**New Title / October 2016:**

**Developing & Using Cross-Modal Ethnographic Narrative Document Analysis**

**(Cro-MENDA) to Study Editorial Cartoons**

**(and implications for its use with other cross-modal texts)**

(*The original, 2013, title* was “Editorial Cartoons in Two Early-Twentieth-Century Newspapers as Mentor Texts for a young Walter Elias Disney: An Ethnographic Content Analysis.” I eliminated the last part of the title in 2014 because ECA is only a part of the study and analysis. *The February 2016 title*, Editorial Cartoons in Two Early-Twentieth-Century Newspapers as Mentor Texts for a Young Walter Elias Disney: Developing & Using Cross-Modal Ethnographic Narrative Document, Analysis (Cro-MENDA), reflected my attempt to combine the two foci – an attempt that proved unwieldy and unrealistic given my time frame. *The October 2016 title* reflects the development of a new methodology for studying cross-modal texts.)

|  |
| --- |
| **I. Introduction** |
| **How the topic emerged from other work and the questions guiding my research became:**How do I know that what I say I think I know about a multi- or cross-modal text is valid? How can I systematically collect the information in a multi- or cross-modal narrative text without losing sight of the narrative? More specificially, how I can know what **topics and themes the editorial cartoons presented, through what frames, and conveying what discourses**?\* ***\**** *The purpose of Altheide and Schneider’s (2012) ethnographic content analysis is to study themes, frames, and discourses reported via various formats, including cartoons.* |
| **b. Personal and professional interests** (journalism, narrative literature,political satire, literacy methods) |
| **c. Summary of each chapter** |
| **d. Why this study is important**  |
| 1. Provides a discussion of and framework for interpretive analysis of multi- and cross-modal texts.
 |
| 1. Adds to the cultural understanding of the role of editorial cartoons (cross-modal, non-linear texts) as a means of transmitting ideas and of shaping attitudes.
 |
| 1. Adds to the understanding of today’s narrative literature, particularly non-linear multi-and-cross-modal narrative literature, and the metanarratives contained within them.
 |
| **II.** | **Theoretical Underpinnings** (one long or two shorter chapters; written partly retrospectively, as is appropriate to the methodology) |
| A. Soft Theory as a basis for Interpretive Study |
| 1. Soft theory vs. hard-core theory (Iser, 2006)
2. Empirical theories vs. grounded theories (Silverman, 2010)
 |
| B. Interpretation and Objective, Subjective, and Perceived Reality |
| 1. Phenomenology as a type of interpretive soft theory (Spinelli, 1989; Ricoeur, 1976)
2. Hermeneutics as a type of interpretive soft theory (Pokorný, 2011; Howard, 1982)
3. Ethnography as a type of interpretive method (Altheide & Schneider, 2012; et al.)
 |
| C. Multi- and Cross-Modal Nonlinear Narrative Cartoons as Texts for Interpretation |
| 1. Semiotic modes (Kress and van Leeuwen, 2006; Tsakona, 2009; Gee, 2003); [added December 10, 2016: rhetorical techniques (Medhurst and De Sousa, 1981)
 |
| 1. Multi- and cross-modality / Non-linearity (Sloutsky & Lo, et al.) [Implicit modality]
 |
| 1. Cartoons as compressed, nonlinear narratives (Herman, 2012; Tsanka, 2009; McCloud, 2000)
 |
| D. Contextual Web |
| 1. Historiographical (Wineburg, 2001)
 |
| 1. Discipline/Profession/Field: Journalistic (Morris, 1989; Lowrey, 2008)
 |
| E. Theorizing Editorial Cartoons  |
| 1. Terminology and Definitions
 |
| 1. Cartoon as Jester / Fool (Morris, 1989)
 |
| 1. Cartoon as Inciter (Navasky, 2013)
 |
| a. Caricature as Catalyst |
| b. Cartoons as sites of content expressed through differing modalities (Cartoons / Content) |
| c. Cartoons as sites of differing heuristics or rhetorical devices (Cartoons / Images) |
| d. Cartoons as sites of differing ethics/ideologies (Cartoon / Stimulus). |
| **III.** | **Methodological Underpinnings of Cro-MENDAas a Method of Understanding Culture through Documents** (one long or two shorter chapters; written partly retrospectively, as is appropriate to the methodology) |
| A. Other methods of studying editorial cartoons & why not use them (Lombard, et al., 1999; Bateman, 2008) |
| B. Considerations in developing using/developing a qualitative research method (Yin, 2011) |
| C. Altheide & Schneider’s (2012) Ethnographic Content Analysis |
| 1. Mead’s Symbolic Interaction (Blumer, 1973/1966)
 |
| 1. Community journalism as process of shared meaning-making (Lowrey, 2008)
 |
| 1. Protocol development & data collection recursive, iterative, ongoing
 |
| D. Elemental considerations |
| 1. Narrative elements (visual and verbal) and narrative as method (Cudden, 1999; Bal 2009/1985; Rose, 2012)
 |
| 1. Symbiosis of artistic and literary elements (Kiefer, 2010)
 |
| 1. Graphic elements (Heller, 2002)
 |
| 1. Elements of humor (Tsakona, 2009; Cudden, 1999)
 |
| E. Rodriguez & Dimitrova’s (2011) Four Levels of Visual Framing |
| 1. Denotative
 |
| 1. Stylistic
 |
| 1. Connotative
 |
| 1. Ideological stance and shaping
 |
| **IV.** | **Demonstration: Cro-MENDA applied to one cartoon, in detail and with metacognitive narrative**  |
| This cannot be outlined, but I will provide a metacognitive narrative of my processes as I use the bases of Altheide and Schneider’s (2012) ECA to describe the narrative, use Rodriguez and Dimitrova’s (2011) FLVF to determine the topic, theme, and frame, and then use Morris (2009) and Navasky (2013) to discuss the cartoonist’s ideological stance and how this cartoon attempts to shape discourse.  |
| **V.**  | **Discussion of the six cartoons analyzed (CRO-Menda and a body of texts); implications for applying Cro-MENDA to other cross-modal texts; Other findings/conclusions** |
| **VI.** | **Discussion of the process of creating a method** |
|  |  |
|  |  |