New England Patriots Vs The Carolina Panthers At The Super Boob?: A Deeper Look At The Media Surrounding Janet Jackson And Justin Timberlake's Wardrobe Malfunction At The 2004 Super Bowl

A Senior Project Presented to

The Faculty of the Communication Studies Department
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Arts

By

Philip Michael Ortez

Dr. Richard Besel		
Senior Project Advisor	Signature	Date
·		
T. C. Winebrenner		_
Department Chair	Signature	Date

Contents

Introduction	2
Context	6
Method	7
Application of the Method	9
Conclusion	20
Bibliography	22

Introduction

Bam! Fireworks go off! You are all hyped up! I mean it is the 2004 Super Bowl! The game is going great! Your team is winning at the half and the new commercials are amazing! Now it is time for the half time show and you can not wait. You have your family and friends over, eating great food, and knocking back some cold beverages in anticipation for the big show. The extravaganza starts and you are in amazement of all the multicolored lights, big screen projectors, and most of all the famous performers. Now your two favorite performers, Janet Jackson and Justin Timberlake, are on together at the same time singing a song. You are totally into the venue; Janet looks great and Justin is singing his heart out. Next thing you know you see Justin take his hand across Janet's chest and pull off a piece of her wardrobe. It happens so fast that you say to yourself "Did I just see Janet Jacksons breast?" Luckily you had just installed your new DVR so all you did was hit the rewind button and sure enough you did just see the world famous Janet Jackson's breast. Everyone at your house is talking about it. Your cell phone is receiving text messages from people that you did not even know were in your contact list. Your children were asking you why did Justin do that to Janet? It was no longer about the big game or the amazing commercials. This moment was bigger and it happened on the biggest stage in the world. This is one Super Bowl that no one will ever forget and that would change the course of television forever!

The event that aired live on February 1, 2004, in Houston, Texas, was one of the most controversial incidents in television history and "nearly 90 million TV viewers in the United States alone" were watching (LaReau 1). The half a second exposure lead to a record setting \$550,000 in fines by the Federal Communications Commissions against

CBS, apart of the media group Viacom (Vires 1). Justin Timberlake's so called wardrobe malfunction caused a record number of complaints to the FCC, more then 500,000 (Vires 1). As a result of the number of complainants "The House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly (391–22) in support of a bill on broadcast indecency. The measure would increase fines to as much as \$500,000 (up from \$27,500) per incident" (Kline 161). Not only did millions of people see the incident but so many viewers drew complaints about it as well. Most of the time the Federal Communications Commissions draw complaints with radio stations, not television broadcasts, so this incident was different because people got to see the incident not just hear about it. Children were also affected by this event. "Federal law bars radio and non-cable television stations from airing references to sexual and excretory functions between 6 a.m. and 10 p.m., when children may be tuning in" (Vires1). The half time show aired at about 7pm Central Standard Time so it was in the time frame of the prohibited references to sexual and excretory functions. As Wendy Kline wrote, "Sexual debates become increasingly heated when focused on children, as illustrated by the Janet Jackson exposure; most complaints had to do with the concern over the incident's effect on children (one reporter noted sarcastically that 'millions of American children lost their innocence' on Super Bowl Sunday)" (Kline 167). Not only did this incident make a deep impact on children but it also has people talking about how we should be teaching children about sex. Kline also states "Sex education, of course, targets children, raising the question of how much children should know and when they should learn it. Since the debate over sex education began in the early twentieth century, the phantasm of the innocent child being dangerously corrupted by sexual talk has provoked controversy" (Kline 167). After the

event, *The Onion* had a headline proclaiming "U.S. Children Still Traumatized One Year After Seeing Partially Exposed Breast On TV" (Onion 1). The issue seemed to linger in public consciousness despite the passage of time.

Audiences of all walks of life should be looking into how this event has affected them. From the most advanced communication scholar to the average American, this event has affected how you take in information because of how the media has framed the event. If you have watched television or any media event after the exposure, it has affected you. According to soapcentral.com "Could Janet Jackson's infamous Super Bowl wardrobe malfunction has had a ripple effect on daytime television? According to a government official, soap operas have become a potential target in the Federal Communications Commission's crackdown on broadcast indecency" (Kroll 1). The soap operas have been affected by the event and so have a number of other media outlets. Companies do not want to get in trouble from the Federal Communications Commissions so they edit scenes that are questionable, thus affecting what the producer might want to convey to the audience. For example "Following the Super Bowl, Guiding Light execs reportedly toned down another love making sequence in which a female character was to have pulled down her boyfriend's pants and revealed his bare bottom" (Kroll1). So the producer edited the scene and was later fired because of his insistence on not wanting to revise the original script.

With this event being so controversial it became an easy target for comedic shows that are popular in today's culture. The Late Night Show with David Letterman and Saturday Night Live were some of many television shows having a field day with the incident. With the news spreading so hard and fast it became a big incident for some

and more of a joke for others. Pop culture was making fun of the incident while people behind the scenes were looking at this hard and realizing that a change had to be made. Media outlets that were not a part of the Super Bowl were looking at the issue to maybe make themselves look like the better media or maybe they were just looking at the whole picture and were covering the parts that the others left out. Maybe the media groups that were associated with the Super Bowl were trying to stop the damage and cover information that made themselves look like they had nothing to do with the incident or direct your attention elsewhere.

The media's attention is very important to look at because the media is our outlet to the world. Sometimes we do not get to see things firsthand so we use media as a crutch to help us understand the world around us. Even if we see things live or in person, like millions of viewers did for the Super Bowl, the media that we consume the days that follow might change our point of view about the event. This is why taking a deep look at where your media sources come from is so important because if you are consuming media information from one source you are probably getting a skewed point of view. By seeing where your sources are coming from and then seeing if they have any connections to the event itself you will be able to see where the media's attention lies. This is imperative because you as consumers do not want to get caught up in what someone else believes but you want to have your own thoughts and ideas about the events without all the twisted view points.

What were different major media groups focusing on, from when the incident happened to about a year later, publishing after the Super Bowl Half Time Show incident?

I am going to look at the media and how they regurgitated the information out to their audiences. I will be doing this with an ideological critic point of view. First I will give a detailed description of the rhetorical situation. After that I will give the origins of ideological rhetoric and procedures to be used. Then I will give a description of the ideological method I will use to frame the event. After that I will apply the method to the event, with sources to support my evidence. Finally I will conclude my paper with a review of my findings.

Context

With so many people watching it was easy for the media to write about things surrounding the event. All types of media got a piece of the action and there were a lot of things published about the event. Today if you go on to Google and type in "Janet Jackson wardrobe malfunction" you get 170,000 hits and if you type in "Janet Jackson Superbowl" you get 281,000 hits. So there is a lot of media out there and all the different media has affected their audiences. The audiences are the people who are being affected by the media. You cannot forget the people who saw the event first hand at the Super Bowl in Houston, and the live television viewers, but my main focus is going to be on the audiences that were being bombarded with articles after the event.

In the introduction you heard me talk about the event itself and the issues that are surrounding the event. You will hear me use the term artifact to describe not the actual incident but the media frenzy that took place within the year of the event happening. So my artifact itself and the things I will be talking about all refer to the media surrounding the event and the points of view different media sources had on their audiences. The rhetors of the artifact are the news media that reported on the incident.

The artifacts are going to be articles that were written about the event. The occasion would be that it was on one of the biggest stages in the world, The Super Bowl.

Method

Ideological criticism is directly linked to rhetorical criticism. "When rhetorical critics are interested in rhetoric primarily for what it suggests about beliefs and values, their focus is on ideology" (Foss 209). According to Sonja K. Foss in her book *Rhetorical Criticism* "an ideology is a pattern of beliefs that determines a group's interpretations of some aspect(s) of the world" (209). When you reflect on ideological criticism this is a quote that will help you understand what the meaning is and will help you apply the meaning. Sonja K. Foss states "the language, concepts, categories imagery of thought, and the systems of representation that a group deploys to make sense of and define the world or some aspect of it" (209).

Within the field of ideological criticism is a category called hegemonic ideology. This field focuses on "the privileging of the ideology of one group over that of other groups" (Foss 210). Another scholar of the study of hegemonic ideology is a man by the name of Todd Gitlin. He states that "Hegemonic ideology permeates the common sense that people use to understand the world and tries to become that common sense" (Cultural 1). Gitlin has written many articles but one that caught my eye was "The Political Uses of Moving On". This article relates to my artifact in the sense that the media was trying to down play and move on from a topic they did not want to deal with. He states that "Americans are being told to "move on"- to leave uncomfortable feelings and unpleasant events behind us- especially when it would be convenient for certain

public figures if we forgot them" (Gitlin A11) This is an example of relating literature that will help me apply hegemonic ideology to the media surrounding an event.

Looking for more interesting sources that applied hegemonic ideology I ran across a piece called *Media Hegemony: A Failure of Perspective* by David L. Altheide. This paper states that "A central issue underlying much of this research is control and dominance of the news process" (Altheide 467). Hegemonic ideology is the dominant force of ideas that a group has and applies in their everyday thinking. These readings helped me understand how hegemonic ideology is used and applied. This will help me apply the idea of hegemonic ideology to the events of the Super Bowl incident.

Looking for sources that will help me gain a further understanding of hegemonic ideology I found a publication called "Cinematic Jujitsu: Resisting White Hegemony Through the American Dream in Spike Lee's Malcolm X" by Kristen Hoerl. She stated that "Gramsci's notion of hegemony explains how ideological texts shape people's taken-for-granted understandings of social reality. Gramsci contended that elements of civil society, such as religion, media, and education, attained consent from subordinate groups for the authority of the ruling class" (Hoerl 358). This article is a good example of hegemonic criticism because it hits on the main point of how the ideological text shapes our reality just like the media does. The major media corporations are shaping and forming ideas that help them out. That means their audiences are not getting just the story anymore, they are getting whatever the media groups skewed view is on the topic.

The procedures that I will use will consist of analyzing the text and supporting with evidence. For my artifact I will be using multiple media sources to help me

analyze what hegemonic ideology I can find within the sources. I will analyze the artifacts using an outline of Sonja K. Foss's four step process. "(1) identifying the presented elements of the artifact; (2) identifying the suggested elements linked to the presented elements; (3) formulating the ideology; and (4) identifying the functions served by the ideology" (214).

Application of the Method

First I want to take you on the journey of how I found the artifacts that you are about to embark upon. Brainstorming I came to understand that I wanted to take a good look at sources that came from at least three of the top media companies to make sure I got a fair assessment of the situation. Once I came to the this thought I decided I wanted to make sure I included articles from the same media company that put on the Super Bowl to make sure I got a good idea of what the main points they were including in their articles. I then looked towards some companies that did not have any affiliation to the Super Bowl so I could compare and contrast any difference or similarities I found. Now that I have found the companies that I wanted to include I had to pick out points in certain articles. Without being skewed to talk about main points that came up in just one article I took a general overview of several articles and picked out main points that kept repeating themselves over and over again. This way I could get a good idea of what each company was trying to portray about the event.

Taking a more in depth look at what CBS and the Viacom group were publishing in the media about the event I will focus directly on media sources that Viacom and CBS are connected with up to a year following the incident. The reason for

looking at CBS so thoroughly is because CBS is the station that aired the Super Bowl and were in charge of the half time show, along with MTV, both apart of Viacom.

In the next few examples I am going to explain what the Viacom Group was trying to do when writing these articles. I thought a good name for the ideology that they were trying to display would be T.O.B. Ideology which stands for transfer of blame ideology because that is exactly what I predict Viacom will do. In this first article written by Brian Dakss for CBS news called "Congress Eyes Dirty TV," there are some elements that I would like to point out. Because this was written by a CBS writer I was assuming that the article would be skewed towards taking the blame off the company and I was not far off. One quote in the article stated by Janet Jackson said, "I am really sorry if I offended anyone. That was truly not my intention, "She continued, "MTV, CBS, the NFL had no knowledge of this whatsoever, and unfortunately, the whole thing went wrong in the end" (Dakss 1). Another example of T.O.B. Ideology or not taking reasonability for their actions was, "This was done completely without our knowledge," said Chris Ender, entertainment spokesman for CBS, which was deluged with angry calls. "It wasn't rehearsed. It wasn't discussed. It wasn't even hinted at. ... This is something we would have never approved. We are angry and embarrassed" (Dakss 1). A third example of this is "We attended all rehearsals of the show and there was no indication at any time that such an inappropriate display was contemplated," CBS President Leslie Moonves told employees in e-mail. "We are angry and embarrassed that this happened" (Dakss 1). Another example in the article that MTV a CBS affiliate said was "Unrehearsed, unplanned, completely unintentional, said MTV" (Dakss 1). Here are just four examples in an article by CBS that states that they had

nothing to do with the incident and that they are not the ones to blame. It skews the audiences understanding of what actually happened to portray a false image of themselves on the audience. The article avoided the punishment and pointed them right back at the performers. If the audience knew before reading the article that it was written by CBS and the incident the article was talking about took place on a CBS Network program then maybe they could link what CBS and the writer were trying to do. CBS was trying to shield the company while trying to mislead the readers. They wanted the issue to go away so the best way to do that is point the figure at everyone else so no one asks questions.

Another article that I could label as T.O.B. Ideology by CBS that was written one year after the incident was an article called "Cleaning the Air," written by Chris Hawke. The article once again had elements of transfer of blame ideology towards everyone else except the company, especially towards the FCC. For example, the article explains how the Federal Communications Commissions "are destroying the business. If anybody wants to do anything revolutionary or different they can't do it" (Hawke 1). Another example that CBS is using this T.O.B Ideology is when the article states "Outrage is an interesting word, but not all of it is aimed at the FCC for being too late to the game, and not doing enough. On the other side of the huge philosophical canyon currently dividing so many Americans is outrage that the FCC is doing far too much" (Hawke 1). The last example of CBS I thought was going in a little different direction but in the end I saw that they were still going with T.O.B. Ideology. CBS starts off by saying that they are still the network to watch for this next year's half-time show with this quote, "Given what happened last year, it's a safe bet you can let your

children back in the room" (Hawke 1). This example suggests that they are free of blame again. Different article with the same result but this time they are not blaming so much the performers but the Federal Communications Commissions. They suggest that it is not their fault with what happened but the FCC's fault in being too lenient with their polices or not lenient enough. The last example directly suggested that with everything that went down with the last Super Bowl that it is safe for you and the whole family to watch the half time show this year because they will be forced in making it comply to the new standers because the FCC will be enforcing the new rules. People who read this might or might not pick up on these points. CBS wants you to believe that it is the FCC's fault and to make you feel like you are safe to watch their network again. They want you to think it is unacceptable for the FCC to be so hard on the network because the FCC does not know where they stand themselves on issues. With identifying this I feel that people will not be ignorant to the point where they cannot make there own decisions. People should look at all sides before just reading articles from networks that are being told what to write from the big company that owns them so the company does not look bad because all they will try to do it skew information to try and make themselves look better. With that you might not be getting the absolute truth about an issue and might be getting the T.O.B. Ideology that they want you to see.

Looking at news from MTV I wanted to find out what elements kept coming up in articles they produced because they were the ones responsible of producing the Super Bowl half time show with CBS. Once again I saw the same elements come up with MTV as I did with CBS concerning the T.O.B. Ideology. The articles were directed towards taking the negativity that came with the incident and directing it towards

someone else. For example, in the MTV article "Janet Apologizes, Says Super Bowl Stunt Went Too Far" author Robert Mancini states, "One day after Janet Jackson's shocking Super Bowl halftime performance, the singer took responsibility for the breast-baring incident and said she never intended the stunt to go as far as it did" (Mancini 1). Another example of this T.O.B. Ideology and MTV not taking responsability of the incident in the article is when the author put in a Janet Jackson quote: "MTV was completely unaware of it. It was not my intention that it go as far as it did. I apologize to anyone offended — including the audience, MTV, CBS and the NFL" (Mancini 1). Also the article stated that "MTV was as surprised and shocked as anyone last night. Janet Jackson acknowledged that we had no prior knowledge of her plans. We will continue to investigate the circumstances" (Mancini 1). In all of the examples above the articles have inferences that say MTV is not to blame and it is not their fault that the incident happened. They make the extra effort to point the finger at the performers and put in quotes that the performers said specifically that they apologize not only to the audience but to "MTV, CBS, and NFL" (Mancini 1). They did not need to add in this last part of the quote but they cut through her quote and made sure to add it into the article that the performers were taking responsibility for their actions and to make the networks sound like innocent infants and taking the easy way out with this T.O.B. Ideology.

One more quote that caught my eye that had a different sort of strategy was "Our goal with the Super Bowl Halftime show was to produce an entertaining stage experience with a positive message about empowerment and voting. We are disappointed that this message has been overshadowed by the unfortunate incident"

(Mancini 1). This quote in the article was saying that the half time show stands for voting and empoweremnet but I feel like they are just covering up what happened. Saying hey this is what MTV stands for and the performerce ruined our message to the audience by doing this ungraceful act when people should have been focusing on our true goodness in trying to help young people have a voice and to vote. I believe that MTV is making the audience feel like it is not the company's fault; after reading this article it is most definitely the performers fault. The audience is asked to avoid the fact that maybe MTV did have something to do with it. Maybe MTV had their own agenda and did exactly what they said they wanted to do, "produce an entertaining stage experience" (Mancini 1). We might not ever know what their reasoning was behind the incident but it is unfair just to look at one side of the issue, especially when MTV is part of CBS and they both helped to produce the Super Bowl Half Time Show. I do not think it is out of the question that Viacom, the owner of MTV and CBS, have mislead the readers to believe in something that may or may not be true.

Next I wanted to look at non-Viacom media sources to see what kind of elements they would portray because they were not directly associated with the Super Bowl event. I wanted to see if I could see any similarities or differences between what affiliated and non affiliated companies where writing about the Super Bowl half time show. I looked at a source from News Corporation called foxnews.com. Fox stated "Janet Jackson Feels the Super Bowl Backlash". This article had elements of what I like to call Scrutiny Ideology, non-Viacom companies inspecting Viacom, which portrayed CBS and MTV in a way that the previous Viacom Articles had not. For example the article stated that "Then came the FCC investigation, congressional hearings and widespread criticism of CBS, halftime

show producer MTV -- and Viacom, owner of CBS and MTV" (Fox 1). Another example of Fox News looking at this incident in a Scrutiny Ideology was in this article statement: "Some stations received negative calls the day after from people who, beyond whether they were offended, recognized it as the latest publicity stunt in an attempt to up the ante on (MTV smoothers) Britney and Madonna" (Fox 1). Also, the article states that they tried to contact Viacom but a "Viacom spokesman did not immediately return a call for comment" (Fox 1). Looking at this article the elements suggest that Viacom is at fault with what happened. I feel Fox News is taking a new look on this event but it is not without a perspective that suits their needs as well. When you read the article you get this feeling that maybe it is not the performers fault but maybe Viacom wanted the Super Bowl Half Time Show to be that much better than the previous year. Why would Fox want to make CBS, a Viacom affiliate, look like the bad guys? Well just as CBS is trying to play the innocence game to shine the lime light away from them Fox is doing the same thing but reflecting the light right back at CBS almost investigating them. Fox is a competitor of CBS so any chance they get to make CBS look bad they are going to do so and to put the magnifying glass on them. It makes perfect sense to Fox to point out that the Super Bowl incident might not have been the performers fault and the audience should put direct blame on CBS because it will possibly have a positive effect on their company. Anyway you look at it this is a new perspective and a new way of looking at the incident. This is what I call Scrutiny Ideology that other non-Viacom companies put out to the audience to make them take a closer look at what Viacom is doing and make them question the reasons behind the incident. I am sure this happens all the time with many different incidences to make competitive companies look bad. With that, the

audience needs to be careful of where the sources came from and to make sure they look at multiple articles from multiple source so they can get a better overall view on the topic they are looking at.

Looking at another big media company I wanted to get a source from AOL Time Warner another nonaffiliated of Viacom. Looking through several articles that they posted about the Super Bowl incident I choose to look at one from CNN.com, a AOL Time Warner affiliate, that I feel sums up their perspective; it was called "Apologetic Jackson says 'costume reveal' went awry". In the article CNN states that "Powell told CNN he was not convinced the incident was an accident. Clearly somebody had knowledge of it. Clearly it was something that was planned by someone. She probably got what she was looking for" (CNN 1). This falls under the Scrutiny Ideology I was talking about in the last paragraph now with a different company but same result in that they are trying to get the audience to take a deeper look into Viacom. Another quote from the article was "Despite its apology, MTV did not hesitate to promote the incident after the fact. A Web page headline said: Janet Jackson Got Nasty at the MTV-Produced Super Bowl Halftime Show" (CNN 1). Another quote used by CNN was "Jaws across the country hit the carpet at exactly the same time. You know what we're talking about ... Janet Jackson, Justin Timberlake and a kinky finale that rocked the Super Bowl to its core. Not everyone was buying the apologies" (CNN 1). The suggested elements in these examples are directed on making the audience take a deeper look at Viacom and to paint a picture that Viacom was in complete control of what happened during the event. But later on in the article you find out that AOL Time Warner were the Super Bowl Half Time Show sponsors. The article stated "AOL, owned by CNN parent company Time

Warner, attempted to distance itself from the dispute. While AOL was the sponsor of the Super Bowl Halftime Show, we did not produce it. In deference to our membership and the fans, AOL and AOL.com will not be presenting the halftime show online as originally planned" (CNN 1). So not only does the article suggest that Viacom is the one at fault they are saying that they are distancing themselves away from the controversy. They helped support the Half Time Show but they say they want to stay away from the issue. This sounds a lot like the T.O.B. Ideology that Viacom was trying to do but it is AOL Time Warner doing it this time shining the light away from them and back on Viacom. Another article I looked at was called "Jackson 'Nipplegate' illustrates the danger of chilling free speech" (Hilden 1), and it looked at the incident with this same sort of Scrutiny Ideology as the first article did. For example the article stated "Powell has a right to investigate if he so chooses. But he should properly limit his investigation to the nipple-baring incident alone, and stop targeting those who weren't involved."(Hilden 1). This statement was going along with other non-affiliated networks in the sense it was pointing out that Viacom should be under investigation and that media companies that were not involve should not be. The funny this is that AOL Time Warner was involved in sponsoring the half time show but they are taking the stands of someone who was not. So they are using both T.O.B Ideology and Scrutiny Ideology when they transfer the blame over to Viacom and when they ask that you take a deeper look into Viacom. As an audience we have to see what type of misguiding the source is going with and see why they are doing this. If the audience is only reading one or many sources from the same company then they are not getting the full view on what is going on. Every company is

out to protect themselves so we need to make sure to check out as many different sources as possible

The last articles I wanted to look at were articles that were not from a major media corporations. I wanted to see what kinds of things peer reviewed and scholarly articles would look at when reporting on the Super Bowl incident. Looking at my first artifact that has the headline "The Wardrobe and the War," written by Gary Burns, I looked to identify the presented elements. Looking for clues, like an investigator, I see many assumptions behind the artifact. Gary Burns uses terms like: rape fantasy, male on female spousal abuse, interracial paring, and white on black (Burns 1-2). After identifying the presented elements I then looked at the identifying suggested elements. Before I got into detail I wanted to see what the overall view point of the article and what I found was that this article boldly has a negative vibe about media and where it is heading. So with that I looked at the terms used and came to the conclusion that the terms used deal with: sex, negative depiction of men towards women, combinations with different races, and the ongoing issue with blacks and whites. What the underlying terms suggest is that most media is depicting elements that they want the viewers to see in a hegemonic way. This article goes beyond your typical gossip magazine, in the sense that they are just trying to sell you something, and they are thinking outside the box seeing things that other media sources are not. This artifact asks the reader to believe that their media world is going downhill and the media intake that they have been viewing is going into whatever direction the main stream media wants it to go into. This article is asking you to see the bigger picture beyond the nude breast and the surface issues that surrounded the Super Bowl incident. These issues consist of racial barriers, sexist

depictions, and media priorities. The audience view point is going to be shifted when they encounter this type of article rather than your standard article because it looks at the Janet Jackson incident in a different way. This article is from a peer reviewed source so most people in the world are not going to get a chance to see this article. They are going to pick up a popular magazine or turn on the television and get all the information from all the biased sources out there. This article serves the audiences with direct points that might not go right along with pop culture. It reaches deeper in the issue and gives a perspective that a lot of media sources are scared to take because of fear of consequences. Plus many media source want to just focus on what they want you to focus on. Sometimes they make you look one way because maybe it is their other media sources that are under scrutiny. Another peer reviewed article that I came across was an article called "The Hypocrisy Bowl" by James Poniewozik. This article was another article that made you think outside the box and when articles like this scholarly reviewed one is not being skewed by a big corporation it is easier to get a more neutral view. In this article Poniewozik says "But MTV is a prime mover in a celebrity culture in which young female singers and actresses, however accomplished, increasingly have to go near-naked — if they want to keep their CDs moving, their ratings up and their movies packed. Now MTV says it got played? It helped invent the game" (Poniewozik 3). With this statement I feel like Poniewozik is trying to get us to see a picture that maybe other media sources cannot get us to see because they are just as deep in the media world as Viacom is. When you are a part of the media family your job is to entertain and to help your company make money. To do that sometimes you do what you have to do to get the job done. In this case Poniewozik feel like MTV was just doing its job and when it back fired on them they

were the innocent ones. I like the way Poniewozik concludes his article he says, "In a way, Justin and Janet did us a favor. They spelled out the subtext of the game and its surrounding culture. By the end of Jackson and Timberlake's song, that culture was naked" (Poniewozik 4). This is so true in the sense that the audience was left in a state of uncertainly and that this incident was almost a good thing. I believe that articles like this would help people to get an unbiased point of view but the world does not work like that and it would take people extra time to look up an article not in the mainstream media.

Conclusion

In review, I went over the importance of the 2004 Super Bowl Half Time Show and showed you my feeling of why this incident was important and should be looked at. Also I stated why this artifact is significant to communication scholars and to the American people. This is because the media has framed the event the way that will help them look better. Also I will go over the findings to the question I asked in the first part of my paper. What were different major media groups focusing on, from when the incident happened to about a year later, publishing after the Super Bowl Half Time Show incident?

The findings that contribute to rhetorical practice are the findings that I came across of hegemonic ideology in the media that surrounded the 2004 Super Bowl Half Time Show. I see the way that media corporations persuades and shapes peoples understandings of social reality through their own stream of media that they have control over. In my application section of ideology to my artifacts I found out that the media is trying to push upon people their skewed view of the topic. With this many people do not have the time or simply would not think about where the news source is

coming from and weather they should be making their decision on the topic based on just a few media sources that may be misleading. In practice when looking deeper into the topic, not just looking at the surface, readers and scholars will be able to see beyond what the big media corporations are doing and to take a topic from several media out leads and make their own decision on the issue.

When analyzing my findings that may contribute to rhetorical theory I see the similarities between rhetorical practices in the sense of media persuasion. The finding about the media persuading the audience goes right along with rhetorical theory and how rhetoricians study the art of persuasion. The way the media is doing their persuading in my artifacts are misleading and deceiving especially from the media that is directly linked to the distribution of the show. My findings help rhetorical theory because it shows how media sources use persuasion to help form peoples hegemonic ideology of their world. Malcolm X once said "The media's the most powerful entity on earth. They have the power to make the innocent guilty and to make the guilty innocent, and that's power. Because they control the minds of the masses" (Jeffrey 1).

Bibliography

- Altheide, David. "Media Hegemony: A Failure of Perspective." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 48.2 (1984): 476-490.
- Burns, Gary. "The Wardrobe and the War." *Popular Music and Society* 28.1 (2005): 115-16.
- "CNN.com Apologetic Jackson says 'costume reveal' went awry Feb. 3, 2004." CNN.com Breaking News, U.S., World, Weather, Entertainment & Video News. Feb. 2004. Web. 09 Dec. 2009.
- Dakss, Brian. "Congress Eyes Dirty TV CBS News." *Breaking News Headlines: Business, Entertainment & World News CBS News.* 11 Feb. 2004. Web. 07 Dec. 2009.
- De Vries, Lloyd. "CBS Dealt Record Fine Over Janet." *CBS News*. CBS Interactive Inc., 22 Sept. 2004.
- "FoxNews.com Janet Jackson Feels the Super Bowl Backlash Celebrity Gossip |
 Entertainment News | Arts And Entertainment." *Breaking News | Latest News |*Current News FOXNews.com. 30 Mar. 2004. Web. 07 Dec. 2009.
 http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,115548,00.html>.
- Foss, Sonja K. *Rhetorical Criticism*. 4th ed. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Inc., 2009. 209-266.
- Gitlin, Todd. "The Political Uses of Moving On" *New York Times* (1857-Current file). New York, N.Y.: Jul 28, 2001. p. A11.
- Hawke, Chris. "Clearing The Air CBS Sunday Morning CBS News." *Breaking News Headlines: Business, Entertainment & World News CBS News.* Feb. 05. Web. 07 Dec. 2009.
- Hilden, Julie. "CNN.com Jackson 'Nipplegate' illustrates the danger of chilling free speech Feb. 20, 2004." *CNN.com Breaking News, U.S., World, Weather, Entertainment & Video News.* 20 Feb. 2004. Web. 25 Feb. 2010.
- Hoerl, Kristen. "Cinematic Jujitsu: Resisting White Hegemony Through the American Dream in Spike Lee's Malcolm X." *Communication Studies*, 59.4 (2008): 355-370.
- Kline, Wendy. "Overexposed? Sex and the Female Body in American History." Journal of Women's History - 17, 3, Fall 2005:161-168

- Kroll, Dan J. "FCC says soaps may need to be cleaned up." SoapCentral. 2004: 1.
- Jeffrey, Robert. "Opinion | Keep America's Ethnic Media Thriving, Dynamic and Independent | Seattle Times Newspaper." *The Seattle Times | Seattle Times Newspaper*. 6 Dec. 2006. Web. 08 Mar. 2010.
- LaReau, Jamie. "Super Bowl to introduce Honda pickup; Big game in February is `perfect platform' to launch Ridgeline." *Automotive News*. 29 Nov. 2004. Web. 12 Jan. 2010.
- Lincoln, Abraham. "A Collection of Abraham Lincoln Quotes." *PERSONAL WEB PAGES home.att.net*. Web. 11 Dec. 2009. http://home.att.net/~rjnorton/Lincoln78.html.
- Mancini, Robert. "Janet Apologizes, Says Super Bowl Stunt Went Too Far News Story | Music, Celebrity, Artist News | MTV News." *New Music Videos, Reality TV Shows, Celebrity News, Top Stories | MTV.* 02 Feb. 2004. Web. 07 Dec. 2009.
- Poniewozik, James. "The Hypocrisy Bowl." (2004): 1-4. Web. .">http://74.125.155.132/scholar?q=cache:WGcyomYFtVQJ:scholar.google.com/+janet+jackson+super+bowl&hl=en&as_sdt=2000>.