Podcast Review Draft

Grace Griffith

1. What is the central topic of purpose for this podcast? How clearly is it communicated?

The title and introduction state that this podcast is about if it really is worth it to get into a high school relationship. The conclusion states that they can be more damaging in the long run.

2. How well does the interviewer maintain a conversational and natural style? Does she or he sound more like they are reading a list of questions or having a conversation? How might she or he improve and be more spontaneous and conversational?

Throughout the podcast, the interviewer sounds like they are having a conversation. She makes the questions flow in smoothly.

3. Describe the vocal quality of the interviewer. Does she or he display good vocal quality and variety? Imagine that you are coaching the interviewer on how to improve her or his voice.  What would you say?

I think that her vocal qualities were very good. I would say for improvement that she could bring some more energy to her voice. She sounded like an interviewer, but it took on this more serious tone.

4. How well does the interviewer (not the interviewee) communicate or build her or his own ethos (community, values, and competence)? How does she or he present a self-image that will be compelling to listeners? How might that self-image be better communicated or improved to help the podcast accomplish its purpose?

The interviewer builds self-image strongly through the introduction and the conclusion. Along with that, she states early in the podcast what her experiences are compared to the interviewee’s experiences. Grace shows her opinion on this matter changing throughout the podcast and starts leaning towards Skylar’s side.

5. What are the most and least compelling aspects of the introduction and conclusion? How well does the introduction help draw the audience into the topic of the interview? How well does the conclusion summarize the key take-away or insight that comes from the interview? What advice would you have to make these more powerful?

I think that the introduction and conclusion say exactly what they need to say. However, the one thing that made it difficult to draw attention was the fact that there didn’t seem to be a whole lot of energy towards this. Even though her voice was good and the things she said were compelling, the lack on energy made it difficult to keep my attention.

Tyler Faber

1. What is the central topic of purpose for this podcast? How clearly is it communicated?

The central idea is to give information about this YEA school program. This is clearly communicated as the questioning starts.

2. How well does the interviewer maintain a conversational and natural style? Does she or he sound more like they are reading a list of questions or having a conversation? How might she or he improve and be more spontaneous and conversational?

The interviewer maintains a conversational style very well. He makes it sound like a conversation by leaving in the laughs and banter. I think that he did great in this aspect.

3. Describe the vocal quality of the interviewer. Does she or he display good vocal quality and variety? Imagine that you are coaching the interviewer on how to improve her or his voice.  What would you say?

The vocal quality is great. The interviewer gave a lot of energy and kept me wanting to hear more.

4. How well does the interviewer (not the interviewee) communicate or build her or his own ethos (community, values, and competence)? How does she or he present a self-image that will be compelling to listeners? How might that self-image be better communicated or improved to help the podcast accomplish its purpose?

The interviewer does not build his self-image that well. He did great on everything else, but there isn’t much of his opinion on this matter anywhere in the podcast. Although, he did state in the description that he was a part of this too. I still think he should’ve given more of his side somewhere in the podcast.

5. What are the most and least compelling aspects of the introduction and conclusion? How well does the introduction help draw the audience into the topic of the interview? How well does the conclusion summarize the key take-away or insight that comes from the interview? What advice would you have to make these more powerful?

The introduction seemed very quick. I’d say that it didn’t draw much of my attention in at first. The conclusion was great, however. He did a great job recapping everything that was stated and really shows the key take-aways of this podcast. For improvement, he should focus a bit more on his introduction since it didn’t really say a whole lot and I bet he could’ve said more.