy who sexually 
harassed me [liked it.
E: [liked it
B: and I was like 
E: yeah! just like brain explosion=
B: =I mean how do you [make-I couldn't even make heads-or I was like I can't even make 
sense of this.
E: [just
B: the problem is, so bad and the bad actors here are so-I don't even know what I'm 
saying, like=.
E: =egocentric [like they think its about them
B: [yeah like 
it's such-it's-we're in such a place when in comes to the conversation around sexual 
harassment and assault that 
the people who are often the perpetrators are not even seeing themselves in that light.
E: somebody tweeted at us actually just the other day, umm, and brought this text 
message exchange to light for us 
between a sexual assault survivor who had used the status on her facebook wall to say 
me too 
and the person who she was talking about texting her saying, hey, I'm just-I wanted to let 
you know I'm here if you wanna talk about this 
and she was like you are the last person I want to talk to and he was like 
you know I-I've told you that I feel bad about what happened between us there was no 
malicious intent and you know, it's not fair that we both keep carrying around this 
psychological baggage 
[umm.
B: [take a hike!
E: right!
B: like are you kidding me!=.
E: =he was like, you know we should talk about this and get it off our chests and she was 
like, this-this is not for you to get any sense of relief from.
B: and-
E: -like that's not what I'm here for=. 
B: =yeah! that's the thing like, people who are survivors are not doing this to make the people who have implemented trama on others feel better.
E: thats-I mean thats-thats the frustration of this campaign too its-I think it's more engaging than empowering for me
and I think there's something worth looking into in that like why-I didn't feel better when I posted no xxx me too on my facebook status.
I felt frustrated I felt like-It was not super empowering but it was something that I felt compelled to not stay silent about.
I am not here to glorify assault or like share my wounds I feel like there's something very perverse about this performance.
I want you to know the details of every person whose every crossed those boundaries with me
that voyeuristic you know at it's core that I'm gonna share those details with the people who I have intimate relationships with in my life
as I feel they warrant sharing.
B: [right
E: [and no further you know what I mean?
so there's something weird about how I left this campaign feeling.
B: I don't think you're alone at all and actually umm someone wrote into one of my favorite advice columns slate dear prudence and they wrote in feeling angry and triggered
and just really upset by the whole me too campaign.
so she writes about how this campaign was feeling really triggering for her as a rape survivor
her boss posted on facebook about quote how proud he was of all the women sharing their stories
and she writes, at the same time I wanna respond I wanna tell people that survivors don't owe them their stories I don't want people to come away from this display of mutual pain and think that by posting a hashtag they've done enough, I'm feeling really grossed out by all the men who seem to have never realized this was a thing until now
I understand why people would want to post but it makes me furious
I just feel like everything I've gone through has been reduced down to a hashtag so it can trend on social media
and so I think you're not alone in feeling like this is this weird heavy burden where you're supposed to slit open your wounds for the world to see.
not everyone feels like that's going to be an empowering or helpful thing in their life.
E: exactly
B: not to mention how triggering this could be having multiple people talking about their trauma and their pain
how triggering this could be for someone who is dealing with this-that kind of thing
I mean I know that the day that we were talking about weinstein all day on a loop I had to-I had to leave early cause I was just like=.
E: =yeah
B: I can't stop thinking about this, and I, it's all I can think about.
E: yeah, I think we should take a break.
because I'm getting enraged and depressed all over again first of all
but second of all the good news is that there are things we can do about this, right? that there are good people who are taking action on these issues that we can join forces with
and the hashtag was just the start of the conversation.
the hashtag is by no means the end of activist momentum on this its just the beginning
and as uhh woody allen came to the defense of weinstein saying I hope this doesn't trigger a witch hunt.
that is exactly what I'm hoping for.
let's talk more about that after a quick break.
B: and we're back.
we were just getting very righteously angry about the state of sexual assault and sexual harassments that we are dealing with here in this country
which is appalling. umm we've been talking a lot about hollywood and media but it's important to point out that in no way is sexual assault and sexual harassment just regulated to those fields.
and so I've actually been really really interested to see how this weinstein case has seemingly opened the doors to other industries having people be called out for their toxic behavior.
and so earlier this week we saw mark halpert at nbc have a handful of accusations from women that he worked with at nbc and abc [umm.
E: [umm just to be on the record that he masturbated in front of an anc news employee in his office and then violently threw another woman against a restaurant before attempting to kiss her.
so I just want to make sure, like, people know that it's those are the kinds of behaviors you hope won't cause you to be the center of a witch hunt, think again.
B: yeah!
E: because I am excited and motivated for this witch hunt.
because this is the kind of bs that we need to call out and people like that should not be able to get away with that.
B: as lindy wrote in the new york times it is a witch hunt for witches, and we're hunting you.
E: yeah, it's so on point=.
B: =so on point
E: it's such a-it's like uhhh I just masturbated in front of my coworker--
B: -can't a guy masturbate in front of a coworker and throw her up against a wall and try to kiss her and not get [called out anymore.
E: [come-on! Don't be such as
B: [jeez what is this nazi germany?
E: [solo
such emotional women are overreacting [god
B: [oh my god
umm, also if you listened to our silicon valley episode you know that sexual harassment for tech employees is uh-is uh a real problem.
and so earlier this week we saw blogger and former microsoft tech evangelist Robert schobel get some pretty intense allegations from women
saying that he groped them that he would attack them and he ended up sort of blaming alcoholism for those that behavior.
E: mmm, that's sad and real but also not an excuse.
B: I mean-I don't alcoholism and addiction issues cause a whole host of things in people's [lives but.
E: [right, but i think it can be both like oh he has a serious mental health problem he needs help
and your going to have to actually be responsible for your own actions anyway.
B: exactly, actually just yesterday Kevin spacey-
E: -I saw that!
B: umm he- it came out that he had made advances to an actor that was just fourteen at the time=.
E: =yeah
B: and you know people have been-there's been rumors about him for the longest time that he's been kind of a toxic predatory person.
and I think that it just goes to show you that it's not just women it's=.
E: =oh yeah!
B: it's-this is a prevalent issue for all kinds of [folks].
E: [well] and I guess the gay community is up in arms today because his [response-.
B: [-it was disgusting.
E: [was sort of like excuse me I'm gay, like, I'm gonna use that as a shield.
B: yeah being a gay man and making a sexual advance towards a child those are two different [things.
E: [yeah
B: like, I am-I'm almost [horrified that he would try to conflate them.
like that's almost like a-that's a pr strategy that is so sleazy and toxic that I can't even believe someone told him that was a good idea.
that like, oh I'll excuse myself trying to make a sexual advance towards a literal child by saying I'm gay=.
E: =yeah
B: what? no-
E: -no no no no
kind of like saying your sweet old president too
B: oh, which president are you [referring to-
E: [-kind of like uh george h w bush who last week after it was made clear that he regularly tells dirty jokes and then pinches the bottoms of young women posing in photos next to the former president
his team released a statement saying he's just a sweet old guy who does in fact pinch women's bottoms=.
B: =that's what I found so weird=.
E: =what!
B: they're no saying he doesn't pinch bottoms they're saying he does=.
E: =he does [they were like-.
B: [-he absolutely does [do that
E: [cut him a break, they were like-
B: [-that's his thing=.
E: =that's his thing, that he's a charming old man who pinches bottoms
and we were all just like what are you kidding me.
and that just goes to show you how far we have to go in this conversation.
it's not just about me too, in a world where the perpetrators would like your status
if-apparently defining what consent is, again and again
and not just for college boys-.
B: -for former presidents-
E: -but for grown ass men like george h w bush knowing that you can't hide behind your
sort of, senile behavior as being an excuse.
so as you've been saying bridget, I think it goes to show that this is not relegated to any
single industry.
it is not relegated to people of any single sexual orientation.
umm, it has every thing to do with power.
and it has a lot to do with what is happening at work because when people are using their
professional power and influence for a means to coerce you into sexual activities that is
non-consensual
then it's especially disgusting.
B: going off that, something I found really really really telling about how bad of a
situation is that earlier this month buzzfeed put out a call
they wanted to know who are the harvey weinsteins of your industry.
so if you're a mathematician who is the guy that everyone knows is a creep that's just
been getting away with it
and I was-when I saw that I was like yeah great like, out these creeps totally like, lets do
this i'm in.
that ended up sort of spinning off into what they called the shxxx media men list
and this was a crowd sourced google doc where it had dozens and dozens of names of
men who had done various inappropriate things.
and these things-and I should say it's all allegations the list makes it really clear that you
know, take the list with a grain of salt
because it's just anonymous allegations so you know, know that going in.
but what I found really telling about this list, is that it ranges from things like sliding into
someone's dms to out right assault or rape
and then things that are not sexual in nature.
like one of the people who's on the list is a man who while his inappropriate behavior was
not sexual in nature it was threatening and bullying and so it was things like intimidating
interns and making them be like
if they crossed him in some way that he would retaliate against them.
E: well it's funny cause it sounds like this is a tale as old as time right?.
like, influence power wielding that influence and power, it happens every day.
B: it happens every day-.
E: -and some of it is illegal and some of it's not=.
B: =totally=
E: =so it is-you-you know I can almost hear the umm the outcry of that group that trump
met with which we covered in the umm=
B: =oh [devos that-
E: [-campus sexual assault-oh devos=  
B: =yeah=  
E: =that's right when we were tackling title nine the mothers of the accused-i'm sorry-  
falsey accused rapists who lives have been ruined because some girl regretted a night  
with their boyfriend basically  
and i can hear those folks lighting up their tiki torches already.  
B: not tiki torches!  
E: well, the line between white supremacists [and my son's not a rapist-it's pretty-it's  
pretty-  
B: [-I mean there-there-there all xxx a mixed bag of you know  
E: yeah, I can almost like hear the beads of sweat forming on this folks' brows because if  
you think about it  
the democratization of gossip through the internet can be used powerfully  
and, some might argue, can be used as a form of influence and blacklisting  
and it can be used in a retaliatory way just like we're trying to present.  
now I'm not here saying that that's what that list is about  
but I get the woody allen fear of a witch hunt  
and at the same time I think we need a lot of more of that kind of exposure= .  
B: =well I actually have often argued that the reason why we are seeing these kinds of  
watershed moments  
is exactly because of things like social media.  
when you look at cosby's situation I think that cosby came from an era where it's old  
Hollywood where=  
E: =yes  
B: you could call someone's pr agent and say this story can we have it killed it's really  
going to be bad for us.  
and we would never be privy to any of that because those powerplayers are wealthy  
connected and all of that.  
and so that's happening in rooms where most of us will probably never be.  
and I think with things like twitter, it has democratized people's voices.  
and so people who largely did not have a platform did not have a voice, can say  
hey, like, this happened to me, hey this wasn't ok.  
and a pr person can't call twitter and say hey can you kill this story  
that's not how twitter works= .  
E: =yeah  
B: [and so it's kind of this reclaiming of power and influence and voice  
and giving it sort of a more level playing field where I'll never forget when that story  
bubbled up again.  
there was no one to call there was no pr person you could call to make everyone stop  
tweeting about it  
it just was, it existed and I don't think you saw that before.  
E: that is such a good point.  
and I think it just goes to show you that when women especially, but survivors of assaults  
across the gender spectrum get together, like your voice can be powerful  
and that what we saw with me too but me too was just the beginning
and so solidarity and a unified front and sort of acknowledging each other's differences and unity is going to be really critical to make this movement an effective campaign for change.
B: I could not agree more.
and so we didn't want to end without giving you some resources if you're finding yourself dealing with sexual or sexual harassment in general or in the workplace.
here are a couple resources that you should know that you have at your disposal.
umm one is a great organization that I know and love is the national women's law center there number is 2025885180, that's 2025885180.
and they're really helpful in terms of coming up with legal resources if you wanna take legal action against someone who is breaking the law or treating you in a way that's inappropriate and you wanna know what your legal resources they are a great great great resource for you.
E: and furthermore, don't forget to check out the eeoc the equal employment opportunity commission who we are always giving a little shout out to cause our little labor organizer blood in us can't help but mention how influential they have become.
and yes they are part of the government so haha this is us relying on our taxpayer dollars and actually cashing in on some of that investment.
you can contact them at 18006694000
and search their website at eeoc.gov for more.
B: so sminty listeners, we want to hear from you.
this is obviously an issue that many many many of us are dealing with
how is it showing up in your life?. how did you feel about the me too campaign?. was it something that you participated in, why or why not?. how did you feel about it?.
if you're a dude, did you take part in campaigns like him though and I did that, how did that go for you?.
we really wanna hear how these campaigns are showing up in your spaces.
E: yeah, I also wanna hear where do you wanna see this go.
are you down for the witch hunt.
or are you fearful of this becoming an infringement on equal justice under the law you know
like is the power of gossip in the workplace being harnessed productibey or do you fear if accusations run amuck.
I'm intrigued by how nuanced our path forward really can be and I'd loved to hear from you brilliant listeners on umm, what action you plan on taking.
B: so get in touch with us on instagram or at stuff mom never told you on twitter or on mom stuff podcast
and we love reading your emails at momstuff@howstuffworks.com
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I: Alrighty hello everybody
D: Welcome welcome welcome
I: welcome to the pilot episode of nerdificent I am Ify nwadiwe.
D: I am danny fernandez. thank you for joining us
I: yes yes and we're here to talk about one thing that is synonymous with the word nerd.
I feel like like nerd and this has gone hand in hand and this is kind of what skyrocketed
nerd culture to the mainstream.
D: yeah and that's what this show is kinda gonna be about you guys.
we're going to be tackling different things in nerd culture that some of you might be
aware of and some of you might not be.
I: yea and whether you're a old school vet rolling dice down in the basement
or a new fan who just saw the hit movie I'm callin that now
smash box office hit black panther-. 
D: -of [course! and now they're like
I: [you're like let's find more of this nerd xxx-
D: -I wanna be a nerd now=
I: =yeah we'll have it all here so ah.
D: dissecting everything in nerdom that we grew up with
I : and more, maybe some of that new nerd hotness you know
D: yeah, although I have a feeling you and I are going to trend towards a lot of anime as
well.
I : hell yeah-that's-that's uh I feel like some-
D: -that toonami lifestyle
I: yeah it's going to make its way.
but yeah so today's subject is probably one of the biggest most popular mainstays within
nerd culture and that is the comic book convention.
but if we're being super specific we're talking about comic con and the comic con as most
people know it
which is the annual san diego comic con
and that's usually what people are referring to-. 
D: -{when they say comic con
I: {when they say comic con
because it is the international comic con which means people from all over the world are
flying to go this specific comic con.
but before we get into that
let's break it down.
what is a comic con.
or what is-we all know comic con or we may not-don't wanna judge you
short for comic book convention.
D: yes. yeah, a gathering of nerds
and now it's grown to hundreds of thousands of people that flock to san diego. but uh the original actually-let's go back to one of the oldest syfy conventions ever
this was on record to the oldest the first recorded intercity meetup of science fiction fans was filcon
and that was in 1936 it was a small party of science fiction fans in new york.
so that was the first one on record that's according to geek's media.
so all the way back in 1936 there were nerds.
I: yeah, I'd like to imagine that is was like just a party like just like everyone was like we're all nerds.
we comin in our syfy gear and we gonna turn up, [you know?.
D: [yeah with their like war of the worlds, or whatever=
I: =yeah exactly
D: and so then we move on to the first recorded official comic book convention
so that was 1964 in new york.
I: yeah, known as the new york comic con it was held in july 24th of 1964 at the workmen's circle building.
it was a one day convention organized by 16 year old burnie bubness=.
D: =bubness mmmmmhhhhm
I: it was organized by a-
D: -[by a sixteen year old
I: [sixteen year old! yeah sixteen year old-
D: -[that's peak nerd that-that's when you're in your peak nerdiness=.
I: =yeah yeah
D: that's when you're a peak comic book collector.
I: yeah that's when you have gumption to like, do a whole convention.
but it wasn't just him it was also fellow enthusiast rod fracken official guest of the tri state con
included steve ditko, flow steinberg, tom gill
and the reports have over one hundred attendees can you image=.
D: -yeah that's good for back then.
I: well yeah-
D: -for a sixteen year old as well
I wonder if they charged people at the door.
I: I mean do you think little burnie bubness would think that he'd be able to add three zeros behind that one-.
D: -oh man, so moving on we have what we know as which is the san diego comic con
so that was originally called san diego golden state comic con.
it was mini con so the first ever one was in march 21st of 1970
and the men that had put that together included shell dorf, ken kruger, and richard alf
so they were the original ones.
they then later had another mini con of august of that same year.
I: so they're doing like nice little mini conventions kinda testing it out before they went big=.
D: =yeah so it was actually interesting so the second con that they had the one that was in august
they actually got jack kirby as a guest
and he's the man who created basically every notable marvel superhero from captain america to x-men
but they also farenheit 451 author ray bradbury and this is a really interesting way that they got him there.
so he actually gave a speech at san diego state university in dorf and alf two of the guys who had put the mini cons together
they attended and then they waited for him after his speech and they asked him if he would speak at their comic con
and he said yeah sure for his normal speaking fee which was 5000 dollars-
I: -no way
D: which was-roughly adds up to 30000 today-
I: -[wow
D: [so he was like yeah sure I'll do it 30000 kids.
and so they were like we can't do that they came up with a plan.
they essentially lied to him and said it was non-profit to educate the public about comics
and bradbury was like sure I'll do it=
I: =yeah!
D: so that's kind of how the first original san diego comic con came to be.
again they were calling it the golden state comic con and then eventually in 1973 is when
they settled on san diego comic con.
I: that's nice.
D: SDCC that we know
I: built on lies and deceit you know just-
D: -I think that-I was reading about this story which was in the rolling stone by the way
and I think that they had said now they had to think of a way to make it non-profit=.
I: =yeah, and they are-they are technically non-profit till this day.
D: oh really? [ok
I: [yeah they're a non profit organization.
D: so that is-that is what was the original san diego comic con and again when-as if he said when people say comic con that is what they're referring to.
however, we have kind of moved on to a specialization of cons-conventions have spread throughout the country.
I: yeah-
D: -throughout, I mean internationally as well but here-
I: -[and to the seas too
D: [in north america yeah
I: sorry to cut you off but yeah, on the seas there's lots of cruise cons too.
and I think it's that effect that happens when you have something grow to a certain point
it'll fork off and have its own genres within that genre.
so you have like doctor who cons=.
D: =yes
I: we have like, you know, anime conventions specifically for anime=.
D: -which I have to stop you right there because anime expo which you and I both have
so many stories from=.
I: =yeah
D: that anime expo is the largest north american anime convention.
it is=
I: =oh I believe it
D: it's insane I-you and I have been like the last couple of years.
I go-I think I go for like an hour and have to give my badge away it's like walking
through-I've never been amongst that many people.
because the difference with-so anime expo actually takes place in los angeles where san
diego comic con is a larger acered sprawling what it's grown to now is it's a lot of
restaurants and bars and interactive things
as well as inside the convention whereas anime expo in LA here is a lot of everyone on
top of each other in one singular area.
I: well that's been the biggest which if you aren't aware there's a big argument within the
congress of moving comic con to LA versus having it in san diego.
and san diego just hands down has more space.
the reason this is is if you haven't been to san diego comic con the convention center is
downtown right next to-it's like downtown area-.
D: -[the harbor gaslamp district which is downtown san diego yes
I: [the-the district yeah
and it's also right next to the petco stadium=.
D: =yes
I: so comic con has had the ability to spread its wings and expand out into those spaces
and a lot of the people who show up in comic con don't feel the need to have to be within
the con because a lot of them are taking over.
like adult swim always has a huge area outside near petco park.
you always have a lot of assassins creed-like ubisoft would have a whole obstacle course
right outside of the con.
and then all of the bars and restaurants are branded
so there's room to breath it's not on top.
whereas LA-LA is LA and there's always so much going on so you have the convention
center-.
D: -and then there's probably a marathon going on=.
I: =yeah
D: they did that one year.
I: oh yeah, or-
D: -or it was like an actual con and then also the LA marathon?.
I: yeah, also the are just doesn't have much like it's really just a whole bunch of wannabe
new york styled buildings in downtown LA who don't give a damn about the con.
and then you have the staple center area which, if they don't have a game kind of tries to
take that place.
but I remember one year there was anime expo and across from the anime expo were the
x games
and I can't think of two worst fandoms-.
D: -[who is planning this-oh the x games in anime in anime expo?
I: [to put in a small xxx oh yeah it was all-
D: -well you and I-I think were texting each other because-just to kind of put this in
perspective
the line to pick up your badge was four to five hours=. 
I: =yeah
D: to pick up your badge to get in
it was [insane
I: [yeah that's also bad planning.
D: yeah, so this-the 2017-just to top off this anime expo 2017 numbers
over 107,000 warm and 357,000 turnstiles.
so like coming in now yeah
I mean it was everyone was on top of eachother.
and anime expo also for just talking about specializations and cons
they go all out.
so I would say the difference between them and say maybe san diego comic con
I think it's like 50 50 50% are dressed up 50% of people are just normal people enjoying
it.
anime expo it's like 90% are dressed up and that takes a lot of time to also go through
security with like swords and helmets and all of this stuff so.
I: and just to put that whole bringing comic con to LA argument to bed
the numbers that you just said for anime expo just remember that-well so what were the
numbers again.
you said a-
D: -[ so 107,000
I: [107,000=
D: =yeah over 107,000=
I: =yeah
D: and then 357,000 turnstiles yeah
I: so comic con they were saying that they're last year numbers was 135,000.
so we can't even handle 107,000 without just having huge congestions it just-cause I don't
know if you've saw the picture of last year's-
D: -[oh yes
I: [anime expo which you can't see carpet-
D: -[no yeah
I: [you-if-uhh overhead view you just-
D: -[person on top of person
I: [see people
so if we can't even handle 107,000 there's no way we'll be able to handle the amount of
people.
and that people getting into the con not to mention people who just go to san diego comic
con just to hang out so it's [impossible.
D: [I do wanna say that you know, two years ago they did that poll in san diego and it
was like what you would rather keep
san diego comic con or the chargers and we saw how that went.
I: well because-
D: -san diego does not want to give up its con.
I: it's the one way they're making money=.
D: =yeah
I: you know the blackfish killed off the whole-
D: -[oh sea world
I: [sea world thing]
they lost that you know and soon we're comin we're coming for the zoo-
D: -well they-they
I: you know I'm-I'm workin on good monkey you know-look, working title
good monkey it's about the way the san diego zoo is abusing monkeys and-
D: -[I have no doubt
I: [other animals working title
D: continuing on with out specializing of cons
we also have star wars celebration-
I: -[oh yeah
D: [which is in orlando
and D23 which is the disney expo that's in LA
now something that's interesting with both of these is that what we've seen-so for the
longest time san diego comic con was king of the premier for trailers=
I: =oh yeah
D: so-so marvel trailers that would drop, DC trailers that would drop
these huge superhero comic book films and what we've seen the last couple of years is
disney's like
you know what, we have our own convention so we're going to air infinity war at our
own convention=. 
I: =yeah
D: instead of at comic con and I-I think that's really ballsy.
and also just shows you know, how much money a lot of these other cons are making as
well
where they kind have spiraled off into something that's happening in orlando or here in
LA.
I: well that's just kind of like, the end game of the cons.
and I feel like one of the biggest problems with cons now
because we started from this small con put together by enthusiasts by you know, burny
bubness and you know
it was just for the passion of it-it was-it was just trying to find like minded individuals
who wanna come together
and now it's just a hub for consumerism.
It's a hub to get people who basically want to sell you things.
and we'll get more into that=.
D: =yeah
I: after the break
and we're back.
so we left off on the note talking about the history of comic con
san diego comic con specifically which is the comic con.
I just wanna remind people just in case people are wondering-
D: -I mean legally we'll get into that-
I: -[oh yeah
D: [but legally it is the-
I: [-comic con
D: [comic con
I: oh my goodness yeah just wait for us to get to that. but yeah it wasn't always as big as it was. and I kind of came into the world of comic when I was an adult. I was able to afford to drive down to san diego. buy a ticket and do that because there was no way I was going to convince my nigerian father to ever spend money on anything that wasn't me trying to become a doctor or lawyer. uhhh but danny you-you actually had a childhood uhh=
D: =yeah
I: where you were able to go to [comic con.
D: [well my family is from san diego so when I was like, 9 or 10 got super into anime specifically dragon ball z and convinced my mom when I was about 11 to take me to comic con. me and my brothers and girlfriend of mine because I was obsessed with the voice actors for dragon ball z which is a very popular anime. I was obsessed with the English voice actors that-those were the ones that I saw on television and that they had at comic con that were signing and so I convinced her to take me. I can tell you a couple of things one, probably not as expensive or else my mom would not have taken my brothers and I as well and two, it was definitely not as packed like I just remember parts of the convention being kind of empty=. I: =yeah D: there was a section where a lot of the booths were that had the voice actors and I got them to sign like dvds. so we can talk about parts of what the convention actually is. there's an area known as artist alley=.
I: =yeah yeah!
D: that's where a lot of independent artists and also artists that you'll see that have worked on nickelodeon projects marvel comic book artist. a lot of them will do commissions on the floor that you can pay for. they'll sign their artwork they have a lot of fan art= I: =oh yeah!
D: there as well. I: even in-in the comic book world if you buy comic books near comic con you'll have comic book covers that are just blank so that you can take it to comic con and get your own custom cover done. so like, there lots of like, love for artists alley. what was that like back then?. was it- was it easier to navigate?. D: I don't necessarily remember artists alley. I do remember the major company still being there though=. I: =ok D: so funimation is the one that owns dragon ball z.
so I remembered there booth and they had vhs tapes back then.
that was the thing to buy was anime vhs tapes and get the voice actors to sign it.
but yeah I believe they still had playstation.
you know I don't even know if nickelodeon was there.
now nickelodeon=
I: =oh yeah
D: so if you-
I: -a huge presence
D: [so if you go to comic con now, yeah nickelodeon has a huge presence they normally
have an interactive house you walk through=.
I: =yeah
D: I think this past year it was hey arnold I know that they had people taking picture with
but the years prior they've had spongebob's pineapple that you can walk through and take
pictures with.
adult swim as Iffy said earlier normally has an area set up right outside of the con=.
I: =yeah
D: and they'll have-I remember they had like an aquitaine hunger force interactive thing
so they have-a lot of these companies have interactive type of homes or whatever you might
say.
I: yeah, and that's-and that's what so crazy is like, to hear back to yesteryear comic where
it was just booths-.
D: -[and signings, booths and signing
I: [it was just, and just signing yeah
and the closest-
D: -and comics!
I: yeah and the closest-
D: -that you can buy
I: you'll ever get to that are the newer cons that started up that can't really afford or garner
the attention of these huge media companies.
like I Remember the first-I went to the first long beach comic con
now it's insane.
but like, before it was literally just you went into a convention hall and there was a booth
that was xxx accomodation of artists alley.
and smaller comic book shops that were reselling comics and just like other like smaller
indie publishers.
but now if you walk the floor of comic con what you're going to see is-it's almost gonna
look like an amusement park.
because you-you've got fox, wb-
D: -like [walking dead
I: [walking dead
D: takes up a huge part of it=
I: =oh yeah
D: which is normally some interactive thing
again this is inside the convention=
I: =yeah
D: so you end up walking through some type of interactive zombie maze or something that set up inside the convention.
I: unless you're me I don't do that.
I don't go in it, like I see the outside.
the outsides nice but I don't-.
D: -[you have
I: -[go in it
D: dc will obviously have a huge presence.
last year was wonder woman's 75th anniversary.
so they had a huge wonder woman exhibit.
marvel will have an entire marvel stage where sometimes they will bring the actors on to the marvel stage=.
I: =oh yeah
D: they'll also bring marvel voice actors on to the stage.
this is all within the convention=.
I: =yeah
D: so it's kind of-everything is happening at once so it's kind of loud=.
I: =oh yeah
D: it's very-if you have claustrophobia-
I: -[and you have
D: -[anything like that
I: no cell phone reception I wanna-[I wanna if you-
D: -[that's another thing
I: if this is the first year that you're going to a con you somehow snagged tickets you're going to con-san diego comic con
don't bother bringing your phone there are too many people in one place trying to use the cell service and it's trash.
you can only call don't think you're going to be updating your insta and all that.
you gotta save it to your phone you might as well bring one of those old school xxx cameras.
I guess I could have called it a disposable camera but xxx [you know what I'm talking about.
D: [I feel like I would be doing everyone a disservice if I didn't mention that the huge thing that's known as hall h=.
I: =oh yeah
D: and hall h is a 6500 seat showcase essentially for big projects.
so when iffy was mentioning that this is kind of consumerism hall h is a section of comic con that is very hard to get into.
you either have to sleep overnight, in order to get into it.
like literally people will line up two days before or a day before.
you'll get a ticket if you're wondering how this works while you're in line so you can leave to go to the bathroom
or if you are press and if you're special press you have to have a password.
I know because I got to go in last year.
you have a password so you-not even with a press badge can you get in.
't's a plus badge plus a password plus you're on the list to get in.
and hall h is where they showcase everything
when you see the justice league lineup of gal and ben affleck and ezra and jason memoin
all of them standing up there
that is at hall h=.
I: =yeah
D: yeah, whenever they have the cast of logan or whatever that's happening in [hall h.
I: [also if want to hear, I feel like a lot of people use podcasts to experience things they
might never experience.
so here close your eyes, I'm gonna give you the hall h experience so.
so imagine you just saved up all your money all year
and you've-you actually were able to get a comic con ticket
you and one other person or you're flying to san diego.
you get down to san diego and you can-can get down to your hotel that you're spending
way too much money on
you might see stan lee in the lobby it's real good.
and then you're like I gotta get to hall h
so you-instead of going around comic con and seeing the sights, you stand outside the
store all day and all night
and you wake up you go in and you watch a trailer and then it's released thirty second
later online=.
D: -[it's so true so.
I: [that is the hall h experience.
D: so listen last year they had released the wonder woman trailer in hall h it was a very
big deal
I could not be in hall h at the time I was in my hotel room and I literally watched it the
same time as everyone in hall h.
I will say thought that it is exciting to be amongst your fellow nerds when even when I
got to go in.
and I felt bad because people had spent the night there
but watching those people walk in they were so excited=.
I: =yeah
D: they had won the lotto because they had made it in they were like jumping and
dancing=.
I: =oh yeah
D: on their way in there so
I: and no-the-my version was the cynical one=-.
D: -[but it is-but it
I: [but there is something like I've
for example been to a bar that was showing an esports match and watching it with nerds
and cheering for teams together.
it does add a whole other layer of excitement to it.
and also not only do you get to see the trailer you get to be in the same room with some
of the biggest celebrities that you've ever seen so.
D: yeah, so that is the phenomenon known as hall h if you ever hear someone to refer to
it.
I: yeah that is hall h.
and there's many other halls but hall h is the one you want to be in and if you're a host it's the one you want to be hosting in if chris hardwick can't.

D: yeah, I was going to say he is=
I: =he's the king.
D: he's probably the designated hall h host=.
I: =he is the king.
but we touched on artists alley but I don't think-we kind of explained it but I-I feel like a lot of people might not know like.
you're hearing about all these different brands and all these cool things
you're like well all those things sound cool why is it a problem why is artist alley being brought up
and I think the problem is
as you're hearing us describe these huge attractions and these huge different booths and set pieces on the floor at comic on
the thing you have to imagine is that that takes up a lot of space.
and as it gets bigger the space for artists alley gets smaller and it gets pushed back further and further to the darkest corners of the con.
it's actually-if you're not looking for it it's hard to find artist alley.
and that's a problem because if you're able to find artist alley because you're able to find artist alley you're going to go there no matter what.
what that means for people who might discover artist alley who might purchase something from these indie creatives
that means that you're not getting that much foot traffic you're not getting enough people who are gonna just be like
oh this is a guy who does the art for a comic I like let me buy something from him.
instead you're stuck in a cold-it's like right under the air conditioner it's-and like-it really feels like you're next to the party because since it's-.
D: -they're next to the bathrooms to be honest.
I: yeah they're next to the party I mean they're next to the bathrooms=.
D: -{they're out in the corner.
I: [and also like you hear the booming distant sounds of like the existing installations and it really feels like you are indeed at the less cool part of comic con
and so you get out of there real fast=.
D: =well that makes a good point so yeah a lot of these companies are taking over the con where it's not so much
they call it comic con but it's not really about comics anymore. in fact
this was was huge story this past year is that mile high comics one of the us's largest comic book retailers dropped out of comic con ok dropped out of san diego comic con after 44 years=.
I: =yah
D: of being there, that was huge
again comic con started to buy and sell started which you can still technically do you can bring comics and a lot of times they do do trades on the floor=.
I: =oh yeah
D: so this was per mile high president chuck rosensky he said after 44 years of my supporting them through good times and bad.
that was just too much indifference to endure.
what he is referring to was a big mishap that happened between mile high and comic
when a comic con contractor failed to deliver mile high comics.
so a lot of these vendors have to have things shipped in and they have to go through a
comic con contractor to get these things on the floor.
so a comic con contractor failed to deliver mile high comics on time and left them
embarrassed and unable to assemble their booth.
they were actually missing huge portions of their comics and this is not-you guys
comic con floor space is expensive=.
I: =oh yeah
D: especially now that you have companies like fox marvel disney that can buy up the
floor space so a lot of these comic book companies are not making the same amount of
money
also a lot of people aren't going there to buy comics anymore which was an issue.
it just wasn't adding up for them.
so he said when you are in a relationship out of love and passion but the other party could
care less whether you live or die
you have to realize that it's time to move on.
so rosinsky also noted that shifting demographics and the increased size of the
convention had created an environment where he was paying for this large amount of
money for essentially 70 feet of floor space=
I: =ok
D: but he wasn't getting the same amount of foot traffic.
so people aren't going there essentially for comics anymore so he-so it-it was a big dent
for them to be putting in the money when people aren't buying comics
and when they don't even have their supplies showing up.
I: here it is, so are you ready for some of these prices.
for an exhibit space a 10 by 10 booth is 2000 dollars.
D: is that for the weekend? or for
I: that's for the weekend and by the way this is for 2013 comic con
so these are these prices are four years old now and the corner premium booth is 700
dollars and island premium booth was 1800 dollars
a comic con table uhh which I'm guessing is even table is uhh 900 dollars and-
D: -so
I: and a small press table was [400 dollars.
D: [yeah so on here it says that for mile high they wanted 18000 dollars
which they're not making-xxx again-you guys
so you have to look at it, are they making that back in sales of comics?
I: yeah no
D: no!
I: there's no way
D: yeah
I: but speaking of like, adding up money and numbers and all this we wanna-I wanna talk
about this because we are like I pointed out before earlier in the episode
comic con is a registered non-profit.
david glanser who-he is actually the chief communications strategy officer for comic con international

got real defensive when he was having to interview with forbes
when they're asking how most major conventions in north america are run as commercial businesses comic con international is actually a nonprofit.

D: even though it's the most successful=.
I: =yeah yeah and-
D: -expensive con
I: and it says that they reported over 17 million in revenue reported in 2014
and so then he goes, well actually this is a quote from it he goes
you didn't mention how much it cost to produce both comic con and wondercon and it uhh
the reported expense which actually in this map that I did I only treated it as if these were expenses for comic con but these are expenses for two cons the administration cost are 728000.
that's how much they report they are.
now I went and did the math and this year for a four day pass it cost 231 dollars it cost 231 for a four day pass
and they say they get about 135000 individual attendees
so if you do the math of that that's 31 million dollars that they stand to make.

D: in ticket prices-
I: =[in just ticket prices
D: =[alone
I: this isn't counting-this isn't counting the exhibitor passes this isn't counting-
D: -or how much booth=
I: =yeah
D: yeah, how much all of the vendors have to pay them= I: =exactly
D: to rent a booth
I: it doesn't any of that
that's how much they're making they make enough money to pay for two comic cons and they're still charging the fans 231 for four days.
D: that's a lot
I: yeah, yeah
D: I don't know why I thought it was 400 dollars.
I: =yet he-
D: =[it feels like it's 400 dollars everytime I go.
I: [capped his xxx
but he went on to say in this same interview we're not in the business to make money we're an educational organization with a mission of promoting comics and popular art.
but they're pushing artists alley to the back corner they're giving these huge corporations large spaces on the floor they're giving them prime space=.
D: =100 percent yeah
I: they're free advertising and we know the money is in advertising and then on top of that they're charging the attendees 231 dollars.
D: this is kind of funny to me you know when you lie about something=
I: =yeah
D: and then you have to live with that lie the rest of your life.
they were like hey it's a nonprofit ray bradbury
and then now it's like they're still holding out that it's a nonprofit to educate people about
comics.
I: and then I only cap that off with one final question
if you are indeed an educational organization with a mission of promoting comics and
popular art
why did you copyright comic con?.
D: I think that they wanted to uhhh-
I: -I [don't know why waited for an answer.
D: [wait did you want
I: yeah I wanted him to burst through the door xxx mr nwadiwe
D: but that is a strong move=
I: =yeah
D: that's kind of-so stan lee's comikaze the original name that started in 2011 he then
changed it to LA comic con for that specific reason=
I: =yeah
D: so that no one could come and make an LA comic con
however san diego trademarked the term comic con.
I: yeah yeah they just got into a suit about it
and they didn't actually have to do a los angeles comic con cause that would be a bold
move coming after stan lee-
D: -[but I think they
I: [it was actually
D: did it for the whole-what was uhh
do you remember when the fine brothers did a trademark on reaction videos
so like, no one else could use that term
[that's what this reminds me of
I: [yeah so it was uhhh
so the ruling was handed in southern california which also that was the shitty thing
was the case was actually against salt lake comic con-
D: -that was it
I: but it was handled in san diego.
like of course san diego is gonna make sure that their cash cow wins that case.
they have everything xxx it just wasn't-that wasn't a fair trial.
it needs to obviously-look I'm not a lawyer I'm not going to pretend to be one
but I think you take it to the next court that's-that's-that's and I think that's the legal term
is when you don't like a judgement you look at the judge and go let's take it to the next
court.
uhhh, but yeah they were going to lose that no way.
there was no way that that judge was going to toss that.
they're saying it's to protect their brand but really what is their brand if your brand is
based on the passion of fans.
D: well and what we're seeing-like what we were talking about with the specialization of different cons now.
there's emerald city there's dragon con.
there's just so many cons that are popping up.
propbably you could just look up wherever you're listening you can literally type in your city and con and there's probably a convention.
some time of nerd convention that is now taking place there
I: but all and all through it's ups and down I feel like comic con is the one place that people will always flock to because it's the one place nerds get to be nerds.
D: I-I might disagree with you on that Iffy=.
I: =really
D: because I feel like star wars fans
if you had to choose cause not everyone has the amount of money to fly to california get an almost 300 dollar badge
also probably for your-there's a lot of families-we see a lot of families at comic con so it's not just you it's your family you're traveling with or a partner or a spouse.
I truly feel like if you're given the choice a lot of star wars fans are gonna go to star wars celebration.
star war celebration has the cast it drops a lot of news typically there or trailers.
I think that they're moving on.
I think people are-I think comic cons-san diego comic con will always be huge but I think some of these other cons are catching up and disney is smart.
disney is capitalizing on that they're like you know what we don't actually need to fly our cast out for this.
we're gonna put our cast we're gonna put all of our money into this and promote our movies.
we're gonna promote our people and have exclusives here.
so that's another thing is exclusives that take place not only just trailers that are dropped or scenes from movies that they'll show there but they also have exclusive toys and merchandise that you can't get anywhere else.
so I do think that that's uhh might be tak-if you had to choose-
I: -I don't like-however I will say I don't like the precedent it sets when you get to bogard your footage and your stuff so that you can get people to pay for your thing.
you run into the problem you're having right now with net neutrality a lot of people are against netflix because they want you to use their shitty version of netflix
they want you to use whatever this-what-what did they put that star trek discovery on uhh cbs bullshit, you know like, I find that instinct not being the idea of oh let's do this better the instinct is like, let's cut out the middleman so we can get all the money and when something's built on that precedent we get left worse products and now that they're able to use their strength as copyright owners to block off other entities from using it=.
D: =yeah
I: you don't get a better product you get what you get.
D: I do want to say that uhh star wars celebration is taking a break this year.
I: what!
D: yeah, it's not happening 2018
after three consecutive years=
I: =this is the most star wars-
D: -(but you know, I know, I think, well I think
I: [we've gotten in the span and they're taking a break.
D: well I think it could be we haven't seen as much promotion for the han solo movie
right?.
I think that the last three years we had movie, movie, movie.
we had force awakens we had rogue one we last jedi we have the han solo film.
so, I don't really know what's going on there but I do know that they're taking a break
and that it will take place again in 2019.
so-so that is an issue so yeah.
so-so star wars fans are going to probably flock back to san diego comic con
and or d23 since disney and star wars and marvel are heavily linked.
so d23 which I was saying is disney's official expo
that's for a lot of disney movie news.
uhh, so they'll drop aladdin exclusives things like that.
I: well, yeah that's very interesting especially about star wars celebrations.
we'll see what the future holds.
and after this break well we'll talk about what the future holds for cons and uhhh
wrap this whole thing up.
whaddya think?.
alright and we're back.
I hope you liked those messages we worked really hard on them
or maybe we just were lazy and played jack and miles.
I think that's what we'll do, you know, mix it up=.
D: =so iffy we are talking about the future.
we're going to predict the future of comic con=.
I: =oh yeah, what's your opinion
D: I-here's my thing
that if you have been comic con the last couple of years you have realized some of the
things being promoted there have nothing to do with nerdom
they're just some cbs show that's airing there=.
I: =yeah
D: literally it's so funny now they'll have procedurals or like kevin can wait or like you
know
they're like passing out flyers or some interactive thing where I'm like you guys aren't
even trying anymore.
this has nothing to do with nerdom [or scifi.
I: [but they pay for that ad space.
D: but they know-but that's the thing you're right it is consumerism where where they're
capitalizing these are hundreds of thousands of eyes are going to be there
so why not have some type of interactive nbc whatever for their upcoming show
they do have that and it's not-have you rea-have you been noticing that it's like this has nothing to do with anything=.
I: =yeah
D: with anything-
I: -[oh yeah no you're just looking
D: [with anything nerd related
I: [around and you're like what's going on here why am I here
D: I think it's going to be even more commercial than it already is.
I agree with the fact that the companies are buying up space
not only are companies are weeding out independent artists inside of the actual con itself
but they are also renting out restaurants and bars in gaslamp district which is downtown san diego
so that you don't even need a badge to go inside for them to get your money and eyeballs
they'll have an interactive show some type of vr simulation or something where you can
take pictures with your friends.
you can get tattoos temporary tattoos are something done that a lot of these brands are
doing.
I: I think that's exactly what's going to happen because every year I notice more more
people who aren't necessarily into nerd culture but wanna-
D: -[are there yeah
I: [more about the next movie and the-because also like, you are getting a headstart on
like the blockbusters of next year when you go.
so I think that wave is going to go where it is going to be a media con it's going to be
almost a tv con a tv and [movie con yeah.
D: [it is a tv and movie con that's so correct.
I: exactly and that is gonna finally gonna lean into that
and then there's going to be the great great great great great great great
grandson of burny bubness and ron fracken who goes
we need a space for us-
D: -but they weren't the
I: the comic book fans
D: I think you mean dorf alf-
I: -[nope I'm talking about my man burny-burny bubness
D: [and kruger they were the
I: I'm talking about my man burny bubness and rob fracken
they're kids-
D: -ok [but dorf kruger and alf
I: [whoever the-whomever
D: are the ones who started the san diego comic con=
I: =yeah and killed it
and started my man burny bubness and rob fracken-
D: -[it is a tv movie con
I: [they're great great great-yeah
D: I completely agree with that yeah
and maybe we don't care I don't care
it seems like people are still showing up maybe people are ex-I mean konen took over part of the con=
I: =yeah
D: konen always does-konen obrien does like live from comic con=.
I: =oh yeah
D: umm and he had an interactive con where I think you could put on like a konen head and that was inside the convention.
so there are uhh-I mean he is a nerdy dude but it's definitely masked in a lot of consumerism as like a big commercial for a lot of these television shows that aren't necessarily syfy fantasy.
I: also I think it's just a simple fact that things that were considered child's play like video games reading comic books are more and more being found out to be just for everyone.
and now everyone can go and I think shows like konen are displaying that which going to lead to people being more-more comfortable being nerdy about things =.
D: =yeah
I: in general not just watching something because it's on but really being passionate about the things they watch and that's why it becomes a tv movie con.
and then the great great great great great grandson of burny bubness and rob fracken start their own just for comics con=.
D: -so we're
I: and that's going to be the new thing J-J-jbc-
D: -[just comics oh my god I would love it
I: [just comic cons
D: there are still a couple of those out there but I would love if someone personally brands themselves as literally nothing but comics=.
I: =yeah
D: just comics here nothing else
and I feel like they would probably sell out too if given the money.
so we're gonna wrap it up her with some of our personal experiences especially as of late now that we are adults that get to get invited to cons=.
I: =yeah
D: Iffy do you have any particular advice for people going to comic con or you know you're experiences.
I: uhh, well my biggest advice is just uhh, bring water you definitely gonna need it to-.
D: -it is july in san diego.
I: yeah so you-if you pay for water at the con that's a new move and you're going to spend way too much money.
but I think my favorite comic con moment has to be when I was going through my brony phase, I thought I was a brony.
I just like going against the grain--.
D: -wait you gotta tell people what a brony is.
I: oh yeah, a brony is a adult male fan of my little pony.
and when I-when I had this phase I wanna say it was way before it got to where people are like
these guys something's wrong with them=.
D: =it's like a cult now yeah=.
I: =yeah so I got-there was a pinky pie
which is the pink my little pony crown that I got from the connos one the freebies
and I went to a andrew w k show and my buddy was like hey I heard andrew w k is a bronny
and so I gave it to him at the show I'm going to put this somewhere special
and tucked it in his pants=.
D: =he's a nice guy
I: yeah, and he tucked it in his pants it was a great moment.
and I was like wow this is cool we're all being nerdy I'm at a andrew w k partying hard
show being nerdy I love comic con.
D: I love andrew w k.
he follows me, he also follows like thousands of people.
I: not me
D: my umm, what, go follow-he'll probably follow you back I don't know.
mine, oh god, I got to be on a panel the last two years and that to me was so surreal.
because as someone used to go to the panels and get the voice actors to sign, you know,
my vhs tapes I got to actually be on panel and arguing about comics
and representation in comics.
that was really cool for me.
the parties also, I just want to say it has become very hollywood.
I don't know if you feel that way iffy I feel like everyone does uhh.
It's very whose who, who gets into what.
there's a lot of after parties like nerdist has an afterparty a famous-playboy!
playboy has an afterparty=.
I: =yeah
D: where I went to the afterparty, very hard to get into
whose party boy from jackass?
do you know who I'm talking about?
I: Oh I know who [you're talking about.
D: =ok so I had an assassins creed metallic wrist wrap from doing the assassin's creed
obstacle course=.
I: =yeah
D: which to get into the playboy party you needed a metallic wrist wrap
and so I just kind of flashed it but like also that party boy guy whatever was with like a
bunch of hot chicks and one had a puppy
and I was like oh my god the puppy and I was like talking
and as they scooch along to get in I like scooched along with them and had my little uhh
metallic wristband.
I: oh nice
D: that was my early days of sneaking into parties before I was invited.
I: that's a protip.
D: yeah and uhh, when I got into the playboy party I was like wow a lot of you weren't at
the con.
I: yeah no
D: because you can tell when are at the con because they are sweaty you are gross you haven't showered all day you know you probably still have your badge around your neck and then you had people you know look like they were angels=.
I: =yeah
D: and I was a sweaty mess so that's my uhh sneaking in my advice. you don't have to have a badge to get into the con I mean to actually get into the convention center.
but you don't have to have a badge to explore the whole town which is totally comic conned up=.
I: =yeah
D: and then also if you are a young person trying to get in you can normally reach out to a lot of these companies that are gonna be there and ask if they need volunteers.
because a lot of times like the people who hand out t-shirts outside of the con stuff like that-hand out flyers promoting a lot of times are volunteers and you get a free pass.
I: yeah and you get a free pass.
D: you get a free pass there you go.
I: yeah and yeah, once again danny you've made a great point of yeah-you don't need a badge so if you're local if you're local and you wanna go down to comic con just drive down a day parking's going to be expensive so be ready for that=.
D: -or take the train
I: yeah, and just hang out down and you'll be able to get swag you'll be able to hang out take pictures with cosplayers just being in downtown san diego which is I think kinda cool.
D: I do too and it's all done up at night as well so it's a big party scene and a lot of those bars and stuff have like nerdy drinks and what not nerdy xxx drinks and the whole bar and the one that iffy and I were at this past year was all dragon ball z style and we got to take a shot out of an ice sculpture of shenron the dragon from dragon ball z. so yeah live you're adult wild fantasies.
I: it's-it's amazing but uhh we gotta get out of here so you know I'll let you know where you can catch me. you can catch me at ify nwadiwe you can catch me on instagram and twitter at those handles and uhh you can catch me here and sometimes on the daily zeitgeist. go ahead and give those guys a subscribe too with us. don't be too busy subscribing them that you forget to subscribe
D: I'm at miss danny fernandez that's ms danny day and I and then fernandez on both twitter and instagram.
I: alright welp this has been nerdicient and we hope you've learned something nerdy today bubye.
D: bye
III. Podcast Transcript: Stuff You Should Know
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J: hey and welcome to the podcast I'm josh clark there's charles w chuck bryant there's
jerry over there
and this is business baby stuff you should know on impeachment.
C: yeah guilty
J: uhh how are you doing first?
let's get the pleasantries out of the way.
C: I'm doing well and I wanna give a shoutout at the head here
because just yesterday in real time I went over to my in laws house for my grandmother
in laws 97th birthday.
happy birthday mary
J: happy birthday mary
C: the lead general on the stuff you should know army xxx
and you're not on facebook so uhh
every year I put a happy birthday on the stuff you should know page and have everyone
chime in from where they are
because she literally sits there and reads through six hundred comments from all over the
world.
J: oh that's cool=.
C: =and it is like one of the best things [for her].
J: [that's really great].
C: it's really neat .
so anyway we were over there and my uhh father in law steve who is the best dude
comes up to me and says uhh how about a show on impeachment.
J: yeah?
C: and he-he you know he didn't recommend he knows better
he doesn't recommend show topics and he went how bout one on impeachment
and I went wow steve that's a great idea=.
J: =yes it is
C: why haven't we done that yet because its uhh relevant as we will see at the end of our
show today.
we'll talk about kind of what's going on in today's terms
and it's just a really weird vaguely written as it turns out strange act american style umm
I'm not exactly sure how they do it other countries but
the way we do it is weird.
J: I think it's just about as weird in other countries because it was adopted either from the
british or from the americans and we adopted it from the british.
yeah, it seems to have like understood in great britain but the framers of the constitution
didn't bother to ask what anybody meant=.
C: =huh
J: we just kinda borrowed it.
C: so anyway big shout out to steve
J: alright steve good idea
C: for this idea
J: it's the summer of steve.
C: it's winter
although he's from ohio but now he's in georgia so it is--.
J: -[for him I'm sure
C: [like summer for him
J: alright so chuck let's get down to this let's get down to [impeachment].
C: [are we] going in the way back machine right off the bat here
J: do you wanna go back to 1868 you wanna start there?
C: well, you know I do.
J: ok well let's get in the wayback machine then.
C: do you know I loved me the spring of 1868.
J: it was a good one.
C: it sure was.
J: that's funny you say that there's this really great short story from the 50s or 60s
I think it's-it's like a horror short story called the vintage season
it's about these future travelers who like in-in the future you can travel through time and
find like the perfect spring or the perfect whatever=.
C: =oh interesting
J: it's-it's pretty good check it out ok
alright well now let's get in the way back machine
C: alright let's fire it up
J: ok so remember we're invisible we can do anything.
C: I know I just uhh booped edmond ross on the nose.
J: yeah I just took off my shoes.
C: everyone's like what's that on my nose and what's that in my nose.
J: right, so there's this dude that dude you just bopped on the nose edmond ross-
C: -senator
J: he's a senator actually=
C: =yeah
J: and he's kinda new his-what is this-this is may of 1868 just a previous july he was
appointed to his seat umm.
as the senator the junior senator of kansas he had some like experience in newspapers that
was his jam
no real political experience and now all of the entire senate is wondering what is this guy
going to do umm
we're right in the middle of an impeachment trial the actually-the impeachment hearing of
president andrew johnson.
who is the successor of abraham lincoln right?
C: that's right and so uhh by december after the assassination of lincoln in april of 65'

his own party was turning against him and saying hey we wanna get this guy out of here

so let's-we haven't tried this impeachment thing on a president yet

and we're eager to.

J: yeah and we can make the case that he was kinda set up his own party-

C: -{totally set up

J: |{turned on him

but then the republican hated him out of the gate the republicans were the ones who were

pushing reconstruction and really wanted the south to pay for seceding and for the civil

war

umm and johnson was from tennessee and wasn't having that.

he vetoed a bill that would have given like basic-basic civil rights to black americans.

he was against the fourteenth amendment he decided it should be up to the states to figure

out how they wanted to handle the post slavery laws

regardless of what that-what effect that had on-on the former slaves.

so he wasn't very well liked by the abolitionist republicans and they wanted to get rid of

him

and the way that they did was to set up this new law which was blatantly unconstitutional

and it was called the umm, what was it called?.

C: the you can't fire that dude law

J: why-yeah that's basically the gist of it umm

the tenure act I believe-the tenure office act

so you know when a president comes in and they appoint cabinet members or you know

supreme court judge or something.

they can pick the person but the senate either has to confirm them or say no not this one

right?.

C: right

J: so the senate has confirmation powers in the president's ability to hire the constitution

even says it in there.

the constitution doesn't say anything about firing those appointees and so it had long been

that the president could fire whoever of their appointees he wanted to right?=.

C: =yeah

J: so what the-what the radical republicans did was pass a bill that said you-if you hire

somebody if you appoint somebody we get to confirm them.

if you try to remove somebody we-you have to approve that as well.

and again it was just-it flew in the face of the constitution as we know it

and umm, the uhh right away andrew johnson fired his secretary of war edwin stanton

and umm

he was impeached right out of the gate.

C: that reminds me of when uhh

earlier this year when jared kushner was taking his first big tour of the white house after

the election=.

J: =mmmmhmmm

C: remember when he like, met all the obama employees and was like oh so like how

many of these peoples are going to be staying on?
and they were like, nobody. this wasn't a corporate takeover you realize.
J: =right
C: that's not how government works. he was like oh well sure well yeah.
J: no I didn't hear about that.
C: it was pretty funny. like he'd just bought a company and is like oh how many people are going to be staying around.
J: oh my
C: yeah
J: so umm, so now andrew johnson is impeached. he's broken a law that congress had just passed and they've impeached him. so what's going on?
C: well here's the deal at the time and you know, it's kinda like this now to a certain degree
but everybody knew how everybody was going to vote ahead of time umm except for him. so-
J: -[except for ross right?]
C: [basically
yeah, basically everybody knew the outcome-what the outcome was going to be except for ross meaning that he was the deciding vote. like it was that slim of a margin.
and so that's why he was so nervous he-he was just sitting there apparently just shredding this paper up as they were going around the room and everyone's saying guilty or not guilty
cause you need two thirds of the senate vote or a super majority to enact this impeachment.
so he was just sittin there and no one knew what was going to happen
he stood up he said he thought later on that he were facing death and he said not guilty?. and everyone sighed and this article points out they don't know if it was a sigh of relief or upset probably both depending on which side of the isle you're on.
J: yeah the whole things recounted really well in this book called impeached by the historian david o stuart umm
which I think is where this guy got this but=.
C: =yeah
J: he umm, he does a good job like getting to the heart of the matter which was this guy edmond ross was from that moment on celebrated as this hero.
this constitutional hero like he said you know what I'm not going to let the constitution be railroaded because you guys don't like andrew johnson
and he's been kinda honored since then=.
C: =yeah
J: I've read a couple articles that are like, actually he was just looking out for himself
johnson was his benefactor=.
C: =right
J: umm, basically appointed him and uhh had a lot of favoritism with him
and this new guy who would've come in I think benjamin ward would not of carried on
the same things.
but regardless if you are a constitutionalist this guy is your hero because he did save the
constitution with that one vote.
C: that's right
J: so what that-what-what took place was an impeachment proceeding and that one was
awfully close.
that was the first impeachment proceeding of a us president but that would not be the last
there've been three more-or two more presidents three total=.
C: =yes
J: that have-have faced down the impeachment gaunt and there've been varying results
but as yet, there has never been a president that was successfully convicted once they'd
been impeached.
because impeachment is not conviction it's a couple of different things.
you wanna take a break and then get into it?.
C: yeah, cause uhh I don't wanna confuse people right off the bat here anymore than we
need to.
J: I think it's a little late for that.
C: so we'll go gather our thoughts take a little podcaster potty break and be back right
after this.

C: alright should we talk about french and latin real quick?
J: yes
C: uhh because the roots of words are always fun to talk about.
the french word xxx means to prevent related to the english word impede and both
originally derived from the latin term xxx.
J: man you're french is just so romantic.
C: and that means to fetter so basically what impeachment root wise is to put a stop to
movement of something.
in this case the-uhh-and not always with presidents we'll see umm
that any-was it any elected official?
J: [uhh any civil
C: [any federal
J: civil officers is what they finally landed on.
C: ok
J: but yeah the federal officials someone who is appointed by the president, the president,
the vice president umm
judges=
C: =yeah
J: typically, but not senators or congresspeople
C: they can just be run out of town on a-on a bail of hay
J: there's the=yeah-basically yeah
man once you see that bail of hay coming=
C: =yeah
J: and you know that it tolls for the
C: you know the taurus right behind it
J: that's a bad day for you
C: umm alright so the origins of impeachment thought pre united states umm
so we're talking british legal history here
there's a dude named tft plucknett
interesting
J: mhm
C: plucknett, uhh he's-
J: -he's a 1940s historian=
C: =I guess so uhh I could have sworn it was plunkett
so tft plucknett says that he umm 14th century parliament was the first time impeachment
came about
and during that time there were a couple of different cases over like an 11 year period
that had a pretty big shift from one to the next that would kind of frame how
impeachment works.
J: right so at the time back then the 14th century right?=
C: =yeah
J: the umm, the kind could appoint there were all manner of positions that the kind could
appoint and once you're appointed by the king
that was it, you only answered to the king=.
C: =yeah
J: you could do anything you wanted and as long as you had the king's favor there was
nothing anyone could do.
so at one point and I'm not sure how they took it upon themselves but this article says that
it grew out of a trial of roger mortimer
who was convicted and umm executed for arranging the murder of king edward the
second=.
C: =yeah that counts
J: and then a chief justice willoughby who was accused of corruption and tried umm
these two guys were like high appointed officials and they were removed from office and
the way they were removed was basically parliament got involved.
so this idea of impeaching people grew out of the notion that wait a minute parliament
and specifically the house of commons.
which is if you take parliament and congress and the united states the house of lords is
like the senate and the house commons is like the house of representatives right.
umm the house of common were the ones who would take it upon themselves to say this
person is bad and were going to get rid of them.
were going to act as their jury and try them and remove them from their appointed
position and king there's nothing you can do about it because we're the ones who hold the
purse strings really.
so you better go along with this
and this idea of impeaching was huge it was revolutionary in-in great britain
and it was equally revolutionary in the founding of the united states too
because if you'll remember the united states was founded at a time where american were
very very wary of kings.
pushing them around and in the constitution is this role this office of the presidency
which is a very executive ruler a king almost.
umm and there's a legal scholar cass sunstein who wrote this great article about all this about impeachment.

and he says a lot of historians agree that the constitutions probably wouldn't have been ratified if these few words about impeachment hadn't been added into the constitution to give americans the power to remove a corrupt president from office.

C: yeah, it was almost-I mean it ended up being very important but it was almost an afterthought in how they went about it.
because upfront they weren't saying hey we need to really like make sure we include this impeachment thing in here

they're worried about framing the us constitution

and then at the end ben franklin very famously said hey you know without impeachment you know what-you what the only other thing we can do is

is uhh-if we get a bad president is shoot him in the head.

and they went oh well that wont do bully bully to that so maybe we should-we should write something down I know we're all tired we've been working on this document for 30-45 minutes

they had fatigue and they-so they ended up saying uhh what over 180 words--.

J: -I think it was actually less than that-.

C: -oh really

J: I don't know where this guy came up with that yeah.

C: alright well seven sentences-

J: -no it's even less than that=.

C: =really?

J: yeah

C: oh good lord

J: I counted four run on sentences that=.

C: =wow

J: that two of which included colones but that-I mean it's a sentence

four sentences in 103 words says microsoft word.

C: really?

J: yeah

C: well they didn't have microsoft word back then so.

alright regardless of how long it was it was short=

J: =right

C: and it was uhh, here's the thing it was written in a very vague language which ended up being very troublesome because they weren't quite sure.

I think they didn't want to hem themselves in too much [which is my feeling].

J: [yeah for sure]

C: on exactly what it would take to start this process like uhhh

so initially they called it uhh it was-George Mason called it umm mal administration.

J: right

C: in other words just being a bad president

J: yeah and they took that out

there was a couple reasons why they said no that's a little vague.
but later constitutional scholars have interpreted the fact that it was suggested and
removed that the framers of the constitution didn't consider not being a very good
president as a reason to be removed from office.
C: right-
J: [but it-it needed
C: [James Madison at the very least said this is just really unclear as to what this can even
mean.
J: sure
so mal administration comes out they hit upon and I'm not sure if they hit upon right out
of the gate or if it came later.
but they hit a pawn bribery and treason which there's no issues with that
they-everyone knows what bribery is everyone knows what treason is it's pretty clear=.
C: =yeah
J: but they-still are like saying no this isn't-it's still not quite there.
james mason spoke up again he said you can really screw with the democracy of america
even without taking bribes even without committing a statutory treasonist act=.
C: =right
J: so maybe we need to add something so that's when he came up with mal administration
said no no that's stupid
but then they came up with something else.
C: yeah he finally said because again, they didn't want to be hemmed in too much but
they also didn't want to be so specific with just bribery and treason
that that was the only that you could use uhh impeachment for
so he finally said alright good god it's late
what about high crimes and misdemeanors=.
J: =and then went xxx perfect
C: and everyone went yeah that's great no one even knows what it means it'll be perfect.
J: what's funny is no one now knows what it mean but apparently it was quite clear what
it meant at the time.
C: oh really?
J: yeah supposedly high crime it doesn't mean like oh my god that's such a huge crime-
C: -[or I'm super stoned
J: [like that's the biggest crime
right yeah, they did grow hemp by the way.
C: yeah
J: but the high crime or a high misdemeanor is-it's a type of crime that can only be
committed by a high person aka an elected or federal official.
C: yeah-
J: [that's what the high part means.
C: [but it's still just a
it's still just a crime or a misdemeanor like I think it's still vague.
J: so the-ok later-later scholars have interpreted high crimes and misdemeanors to mean
it's a crime or misdemeanor that's carried out and can only be carried by somebody in an
elected position.
so it's a betrayal of the public trust that an elected=
C: =ok
J: or federal official is given ok?.
and that-the crimes part that throws people off.
a high crime can be umm-it doesn't have to be an actual crime ok.
so you can be impeached for a high crime that if you go and read the us code is not
actually a federal crime=.
C: =right
J: you're not breaking the law but you can still be impeached for it even though it's not an
actual crime.
and then conversely an actual crime isn't necessarily an impeachable offense.
that what the framers were trying to get at here was that the-the president or the vice
president or whoever was being impeached
had betrayed the public trust had used their elected position their high position in a way
that was-that rendered them unfit to serve any longer.
they could not be trusted any longer they approved themselves a lech a terrible person
and had discharged their duties as president in a mal-malodorous way.
C: said the guy whose shoes are off in congress
J: right, they cleared the room man pretty quick=.
C: =nice work
it's like elizabeth warren takin to the podium.
J: right when she takes her shoes off
C: people clear out of there.
J: she's had like onions for lunch.
that lady will just eat a whole onion raw.
have you ever seen it it's amazing
C: where did I see that recently?
J: a whole onion raw?
C: no-
J: -[somebody eating a raw onion?
C: [no it was like a
it was a like a movie or something
oh I know what it was
the movie where the kid was hungover and the parent comes in the next morning
and is like here, eat this raw onion trust me
and the kid starts to eat the onion and they're like just kidding.
J: crap-
C: -[I can't-I can't remember what movie was.
J: [what movie was that?
back to the future 2
C: yeah that was it.
J: ok
C: when marty's hungover
that was the full name back to the future 2 marty's hangover
J: colon the onion
C: umm, so here's the deal though with-it's one of two things when it comes to
impeachment
it's either literally a crime but it doesn't have to be=
J: =right
C: and if it's not a crime literally then it's probably something political=
J: =right
C: going on, in that it is-they feel that it is subverting the office of the president
J: right, that's the general interpretation
but again I mean like they didn't say high crimes and demeanor-or high crimes and
misdemeanors asterisks right=
C: =right
J: and they define that=
C: =right
J: so it's open to interpretation
C: yes
J: and it still is today which is why unless you are a president or a vice president have
been actually caught accepting bribes or committing treason
there's a lot of wiggle room for you to get out of this.
C: yeah an impeachment doesn't send you to jail
like then you can then be tried for treason
and that would-could send you to jail.
J: yeah it's specifically says in the constitution that this is strictly to remove the person
from office possibly to prevent them from ever holding federal office again=.
C: =right
J: but that you have to leave it to the regular courts to umm to try and punish them if it's
an actual crime separately.
that's different.
C: right
J: but it's weird because the impeachment process as we'll see is very much like a uhh-
C: trial
J: a kangaroo court trial
C: well let's go ahead and talk about it.
J: ok
so if you're impeached
if you're a president and you uhh do something that enough people in the house of
representatives find unsavory you may find yourself facing [impeachment].
C: [usually] that means the people in the house of representatives are uhh representatives
in a different political party than your own usually.
J: yes, you would have to be pretty bad for your own party to be the ones that drew up the
articles of impeachment to start right?.
C: correct
J: so with the articles of impeachment it can be introduced typically these days from what
I understand
there's a judiciary committee in the house and they will be responsible for drumming up
the articles of impeachment and then introducing them to the house as a whole
but an individual representative could come up with the articles of impeachment himself
or herself and introduce it on the house floor to be voted one way or another
which just happened at the beginning of december=.
C: =yes
J: as a lone representative al king I think from texas introduced articles of impeachment and it got voted down. so you can do it yourself just as a lone dude or dudess umm but normally it's the judiciary committee. I think because the parties tend to try and keep a stranglehold on stuff like that-. C: -yeah and like even with this case the democrats were like easy easy al like=. J: =right C: just uhh settle down we're going to get [there] J: [al was like] I hate him so much= C: =too early al stand down J: so as al stalks off but the process continues apparently under more normal circumstances but he was a great example that any representative can introduce articles of impeachment and an article of impeachment chuck-presidents who have been impeached have had-I believe johnson too but definitely nixon and clinton umm and now uhh trump-he wasn't impeached but he's had articles of impeachment brought up against him which is significant in and of itself. because what it's saying is we are accusing this president of this crime and each crime or each betrayal of office whatever you want to call it each high crime and misdemeanor or each actual crime it gets it own article of impeachment. so very frequently in a president will be impeached with multiple articles of impeachment and the house is forced to vote on each one. C: yeah J: so-so if you have like five that means there's five chances that that president can be impeached depending on the evidence. and so each impeachment-each article of impeachment is going to say this is what the president did here's all the evidence that backs up us saying this umm and house whaddya think?. and then the house will vote on it. C: that was al green by the way not al king. J: oh sorry C: it was legendary soul singer al green. J: it was al green it wasn't al king? C: his name is al green yeah but it wasn't legendary soul singer. J: right sure C: yeah umm so if the vote gets the majority then the president is officially impeached at that point umm. which- J: -and it's just a simple majority 51 percent. C: yeah in the house and that means-basically that means that it's a-it's like a criminal indictment umm. if we're going to be comparing it to like you know the-the civilian legal standard so uhh you're officially accused of this wrongdoing which could mean you could be removed from office officially if the house has voted with a simple majority uhh.
but it's not over because then what happens is it moves over to the senate and at that point that's where you need the two thirds majority in order to finish the prosecution.
and here's the thing they didn't-like I said it was a very kinda short insert as far as how to go about this so there aren't any hard and fast rules.
so whenever this has happened they're kind of just like alright how do you want to do this ummm
we're not going to have prosecutors we're going to have what we call managers which is a weird word for sure uhh
but they're going to act as prosecutors and they're going to be called to argue the case before the senate.
J: and these are members of the house who are managing the impeachment proceedings in the senate on behalf of the house
C: correct so-
J: -because the house has said we the house think this president should be removed and now we're going to send some of our members to argue this case=.
C: =eyes and the senate is essentially the jury at this point in the proceedings
J: right but they're the jury and they're also the ones who are making up the rules.
they're in charge of that as well.
C: which is very strange
J: it is! and it-
C: -you wanna hear something kinda fun?
J: what, yeah
C: my uncle was a manager for clinton's impeachment trial.
J: no bob barr is your uncle.
C: no not bob barr there were several managers uhh.
my uncle ed bryant.
J: really?
C: yeah I've talked about him before he was a republican congressman from tennessee
and he was one of the managers.
because he was an attorney and a former army judge advocate general and judge advocate general is that what he was?.
J: jag
C: was he a jag?
J: well that's what it stands for? thats-
C: -[I know but I
J: [the abbreviation
C: I can't remember now maybe I'm just thinking of the TV show
but he held the legal position in the army uhh.
and then was-
J: -well that would be navy I think are the jags right?
C: oh I don't know, he was in the army though.
J: ok go ahead
C: but he was one of the managers in the clinton impeachment umm=.
J: =that is fascinating
C: trial and he-and I gotta say like uncle ed and I are politically divergent but he's a good
dude and an honest kind man I can say that for sure.
so I was always proud of him as a person even though we didn't see eye to eye politically but he was umm-he's such a good guy that monica lewinsky requested him personally to dispose her because he was just regarded as like one of the good guys and one of the fair like decent humans.

J: so he was the guy who exposed monica lewinsky for the clinton impeachment trial.

C: my father's brother

J: he needs a tshirt that says that man.

C: you're right.

J: that's crazy.

C: I know isn't it.

J: wow, so how does he feel about it because most umm I shouldn't say most, a significant number of legal scholars and historians look back at that.

and the andrew johnson one and say those impeachment proceedings should have never happened.

never should've passed the house and that they were partisan proceedings

C: yeah I don't know you know

we're not super in touch in anymore but now that I'm older I would love to pick his brain a little bit about this=.

J: =yeah

C: uhh and I'm sure he would spill it you know

J: conference me in

C: yeah I'll do that

J: ok

C: yeah at the next christmas I'll be like yeah uncle eddy just hold on a minute I'm just going to put this phone down next to you and don't pay attention to that picture of josh=.

J: =right

C: as his avatar

J: and I'll be like did you get my tshirt I sent you

C: yeah pretty interesting

J: that's fascinating.

C: I know right

so at any rate the managers are there arguing the case before the senate who acts as jury that are also making up the rules as they go.

and uhh two thirds like we said a couple of times you need that two thirds senate vote and then at that point if two thirds vote guilty then that's it man the president is--.

J: -[oh yeah you're out

C: [is done

J: yeah and then the vice president takes over and umm that's that.

you probably can't hold a federal office after that either although I don't think it's automatic.

C: right so let's-should we take a break?

J: yeah

C: alright let's take a break and we'll talk about-we've already talked about johnson we'll talk a little more about mr. bill clinton and president mr. richard milhous nixon right after this.
J: ok chuck
C: yes
J: so like you said we talked about johnson he got off by one vote man that must've been so tense.
C: yeah
J: umm and then up next-so president wise-we'll find that there are plenty of other people who have been impeached.
but in the united states president wise the next president was richard milhous nixon=.
C: =yeah it was a long break in between.
J: yeah over a hundred years like a 104 years I think something like that=.
C: =yeah
J: so nixon is getting his own episode we're doing a watergate episode hopefully not to distant future=.
C: =for sure
J: such a fascinating case
C: yeah man
J: so umm we'll-but-the whole premise of what nixon was eventually moved out of office for
he didn't actually get impeached he resigned but he probably would have been removed from office.
his probably would have been impeached he probably would have been convicted and he would have been removed
but he didn't give them the satisfaction=.
C: -that's right.
J: he resigned but he went-this is just in a few week he won the election by an enormous margin
the electoral college vote was 520 nixon 17 mcgovern 17 520 to 17 that's the landslide that he won re election with.
and with in a few weeks he was out of office and it was because of that watergate break in and it wasn't even necessarily the break in
which was bad enough that like some operatives from the white house broke into democratic headquarters in the watergate hotel and were caught trying to replace the phone tap that they had on the phone
and it turned out that it was traced back to the white house.
the president probably had involvement.
that's bad enough but the cover up is what ultimately led to nixon being railroaded out of the white-house.
C: yeah for sure but like you said the writing was on the wall and he said you know what I quit I resign.
and everyone went ahh man=
J: =I know
C: we really wanted to impeach you.
J: we brought the bail of hay and everything.
C: I saw all the president's men again the other day for xxx.
J: so great
C: such a great movie
J: so nixon he's a pretty instructive example as well. 
he had multiple articles of impeachment against him. 
on one was tax evasion when he was president he failed to pay like 400 grand in taxes 
which is like 2.6 million today which-that's a substantial amount of money 
plus he was president when he failed to pay those taxes=. 
C: =crazy 
J: he didn't get-again he was never-they didn't get to the point where they voted on the 
articles of impeachment 
but that was one against him obstructing justice was one 
using the office to umm obstruct justice was a big one. 
he had like a hand picked cia task force umm that was trying to keep the fbi from 
investigating watergate. 
so he had a lot of different articles of impeachment against him. 
surely one of them would have stuck and he would have been removed. 
but then after nixon it was 1972 up comes clinton about 20-I think 26 years later 
wasn't it 1998. 
C: I think yeah 97 98-well it depends on you know-the whole kitten kaboodle was over a 
couple of years for sure. 
J: right so clinton was up next. 
C: yes and uhh very famously he did not get impeached because he did bad things in the 
white house with monica lewinsky. 
he was impeached because he perjured himself. 
very famously said I did not have sexual relations with that woman- 
J: -man that was good-did uncle-I bet uncle eddy does a good clinton too= 
C: =doubt it 
yeah I remember in college actually just post college I remember bill clinton looking 
amERICA in the eye on television and lying to all of us 
very disappointing and he was the man in power who used that power to some people say 
take advantage of a younger coworker. 
other people you know it was a consensual relationship but he was the president and she 
was a political junkie so. 
J: sure and also- 
C: =draw your conclusions 
J: he also was accused of trying to get her to-she was a witness 
monica lewinsky was witness in a sexual harassment case against him by paula jones 
and he was accused of trying to get her to lie for him as a witness=. 
C: =yeah 
J: which is big time obstructing justice especially if you're president umm. 
and so if you-if you look at it in that light was he having that relationship with lawinksy 
to influence her to lie to the jury=. 
C: =right 
J: which makes it doubly worse somehow triply worse or quadruply worse even= 
C: =yeah 
J: so there was umm there were-there was a lot of beef against him. 
C: I mean the stink from that mess affected this most recent election you know?
J: oh yeah yeah for sure it definitely-I mean the clintons have a pretty bad rep still from that=.
C: =yeah
J: among certain parties
pretty extensive parties I would say
C: and earned you know
J: I remember being very upset that bill clinton lied to my face.
J: well that's not why he was-he didn't purger to the american people he lied to a grand jury as well under oath.
C: oh yeah he said the same thing to the grand jury as he said to our faces=.
J: =sure yeah-
C: -but I remember feeling especially let down because he looked me in the eye=.
J: =right
C: you know, like when a president is facing camera and says something very seriously like that they're talking to you they're talking to their constituents.
like it's a personal relationship I remember just being really upset about the whole thing.
J: well ok
I didn't-I don't think I felt quite like that=.
C: =oh really?
J: I just assumed-I just assumed he was lying=.
C: =really?
J: yeah he's president.
C: oh man I believed him.
I was-I was much more naive in my younger days.
J: well I think it's sweet chuck.
C: yeah
J: uhh that's slick willy always with smooth talk
C: that's right, tricky dick and slick willy
you know we need to stop electing people with those nicknames.
J: right-I know we're just asking for it
C: what about-what about honorable frank? why didn't he ever get elected?
J: he doesn't have any campaign money.
so uhh ok so clinton escaped-the vote was 50 50 umm-..
C: -[xxx vote
J: [which
yeah yeah so he was actually impeached like andrew johnson was and it did come up to
vote the articles of impeachment came up to vote
and they were-it was 50 50 which was pretty close to party lines.
I think five republicans five democrats voted for impeachment and ten republicans voted
against-it's like-I can't remember
but it was very close to party [lines].
C: [it was] ten republicans voted for acquittal two of which are still there susan collins of
maine, she was a brand new either freshman or sophomore senator=.
J: =wow
C: and richard shelby of alabama
J: wow
C: is still there
J: and they voted against acquittal?
C: they voted-
J: -[or they voted
C: [for acquittal
J: against impeachment I should say
C: yeah yeah-
J: -or conviction
C: they were two of the ten republicans
J: so uhh clinton made it out an I was reading this-there's this really 538 blog about umm
I think it's called will trump be impeached
and it's you know it's 538 so they've got all this data and everything to back up what
they're saying.
so they were saying one of the sure signs that a-an impeachment is probably not going to
go through is like how divided the parties are.
if the parties are-
C: -oh within themselves?
J: no no between the two
C: oh oh
J: like if you're probably going to have a party line vote=
C: =yeah
J: people prob-people aren't going to defect enough to actually vote for impeachment or if
they do they aren't going to defect enough to vote for conviction in the senate
C: right-
J: -and that was the case with clinton.
C: right right but today it would take republicans senators to say to get together and
say hey maybe we can get this guy out of here and get uhh pence in there
and like commit like you know, what's it called on a ship?.
J: mutiny
C: commit mutiny
J: yeah it almost I mean with the introduction of pence out of nowhere it definitely
seemed like it was plan b from the party all along.
C: right
J: I would not be at all surprised if that actually happened.
I don't think very many people would be surprised if that happened.
but I saw in that same 538 blog there's umm like a betting odds website
that they cited that gave like even odds that trump would umm would not finish out his
full four year term.
which is just pretty significant you know 50-50 50 chance.
C: yeah
J: that's crazy
C: yeah my call from the beginning was that he would not finish out his four year term
because he would resign he would not allow himself to be impeached.
J: I don't think so either.
C: is that he would resign and claim to be a victim of the political system and basically
say I told you all along it was the swamp I couldn't drain it now I'm a victim of it.
J: I-man so p t barnum played by umm-
C: -hugh jackman
J: hugh jackman
C: jared from [subway]
J: [jared] from subway
and then now this one
C: if this goes through just call me nostro chuckis from now on.
J: oh man that's not bad.
C: so there's-
J: -I have two tshirts to buy him
C: there's a very interesting-and the reason I said that this was right after he got elected
was because I was like I don't think he really wants to be president for four years.
J: I read that in multiple places that he's not-he doesn't actually enjoy the actual
presidency.
C: yeah and- and from what I've heard he gets very bored with doing the same thing and
politics is certainly not the way he's used to doing business and like.
I would just like man the guy is going to get tired of this after a couple years and just
want to go back to his cushy civilian life
and then be a martyr and say yeah couldn't do what I wanted to do so I'm a victim.
so that's chuck's call.
you heard it hear first.
J: so-so-so trump hasn't been impeached yet but they've already brought it up.
it sounds like-although it kind of waxed and waned in early december all of the-
especially the left leaning news outlets=.
C: =yeah
J: were like impeachment, people are actually talking about impeachment-
C: -[yeah i know settle down everyone
J: [it's probably going to happen now
and then if you look like a week later all of those articles are gone they've just moved on
to something else.
which is pretty ridiculous but the status quo these days so umm
who knows what's going to happen with trump
but the chances of him actually being impeached and convicted are extraordinarily low
because he's president right?.
that's such an enormous thing to remove a president from office=.
C: =yeah
J: what's not quite as enormous is to remove a federal judge which is why out of the 60
people in the united states who have ever been impeached
I think it's even more than 60 umm
and convicted which is down to 15 all of those I believe were federal judges.
C: correct umm they were you know, you name it
they were dui drunks or drunk in court=.
J: =yeah
C: or tax evaders or accepted bribes or perjured themselves like yeah
federal judges have sort of carried the mantel for impeachment you know.
J: yeah and in a really weird way they are laying-their impeachment trials have laid the groundwork for the big ones that you see like-.
C: -yeah the precedent
J: yeah I'm sure if you asked your uncle he would tell that yeah they went back and looked at impeachment trials for federal judges to see you know what procedures were used-.
C: -[probably yeah
J: [and followed and what the rules were so the impeachment of federal judges who were drunk on the bench are paving the groundwork for future-for presidents to be impeached with you know=.
C: =yeah
J: or impeached by umm and then there was a senator william blunt from north carolina he was the only senator to ever be impeached and his trial actually established that senators and representatives couldn't be impeached they were immune to impeachment because they were civil officers that instead their own party-or their body i'm sorry so if you're a senator two thirds of the senate could vote for you to get out of the senate if you were a representative two thirds of the house could vote for you to get out of the house and that's what they did to blunt they said we can't impeach you but we can use this other thing=.
C: =right
J: and-and it's basically a vote of no confidence which also comes from parliament as well.
C: interesting
J: yeah
C: well this week in real time this will already have happened by the time this is released but I think tomorrow there is a special within the democratic party on who will be the top democrat on the house judiciary committee. this is going to happen in the midterms but uhh when democratic representative john connors stepped down over sexual harassment allegations couple of week ago umm. they had to hold a special caucus for an election it's going to happen tomorrow and looks like two people. either jerry nadler of new york or zoey lawfglen of california are the top two competing for this top spot and they're both well aware that what that means uhh in this article here it's titled in the battle to lead potential impeachment umm. they know what they know-it says they're signing up to be trump's chief antagonist uhh. but they also said hey listen we're not going to go in there and just start saying impeachment impeachment like if this is ever going to happen it's gotta be the will-we have to feel like it's the will of the american people like we have to feel like they are enough trump supporters out there that have turned on him because of something he's done=.
J: =well yeah or else it'll be like what you said where it's-it's-you've just proven everything the guy has said from the moment he started campaigning.
C: right that they're just out to get him from the beginning.
J: yeah, and that the elites have it so rigged that even if you do win they'll just get rid of you.
C: yeah I man one of them-nadler even said there's not much point in impeaching a president and having him acquitted in the senate because that's what happened with clinton and like you said even republicans largely look back and say of course that was just a big distracting waste of time.
J: yeah that's-I mean that's what I've read as well is that they-it's not looked upon as the finest moment in legal-american legal history.
C: yeah so we'll know the outcome tomorrow in real time and both of them are kinda on the same page as far as that goes. they're like we need-it needs to be something legit worth impeaching a president for that most of the american people would agree with. we're not just out to get him but if he does something we're out to get him.
J: or if we find something that he's already done
C: yeah exactly
J: yeah so well there you have it yeah if it turns out that he umm did obstruct anything uhh that would be a big deal cause- C: -well
J: two the-the-two of the three presidents that have been impeached were-had at least articles of impeachment that included obstruction against them.
C: yeah yeah but his attorneys are saying-have literally said the president can't be guilty of obstruction of justice because they are justice.
J: that's the most ridiculous legal interpretation I've ever heard in my life. I'm going to go on record of saying that.
C: they're saying they're above law.
J: I-I am the law that's what it says. how can I obstruct the law? I'm the law a crush but anyway we should probably stop now.
C: yes
J: alright well if you want to know more about impeachment uhh you can type that word into the internet and some really interesting stuff. I mean a lot of it is bone dry=.
C: =yeah
J: but people are really into the legal history and constitutional interpretation=.
C: =sure
J: so you can find some pretty interesting articles all around the internet on stuff like this so just give it a shot see if it's-it's up your alley.
C: yeah and at the very least if this does happen to play out over the next couple years you know, it's good to know how it all works you know.
J: exactly exactly
C: you can impress you friends.
J: yeah you can be like they're-they're never going to get a super majority and you're friends will be like what did you just say.
C: i know
J: what magic word was [that]
C: [what] does this have to do with comic books
J: so uhh since chuck said comic books it's time for listener mail

### Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Podcast 1</th>
<th>Podcast 2</th>
<th>Podcast 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overlaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Podcast 1</th>
<th>Podcast 2</th>
<th>Podcast 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overlaps w/Interruption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Podcast 1</th>
<th>Podcast 2</th>
<th>Podcast 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. 

V. 

VI. 

Podcast 1
Podcast 2
Podcast 3
VII. Latches

Podcast 1: 5.88
Podcast 2: 8.03
Podcast 3: 4.28

VIII. Minimal Responses

Podcast 1: 5.04
Podcast 2: 6.11
Podcast 3: 8.68

IX. Questions

Podcast 1: 3.57
Podcast 2: 1.47
Podcast 3: 4.99

X. T-units

Podcast 1: 33.72
Podcast 2: 38.95
Podcast 3: 36.99
Attention Getters

Podcast 1: 3.25
Podcast 2: 3.05
Podcast 3: 2.37
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This resource is also essential to my project because it provides an easy-to-follow walkthrough on transcribing in sociolinguistics. I have never transcribed this much data before, and this document was intended for beginner transcribers like me. It easily breaks down the steps of transcribing, the first step is creating a rough transcription of the dialogue. The second step is adding a layer of symbols to represent linguistic features common in conversation, such as interruptions, overlaps, and latching. The third step is adding another layer of sociolinguistic symbols that often represent pragmatic traits of the dialogue that would normally be difficult to transcribe. Finally, this article has a glossary of CA symbols and what they mean. This article will serve as my transcription reference guide.


This article is the foundation for my research topic. I am replicating Fishman’s research project but changing the participants, the amount of data collection, and
adding a linguistic feature that she covers briefly (interruptions and overlaps).

Fishman wrote her article over 40 years ago but her findings are still very relevant today. She based her conversational analysis on outside research that I am also using such as West and Zimmerman, Harvey, and Lakoff. I am using the linguistic features that she thought were necessary for determining how much linguistic “work” each speaker contributes to the conversation. These include questions, attention beginnings, interruptions and overlaps, minimal responses, and statements.


This article is vital to my research because it has an in depth literature review of research pertaining to interruption and overlaps as well as its own research on how to perform conversation analysis. Their research is a culmination of West
and Zimmerman, Harvey, Sacks, Tannen, Lakoff, etc. It discusses the intricacies of performing conversational analysis for turn-taking, interruptions and overlaps.


This is the textbook that I used for Linguistics 350 and is essential to developing my register analysis. There is a table on page 40 that breaks down situational characteristics that I will use as the model for my register analysis. I will use this table to fill in information about the podcasts, such as who is in the audience, how much interaction is there with the speaker and the audience, and what is the mode of interaction. Additionally, chapter 4 covers the conversational genre and register and provides information that I will use as my model for general conversation.

Page 62 will be my resource for quantifying the data from my project. It covers how to make field-based decisions and how to norm data.