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Public Journalism in International Perspective

At first glance, the debate over “public journalism” in the United States may seem a provincial anomaly. After all, there has been no worldwide call for “public” or “civic” journalism, as there has been for media literacy, regulation of media conglomerates, reallocation of the electromagnetic spectrum, or changes in the international flow of cultural products. Even within the United States, most of the public journalism experiments of the 1990s have occurred in small- or medium-market newspapers, and prominent elite papers such as the New York Times and Washington Post have been among the most strident critics of those experiments.

And yet the public journalism movement echoes important trends in international communication. As a theory, public journalism often draws upon the same communitarian philosophies of civil society and the public sphere cited by scholars and activists who have proposed more participatory models of international development.

As a social practice, public journalism honors the civic role of non-governmental groups, who have often struggled against the conventional news judgments of media owners and professional journalists. Some aspects of public journalism may seem idiosyncratically and naively American to those outside the United States. From an international perspective, the movement certainly has its blind spots and assumptions — most notably, in taking for granted material and cultural resources that are hard to mobilize in much of the rest of the world. Nonetheless, the public journalism movement is worth watching, for both its successes and its failures. If nothing else, the response to public journalism anticipates the struggles that await reformers around the world who hope to make the press a more responsive and democratic institution.

I. Public Journalism as a Discourse about “the Media”


Criticism of journalism in the United States stretches back to at least the 1830s. Ever since the daily newspaper emerged as an icon of 19th century city life, observers have debated its quality, significance, and influence. Sometimes critics have framed their arguments as a jeremiad, calling a fallen people to give up their evil habits and return to the ways of righteousness. At other times critics have adopted the measured phrases of the social scientist, calmly weighing media effects on attitudes, opinions, and behavior. Regardless of the idiom, however, talk about the mass media always carries an unmistakable moral undertone. Joli Jensen (1990) has argued that talk about “the media” can be usefully understood as one of the characteristic habits by which modern people ponder the experience of modernity. The media lend themselves to debate not just because they are instruments of power, but also because they are widely circulated, readily available symbolic representations of society in microcosm. For people living in modern societies, media products, organizations, celebrities, professions, and practices are good tools to think with.

Because the modern newspaper promotes itself as an encyclopedia of everyday life, it often finds itself an object of public debate. Marion Marzolf (1991) has argued that U.S. debates about news have often focused on concerns about the prospects of democracy. Critics have wondered whether the accessibility, simplicity, and sensationalism of the popular press would undermine the political and moral character of the nation. For much of U.S. history, these debates were lively, even violent. John Nerone (1994) has documented a long history of violence against the press, including beatings of editors and mobbing and destruction of newsrooms. By the end of the 20th century, however, violence against the press had greatly diminished. Nerone finds this outcome paradoxical, for it may acknowledge that the institutional press now monopolizes public debate. Lack
of violence may mean citizens have acquiesced to a public sphere dominated by bureaucratic, commercial, professional news organizations. In a world in which free expression has become bureaucratized, media criticism flourishes as a domesticated, ceremonial alternative to violence.

II. Journalism and the Crisis of Democracy: The U.S. Perspective


If Americans no longer fight over the press, it may be because they have lost some of their enthusiasm for politics. According to Michael McGerr (1986), that loss of enthusiasm can be traced to a series of late 19th century reforms designed to make politics less corrupt and divisive, and more subject to impartial, scientific control by the educated classes. A new generation of Northern newspaper editors, who supported such reforms, began transforming the daily press. They argued for independent daily newspapers, supported by advertising revenues rather than party subsidies. Such papers would offer impartial information to rational, nonpartisan readers. Many forces helped make this shift in politics and the press plausible. Industrialization and westward expansion were creating an advertising base that could support independent papers. Urban reformers were using scientific methods to address health problems in America’s chaotic, rapidly growing cities. Frightened by the influx of immigrants, traditional Anglo-American elites proclaimed their civic-mindedness, hoping to counter machine politics, recoup their cultural authority, and subject public debate to more rational control. And finally, playing in the background of all these changes, the Civil War continued to remind Americans of the costs of ideological divisiveness.

The long-term decline in popular politics that began in the late 19th century would set the stage for the public journalism movement of the 1990s. The reforms that made U.S. politics more rational, professional, and bureaucratic also made that politics less enthusiastically democratic. Public journalism supporters would argue that professionalization had joined politics and the press in a downward spiral. Just as declining voter turnout would come to symbolize Americans’ loss of interest in politics, declining newspaper circulation would come to symbolize readers’ loss of interest in the press. The truth be told, by the 1990s many market and demographic changes—population shifts to the suburbs, monopoly ownership in most cities, the availability of instantaneous information from television and other electronic media, more competing forms of consumer entertainment—had made the daily newspaper less central to American life. But the literature of public journalism would always probe these changes for their political significance. What did the decline of the daily newspaper, that icon of democracy, foretell for the future of American politics?

Dozens of works of political theory and criticism in the 1990s found evidence of decline in the U.S. press and the political system it served. The titles and subtitles of books published during this period tell the story: “media and the decay of American politics,” “why Americans hate politics,” “how the media undermine American democracy.” Political scientist Robert Entman (1989) argued that democracy was suffering from both
supply and demand problems — not enough quality journalism being produced, not enough being read. On the supply side, he said, journalists worked most closely with elites in deciding what's news, rather than with the public at large. The organizational routines that allowed large newspapers to reproduce themselves each day also tended to slant stories in line with organizational and professional values. On the demand side, journalism suffered for lack of an audience interested in a different kind of news. Without demonstrable demand for an alternative, journalists and news organizations simply left consumer choices to the marketplace. The result, Entman said, was "democracy without citizens" — a paradoxical system in which media powerfully influence the behavior of politicians without responding to the requirements of active citizenship.

Other studies of political reporting in the 1990s often came to similar conclusions. For example, journalism professor David Protess and his colleagues at Northwestern University (1991) found that four of the six investigative reporting projects they studied involved behind-the-scenes collaboration between journalists and newsmakers. In this style of "coalition journalism," news organizations typically released stories to coincide with policy-makers' announcements of reforms. Thus even investigative journalism — so often praised as the profession's highest practice — was being conducted with almost no public input. Investigative stories invoked "the public interest" to justify their own importance. But such stories generally did not mobilize the public as an active political force.

A series of popular books by journalists in the 1990s would affirm that American democracy was in crisis, although not always agree on the cause. Washington Post reporter E. J. Dionne, Jr. (1991) proclaimed, "At the very moment when democracy is blossoming in Eastern Europe, it is decaying in the United States" (p. 9). Dionne described political discourse as being dominated by liberal and conservative extremists, by the "Sixties Left" and the "Eighties Right," rather than by a concern for the common good. According to Dionne, many Americans had simply walked away from public life in disgust.

Rolling Stone political reporter William Greider (1992) argued that democracy in the U.S. had been reduced to a sham. For him the problem was not the polarization of public discourse, but its domination by special interests. The media, major parties, corporations, and government agencies had all collaborated to exclude citizens, and left the people with no one to speak on their behalf.

Atlantic Monthly editor James Fallows (1996) placed particular blame on the press. Fallows, who had previously written on how U.S. businesses and the military had reformed themselves, found the press particularly immune to self-criticism. Journalists seemed unaware of how their newsgathering routines, their taste for television punditry and the lecture circuit, and their professional perspectives had distanced them from the public they claimed to serve.

III. The Theory of Public Journalism
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This popular literature on the woes of American democracy often points to the 1988 and 1992 elections as low points in the performance of journalists and politicians. Yet Americans’ fears for their democracy resonated so strongly in part because they were so deeply mythic and familiar. As the historian Daniel Rodgers (1987) has argued, the crisis of democracy first became obvious during the 1920s.

The country’s experience with propaganda during World War I unleashed demons that the U.S. has been unable, or unwilling, to exorcise. Before the war, Progressive Era reformers had staked their hopes for reform on the purifying power of public opinion, even as some of their reforms deliberately disenfranchised less genteel segments of that public, as McGerr and others have documented. But the war showed how easily the machinery of propaganda and advertising could be mobilized in the service of private interests.

The journalist Walter Lippmann’s elegantly morose book, Public Opinion (1922), would set the tone for much commentary in the 1920s. In the face of so much propaganda, Lippmann asked, where could modern people find reliable maps of reality? Lippmann’s book systematically confronted and destroyed every shibboleth of American democracy—the assumption that citizens were adequate to the task of self-government, that their participation in local politics would prepare them to govern the nation, that political institutions functioned as designed, that the news offered the knowledge they needed to make rational decisions. As a solution, he proposed to put knowledge questions in the hands of scientifically minded nonpartisan professionals such as himself, though his hope in this solution would fade, too.

Lippmann’s analysis did not go unchallenged. The most powerful response would come several years later from the philosopher John Dewey, in his book, The Public and Its Problems (1927). Dewey often agreed with Lippmann’s indictment of the failures of democracy, but disagreed with Lippmann’s theoretical approach, gloomy conclusion, and proposal to put social scientists in charge of the machinery of knowledge.

The essence of their difference was this: Lippmann thought that the democracy suffered from lack of knowledge; Dewey thought democracy suffered from lack of solidarity. For Dewey the challenge was to infuse the commercial and technical network of the Great Society with the spirit of local community. Expert knowledge, in and of itself, could not bring about the Great Community that Dewey envisioned. “A class of experts,” he wrote, “is inevitably so removed from common interests as to become a class with private interests and private knowledge, which in social matters is not knowledge at all” (p. 207).

The Lippmann-Dewey exchange, ignored by press scholars for many years, would become the theoretical centerpiece of the public journalism debate, thanks largely to the writings of James Carey (1974, 1982, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1995) and, later, Jay Rosen (1999). Proponents of public journalism have typically identified with Dewey’s position. They have argued that the goal of public journalism should be to reconnect the press and the public, to engage readers as citizens rather than just consumers, and to make the news conversable rather than merely informative. And yet their preference for Dewey over Lippmann has not been entirely consistent.

As discussed below, public journalism constantly asks, à la Dewey, what kind of journalism would make public life go well, but sometimes answers, à la Lippmann, by describing what sort of information citizens need in their deliberations. Similarly, with so many public journalism projects focusing on election year issues or community planning, proponents have
often fallen back on the familiar self-justification of conventional journalism: that it provides citizens with the knowledge they need to make informed decisions about public life.

By contrast, the scholar most responsible for theorizing the Lippmann-Dewey debate — James Carey, formerly of the University of Illinois and currently at Columbia University — has been quite consistent in his reading of that debate. If Jay Rosen has been the midwife of the public journalism movement, Carey has been its philosophical godfather. His own writings about contemporary journalism began in 1974, with an essay on the state of journalism criticism. Carey’s first account of the Lippmann-Dewey debate appeared in 1982, though curiously not in the context of journalism. His essay “Mass Media: The Critical View” (later reprinted in his 1989 book, Communication As Culture, under the title “Reconceiving ‘Mass’ and ‘Media’”) used Lippmann and Dewey to illustrate the difference between objectivist and expressivist views of reality. This essay was one of several Carey wrote in the 1970s and 80s in support of cultural studies approaches to mass communication research.

Dewey’s objection, Carey wrote, was to Lippmann’s spectator theory of knowledge: “[Dewey] would insist that we are not, however, observers or spectators of a given world but participants in its actual making. How we constitute the world is dependent on our purposes and on our skill at foresight, at imagining the possible states of a desirable politics” (Carey, 1989, p. 82).

In subsequent essays, Carey (1987, 1991, 1995) would argue for the centrality of “the public” in any society that called itself democratic. His definition of the term public, however, deliberately diverged from that commonly used by other media researchers. Carey thought of the public not as an audience for professionally packaged messages, but as a shared political space in which a democracy could talk to itself about itself.

For Carey, any democracy must create “a public realm in which a free people can assemble, speak their minds, and then write or tape or otherwise record the extended conversation so that others, out of sight, might see it” (1989, pp. 207-227). Carey (1995) found evidence of the need for a conversational space in the failures of the U.S. presidential campaigns of 1988 and 1992, as did other public journalism supporters. But he also drew his examples from overseas, noting the importance of public culture in the democratization of Eastern European states (1991) as well as the losing battle to preserve public broadcasting systems in Europe.

Support for the theory of public journalism would come from other intellectual traditions as well. Clifford Christians, John Ferre, and Mark Fackler (1993) argued for press ethics that emphasized community needs not just individual decisions — an approach that echoed public journalism’s concerns for the common good. “Communitarian ethics,” they wrote, “establishes civic transformation as the press’s goal and reorients the media’s organizational culture around the principle of mutuality” (p. 166).

Similarly, Rob Anderson, Robert Dardenne, and George Killenberg (1994) argued the importance of understanding journalism as a communication profession. Professional journalism, they said, tends to think of itself as a vehicle for conveying information. What it needed to enliven and democratize its practices was more of a commitment to dialogue as the link that connects communities and the news. Jay Black’s edited collection Mixed News: The Public/Civic/Communitarian Journalism Debate (1997) identified the range of intellectual sources proponents were using, as well as giving voice to the responses of some opponents, such as John Merrill.

The most prominent and tireless advocate of public journalism has been Jay Rosen of New York University. His book, What Are Journalists For? (1999), chronicles his attempts, over a decade, to construct a theory for public journalism, interest journalists and other educators in the movement, and monitor and support the public journalism experiments of hundreds of news organizations across the United States.

After many years, Rosen has arrived at a crisp and simple description of the goals of public journalism. He says that it is an approach that encourages news organizations to “1) address people as citizens, potential participants in public affairs, rather than victims or spectators, 2) help the political community act upon, rather than just learn about, its problems, 3) improve the climate of public discussion, rather than simply watch it deteriorate, and 4) help make public life go well, so that it earns its claim on our attention” (1999, p. 262). Rosen believes that the press can meet these goals only if it connects itself to the life of the community, as Dewey suggested.

For the most part, Rosen has positioned himself as
a theorist and interpreter of the current state of journalism, rather than as a historian of journalism or politics. As the list above demonstrates, his writing displays a talent for apothegm. He has cultivated that talent in part as a way of making his theories more memorable, especially for sympathetic working journalists who were constantly defending their new ideas to skeptical colleagues. Rosen has also succeeded in getting a wide range of foundations and professional organizations to support workshops, forums, and experiments.

A list of the organizations that have sponsored public journalism initiatives since the early 1990s would include the Knight and Kettering Foundations, the Pew Charitable Trusts, the American Press Institute, and the Poynter Institute for Media Studies, as well as newspaper chains such as Knight-Ridder and Gannett. The support of these groups would help Rosen publicize the cause of public journalism, though it would also open the movement to criticism from traditional journalists who wondered what the foundations and newspaper chains were trying to buy with their support.

IV. The Practice of Public Journalism


Throughout the 1990s, the public journalism movement enacted its ideas in dozens of newsrooms in the U.S. Indeed, one of the more interesting and controversial aspects of the movement has been its constant interplay between educators and journalists, news organizations and private foundations, theory and professional routine. Apart from works theorizing the relationship of journalism and democracy, there are also works describing the reforms that have been introduced in the name of public journalism.

The most influential of these books has been Davis “Buzz” Merritt’s autobiographical account (1998/1995) of his work as editor-in-chief of the Wichita Eagle. Merritt was one of the first journalists to look outside the profession for a philosophy to guide his experiments, developing his ideas in conversations with Jay Rosen and with David Mathews of the Kettering Foundation. Merritt’s book describes his growing dissatisfaction with American politics and the performance of the press. He notes that from 1975, when he became editor, through the 1980s, the Eagle dramatically improved itself by all the measures that the profession uses to measure reputation. Yet circulation and readership continued to decline.

Merritt suspected that journalists’ own professional practices were adding to the chaos of public life and discourse. News organizations were too caught up in daily deadlines. Journalists placed too great a premium on toughness and adversarialism. News stories too readily portrayed every issue as a contest of extremes. All the while, as politics fell apart, journalists acted detached, as though they were indifferent to the outcome of events.

The Eagle would produce two notable early experiments in public journalism. First, during the 1990 Kansas gubernatorial election, the Eagle downplayed traditional horse-race coverage and published issues boxes each Sunday that compelled candidates to respond to citizens’ concerns. Second, hoping to do more than just change election coverage, the Eagle introduced its “People Project,” subtitled “Solving It Ourselves” — an effort to make news coverage more relevant to readers. The newspaper conducted 192 two-hour interviews with citizens, focusing on their analysis of the political and social problems facing Wichita.

As such experiments multiplied across the country, they came to constitute a history of the movement: the Columbus (Georgia) Ledger-Enquirer’s 1987 sponsorship of a six-hour public forum on the city’s future; the Charlotte (North Carolina) Observer’s 1992 use of citizen poll data to set the agenda for election coverage; the Madison (Wisconsin) State Journal’s 1992 “We the People, Wisconsin” project, which used citizen “juries” to articulate a public agenda; the Akron
(Ohio) Beacon Journal’s 1993 “Coming Together” project, which led to a Pulitzer-Prize winning 1994 series on race and pledges by 22,000 residents to work for improved race relations; the Tallahassee (Florida) Democrat’s 1994 public listening project, which began with detailed phone interviews with 828 randomly selected citizens; the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot’s creation of a “Public Life Team” that declared that its mission was to “revitalize a democracy that has grown sick with disenchantment” and to “lead the community to discover itself and act on what it has learned” (Charity, 1995, p. 151).

With a grant from the Knight Foundation, Jay Rosen established the Project for Public Life and the Press at New York University in 1993, as a clearinghouse for information about public journalism experiments and philosophy. At the same time, the Pew Charitable Trusts, a foundation long interested in civic reform, hired Ed Fouhy, a former television network news executive, to run what would become the Pew Center for Civic Journalism. The Pew Center would sponsor and publicize its own experiments in civic journalism. Schaffer and Miller (1995) described Pew’s sponsorship of projects in Charlotte, Tallahassee, and Madison, as well as projects in Boston, San Francisco, and Seattle that also involved National Public Radio and the Poynter Institute for Media Studies. Arthur Charity’s Doing Public Journalism (1995) would become the movement’s first sourcebook, an enthusiastic summary of its accomplishments and methods.

The projects described by Charity shared important traits. Most notably, most occurred in mid-sized cities. The reasons for this pattern have not yet been fully explored. Major metropolitan dailies like the New York Times and Washington Post have been among the movement’s severest critics, because they imagine themselves as trustees of the highest professional traditions — traditions that they think public journalism wants to destroy. The papers in smaller cities, by contrast, feel more genuinely invested in the language of community, and thus more open to public journalism’s appeals.

Indeed, one way to interpret the popularity of public journalism in smaller markets is as a discourse about the changing character of small U.S. cities. Citizens in Wichita or Charlotte may begin taking stock of themselves when the problems of larger metropolises — urban sprawl, gang violence, drug dealing, new waves of immigration — begin showing up in their home town. Thus the “disconnect” that public journalism so frequently describes may be internal as well as external — not just between individual citizens and their political institutions, but between citizens’ older and newer senses of their community’s identity.

Public journalism experiments also violate professional assumptions about what counts for a news organization, who journalists are, or what kind of work they do. In several major projects, for example, newspapers have joined with commercial and public television and radio stations. The alliance with commercial television particularly troubles print journalists, who think of themselves as more authentic than their broadcast counterparts.

Public journalism also forces reporters to develop new skills and habits. Reporters are experienced interviewers, but they often practice a rather selective form of listening. They hear what they need to hear in order to meet their deadlines. Nor do they have much training or practice in skills required by public journalism, such as leading focus groups or moderating community forums or interpreting polling data. The introduction of newsroom consultants, who do have these skills, has sometimes bred resentment, for it seems to challenge journalists’ sense of news judgment. Finally, the support of foundations and newspaper chains like Knight-Ridder has made many journalists suspicious of the movement’s motives. They wonder whether public journalism is just a new form of marketing or public relations, a strategy for cozying up to readers or — even worse — to the institutions on which they report.

V. Criticisms of Public Journalism


Public journalism has attracted its share of critics, among professional journalists as well as press scholars. Just as proponents imagine the history of public journalism as a series of famous projects, opponents imagine that history as a series of famous refutations by prominent journalists: Washington Post managing editor Leonard Downie's condemnation of press involvement at the 1994 Associated Press Managing Editors convention; former NBC News president Michael Gartner's 1995 warning about the "menace" of public journalism; executive director Rosemary Armao's attack on public journalism as "crude, naive, and dumb" at the 1995 Investigative Reporters and Editors convention; former New York Times executive editor Max Frankel's 1995 condemnation of "fix-it journalism"; New York Times editorial page editor Howell Raines' attack on James Fallows' discussion of public journalism in Breaking the News (1996); New Yorker writer David Remnick's 1996 defense of "informed, aggressive skepticism"; syndicated political columnist David Broder's abandonment of his earlier support at the 1996 Stanford public journalism conference. (Summaries of many of these criticisms can be found in Rosen [1999] and Corrigan [1999].) In this litany, the status of the critic counts heavily, for it establishes the authority of their refutations. Tone matters, too. Journalist-critics tend to portray themselves as plain-speaking, hard-hitting, independent-minded, shoe-leather reporters who are not afraid to speak the truth about a pointy-headed fad that endangers the highest traditions of professional journalism. 

Corrigan (1999) describes the proponents of public journalism as "evangelists" — a metaphor that has been widely used by other critics. He and other journalist-critics portray proponents as "proselytizers" who want to convert their profession to a new faith. Corrigan notes that the autobiographical accounts of Merritt and other proponents describe their conversion to public journalism as an epiphany. Whether such religious metaphors aptly describe the movement is open to question. (For their part, Carey and Rosen have responded that it is conventional journalism that portrays itself as the one true church, and that if one were to apply a religious metaphor, that public journalism's proponents should be described as heretics and their critics as the real high priests.)

Nonetheless, the persistence of the tag evangelist suggests the depth of professional resentment often directed especially at non-journalists such as Rosen. Like other critics, Corrigan has condemned public journalism for too vaguely defining its goals (what's so new about it?), for compromising professional autonomy (shouldn't journalists be the ones to decide what's news?), for accepting foundation and corporate money (whose interests does the movement serve?), and for reducing journalism to a form of public relations (who will tell the hard truths if journalists do not?).

Academic responses have varied more widely. Lambeth, Meyer, and Thorson (1998) assess the effects of public journalism on news coverage, using a range of approaches. The authors in their anthology assess Davis Merrill's philosophy of public journalism; evaluate changes in citizens' political knowledge as a result of the "We the People/Wisconsin" project; examine the tensions between deliberation and mobilization models of social action in that same project; describe the changes in newsroom structure at a public journalism paper; compare the belief systems of journalists at two newspapers, one a conventional and the other a public journalism paper; debate the results of the Charlotte Observer's controversial 1996 election coverage; and suggest research questions by which future public journalism projects might be judged. This approach effectively normalizes public journalism as an object of social science scrutiny.

The authors in Glasser (1999), by contrast, critique public journalism as a theoretical idea. Rosen (1999) describes the gist of Glasser's book, as he understands it. The scholarly contributors, he says, criticize public journalism for "misreading the exchange between Lippmann and Dewey; failing to pose a significant challenge to corporate control of the news media; adopting a sentimental or thinly reasoned view of democracy; promoting a hazy conception of itself that muddles important problems of definition; skirt[ing] important questions of power, justice, and inequality; relying too much on foundation support; neglecting to consider historical precedents in its eagerness to be seen as 'new'; overburdening the press with responsibilities it cannot meet; declining to offer a potent challenge to journalistic authority; and offering an illusion of empowerment and participation rather than the real thing" (n. 5, p. 318). Though rather accurate, Rosen's summary does not mention that virtually all the contributors agreed with significant portions of public journalism's critique of conventional journalism.

Unlike journalist-critics, who think public journalism has gone too far, scholar-critics do not think it has gone far enough. Several of the contributors to Glasser's book want public journalism to be more
critical of corporate ownership and newsroom structure; several think that public journalism’s reading of the theory and history of democracy needs more nuance and complexity; some want public journalism to give greater weight to the role of other social institutions. But a number of the contributors praise the impulse behind the movement. James Carey’s chapter, “In Defense of Public Journalism,” argues that the movement has committed itself to “the reawakening of an antecedent tradition of journalism and politics, one that emphasizes local democracy, the community of locale, and citizenship as against the distant forces that would overwhelm it” (p. 63).

While public journalism may have its problems, Carey argues, its invocation of the tradition of civic republicanism “at least provides some oppositional force to the next wave in the global concentration of power and the tyranny of the market” (p. 64).

VI. Public Journalism and the International Debate over Civil Society


James Carey’s reference to the “global concentration of power and tyranny of the market” hints at a larger international context in which we might understand the public journalism debate. Does public journalism articulate any internationally shared problems? Does it address political, social, and economic dilemmas that also confront other countries? As noted above, many of public journalism’s concerns seem characteristically American. The debate about citizens’ loss of civility, for example, paradoxically takes place in a society with relatively little organized political violence, in which the vast majority of public opinion rests comfortably in the middle of the political spectrum. The complaints about citizens’ lack of trust, growing cynicism, and apathy mask the fact that Americans continue to be more trusting and less cynical than citizens in many other countries, and can afford to be committed to volunteerism as a mode of social
control. The assumption that commercial news organizations might devote themselves to the public good seems a characteristically American hope that economic power and political democracy can peacefully coexist. Finally, the fear that the U.S. is becoming "balkanized," as immigrants from Eastern Europe, Latin America, the Mideast, and Asia create new enclaves across the country, seems overwrought. The U.S., after all, nowhere finds itself flooded by the tidal waves of war refugees that overwhelm much poorer countries in Africa, Asia, or Eastern Europe.

As Michael Schudson (1998) has recently argued in his history of citizenship in the U.S., there are ample reasons for hope. He notes that the forms of citizenship have changed, in part because many of the reforms once hoped for — voting rights, minority inclusion, public education — have been accomplished. If Americans so easily discover a society in decline, it may be because they struggle against a heroic mythology of their own making. Their mythology of participatory citizenship may exaggerate the level of individual activism needed to maintain democracy. In a society with mature political and social institutions, it may be sufficient for most people to be what he calls "monitorial citizens" (p. 311).

And yet the public journalism debate in the U.S. echoes similar discussions around the world. The challenges to public life now look global rather than merely local. No country can entirely foresee the consequences of global trade in commodities, information, capital, and deadly viruses. Many societies struggle to maintain a space for political discourse, in a world carved by corporate power and, in places, still subjected to the whims of military juntas, aristocrats, and dictators. Increasing ease of movement creates new cultural opportunities, but also new occasions for collective violence. When people across the world speak of such issues, they necessarily consider the role of communication media. And they use the media as metaphorical emblems of social order, just as public journalism proponents like Jay Rosen and James Carey speak of journalism as a totem of democracy. To talk about reforming the media, in turn, is to dream the forms and relations of a new social order.

Many of those dreams now go by the name civil society. That term, though widely used in the 1990s, remains open to contest, adaptation, and interpretation. John Keane (1998) considers it a state/non-state distinction. He defines civil society as a "complex and dynamic ensemble of legally protected non-governmental institutions that tend to be non-violent, self-organizing, self-reflexive, and permanently in tension with each other and with the state institutions that 'frame,' constrict and enable their activities" (p. 6). Célestin Monga (1996), confronting the particular dilemmas of Africa, applies the term to any groups committed to emancipatory politics: "I define [civil society] as including only those groups, organizations, and personalities that pursue freedom, justice, and the rights of citizenship against authoritarian states" (p. 4).

The role of economic markets in enabling civil society remains controversial. Following Jürgen Habermas's (1989) widely influential work on the "public sphere," some scholars consider market forces and nominally private organizations like corporations as threats to the autonomy of civic life. John Ehrenberg (1999) thinks that the most productive use of the term civil society is to describe, "the social relations and structures that lie between the state and the market" (p. 235). Keane finds the relationship between markets and civil society difficult to disentangle. The networks created by civil society help markets to function more effectively; however, unrestrained "commodified economies" often damage the social relations and infrastructure that markets were meant to enhance. Keane concludes that, "Where there are no markets, civil societies find it impossible to survive." But he adds that markets are no substitute for social order: "Where there is no civil society, there can be no markets" (p. 19).

If the 1988 and 1992 presidential elections came to symbolize the failures of U.S. press coverage, the breakup of authoritarian states in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union have come to symbolize the challenges of civil society. To borrow the title of a book by Ralf Dahrendorf (1997), the debate about civil society must now be imagined "after 1989." Václav Havel, once a political prisoner and now president of the new Czech Republic, said "the fall of the Communist empire is an event on the same scale of historical importance as the fall of the Roman empire" (quoted in Madison, 1998, p. ix). Dahrendorf and others have noted the new nations of Eastern Europe must figure out how to build a civil society on the ruins of an autocratic empire. In the new order, what will replace old institutions and structures of the state? How can a society create, on the spot, the rules of deliberation and constitutional structures needed to govern itself? How does one encourage civic associations without feeding the traditional communal prejudices of ethnic, linguistic,
and religious groups? What moral, spiritual, and intellectual resources will be needed to make the new rights (and rites) of citizenship meaningful?

Often these debates about civil society in Eastern Europe have played across the background of the public journalism discussion in the U.S., as when Carey (1991) writes about journalism and politics in the U.S. with the "age of glasnost" firmly in mind. But as Benjamin Barber (1998) has noted, civil society advocates are not all working toward the same ends. Citizens in emerging democracies want to build new social institutions in nations where the state may have repressed competing civic traditions. Citizens in the U.S. and Western Europe, by contrast, want to revive existing but moribund traditions (p. 14). Public journalism, as a version of civil society reform, follows the U.S.-European model, seeking ways to reverse the eclipse of democracy. Many other nations fall into Barber's first category. They struggle to create social, political, and economic infrastructure and traditions that developed nations can take for granted.

Barber's observation about the disparate civic needs of developed and developing nations applies as well to journalism. For example, where public journalism wants to counterbalance professional power, journalists elsewhere yearn to achieve more independence and autonomy (Weaver, 1998, p. 464; Splichal and Sparks, 1994). Despite declines in circulation or occasional dips in profitability, American newspapers do not struggle much with challenges faced by newspapers in other parts of the world—the multiplicity of languages, the scarcity of affordable newsprint, geographic impediments to distribution and news gathering, and threats of violence against reporters and newspaper offices. By comparison, the problems confronting public journalism in the U.S. simply seem more benign.

Yet public journalism strongly resembles many proposals for improving the press in developing nations. Shelton Gunaratnae (1998) has noted the resemblance between public and developmental journalism. He describes developmental journalism as a "triangular interaction of news, communication, and community" (p. 301). Supporters of developmental journalism have critiqued the limitations of traditional news values, encouraged styles of news that promote the community, argued the need for bottom-up communication, and urged journalists to take a more active role in support of social change (pp. 301-302). Gunaratnae also notes that the new skills needed for public journalism would also help developmental journalists—the ability to listen carefully, use polls and focus group techniques, organize public forums, and work with journalists in other kinds of news organizations (p. 311). Similarly, the New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO) has increasingly stressed models of coordinated civic action that public journalism proponents would likely find recognizable and congenial. Vincent, Nordenstreng, and Traber (1999) note that the early calls for restructuring international communication media have now led to "an alliance of grassroots organizations, women's groups, ecology networks, social activists, and committed academics" (p. ix). They describe the NWICO as evolving into "a network of networks based in civil society" (p. x).

**Perspective**

The public journalism experiments in the U.S. may be too idiosyncratically American to provide a model for developing nations. But surely the response to public journalism should offer a cautionary tale to all. Confronted with the mildest suggestions for reform—i.e., talking to readers, reflecting on one's professional biases, opening public discourse to a different set of voices, looking for ways to support the common life of a community, taking the intellectual heritage of democracy and press theory more seriously—the journalism profession in the U.S. has often responded with sarcasm and contempt. Despite their colleagues' ridicule, however, many U.S. journalists have been willing to experiment with public journalism as a way of making their work more meaningful. They have sought new ways to share the democratic aspirations of their fellow citizens. To be sure, the opponents of public journalism are appalled. A powerful profession smugly certain of its own importance and comfortable in its ways suddenly finds that the modest experiments of a few educators and editors have built into waves of reform. Those reforms may not go far or fast enough, but they should give us reason for hope. The work of civil society can continue, with or without the support of the dominant press.
Bibliography and Other References

Glasser (1999), Black (1997), and Gunaratne (1998) offer excellent detailed bibliographies of public journalism. Rosen (1999) contains no bibliography, but its footnotes contain a number of references not found in other sources, and the book authoritatively describes the sequence of events leading to the public journalism movement.


Afterword

By the Editor of Communication Research Trends

The press and other mass media can never meet all the information needs of any country; although they do meet them more successfully in some countries than in others. The need for dialogue between "the grassroots" and the "power elite" also is fully met rarely, if at all. Public or Civic Journalism is an effort to fill both these informative and dialogic needs. As Professor Pauly has indicated above, it is typically an American response, framed in the context of U.S. political and social institutions and using resources that may not be available in other countries.

Many of the needs elsewhere are nevertheless similar; and they are even more acute in places with repressive governments that acknowledge only top-down channels of communication. People in countries experiencing internal conflicts often encounter obstacles to the information they need to make the balanced decisions necessary to improve their condition. Barriers to dialogue between different ideological or ethnic groups often seem insurmountable. Vested interests may so control the mass media that only their side of the issue is presented to the public, and dissenting opinions are subtly ignored or disparaged.

In an overwhelmingly secularist society that recognizes only materialistic values religious perspectives tend to be among the "dissenting opinions" that are routinely suppressed or distorted in the media. Studies such as that by S. Robert Lichter, Stanley Rothman, and Linda Lichter (1986: 22) suggest that journalists are significantly less religious than the general population, at least in the United States. Subsequent research has tempered that conclusion somewhat but has not flatly contradicted it (e.g., Weaver and Willhoit, 1991; Dart and Allen 1993; see also Trends' own review of the literature: Biernatzi: 1995). Even if they are not openly hostile to religion and principle-based morality, they have tended either to stereotype religious behavior and institutions or to avoid mentioning them insofar as possible. Consequently, religious people have a special need for alternative channels to present their views to the public and to dialogue with others who might be open to dialogue. Public journalism creates opportunities for contact with the broader society that are impossible using religiously-controlled media alone — such as diocesan newspapers, or parish bulletins — that typically are read only by church members.

The electronic mass media can be expensive to use. Their use by religious organizations tends to be limited to those groups that are well funded. Since religious conservatism often seems to accompany affluence, mainstream religious views often are displaced by those that either are ultra-conservative or saleably simplistic — such as the water-down, feel-good theology of the typical televangelist. However, disinterest rather than cost seems to be a factor in some cases. Even relatively inexpensive mass media outlets, such as the public access channels of cable TV providers, which could be valuable tools at the local level, are utilized much more by Pentecostal or evangelistic churches than they are by mainline Protestant or Catholic bodies.

This issue of Communication Research Trends can serve to alert religious communicators to the potential value. Public Journalism and similar alternative media forms offer them for expanding and improving their dialogue with their local communities and the world.

— W. E. Biernatzi, SJ
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In the Preface, the author asks, “What exactly is value? And how, in future, will value be created?” He says that the book is intended to try to answer those questions “from a technological, social and organizational perspective” (p. ix). Without trying to predict how the culture of the 21st century will develop, Barnatt says he “seeks to explore how, in a consumer-driven world that constantly demands further progress and ‘profit,’ we may avoid becoming technology rich but value blind” (ibid. - his italics). He admits to being a “futurologist,” and rebuts the objection that “studies of the future are never right” by replying that “the real purpose of attempting to look ahead is to try and foresee new questions, rather than to concoct any particular ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answers” (ibid.).

In chapter one, “Prelude,” he cites as an example of being “technology rich but value blind” people who buy computers on the basis of hype, rather than to fulfill the tasks they have to perform. “Indeed, it has been estimated that ninety percent of the available options in many major programs get untouched by all but the most persistent techy freaks or computer professionals” (p. 3).

“Valueware” is where the hardware and software overlap to do what the computer user actually wants or needs to do. Surplus capabilities in hardware or software have no “value,” and therefore go to waste (p. 4). Capabilities of computers have increased many-fold in recent years, but the value their users derive from them may actually have decreased in the process of upgrading, since they have to pay for capabilities they do not need: “...perfectly satisfactory ‘old’ technology has been clutched from the consumer’s grasp in favour of a now obligatory multimedia jamboree” (p. 6).

The eight chapters that follow the “Prelude” are divided among three parts: Part I, “Convergence Forces”: “these comprise ‘networks and middleware’... flexible working patterns... and those push and pull factors that continue to draw more and more technology into human lives...” (p. 21). Part II, “Value Perspectives,” presents a typology of three possible value perspectives: “maximizing corporate success,” the “Net” itself as a habitat, or “the greatest ever info-nexus of humanity” (p. 21), and “the attitudes, skills and mindsets of those young people today who are destined to become the key workers, customers and value-shapers of century 21” (ibid.).

Admitting that the previous eight chapters “focused on the tools and human perspectives likely to shape future value creation, rather than on the nature of value itself,” he returns in the final chapter “to the actual definition of value,” in addition to highlighting his “set of interrelated hopes and fears” (p. 182 - italics his). Barnatt concludes that “that all measures of ‘value’ stem from the fulfillment of three basic yet co-dependent human needs..., our requirements or desires for survival, for creation, and to touch or be touched” (p. 182). He adds that “it can reasonably be claimed that all sources of future value creation will be attributable to overlaps of technological, human or organizational hardware and software that enable survival, creation, touch, or some combination thereof” (p. 187 - italics his).

One of the author’s hopes for the 21st century is “the emergence of a gentler mode of capitalism” (p. 194 - italics his), aided by an already-evident tendency to begin to “value interdependence over independence” (p. 196 - italics his).

The epilogue envisions what male-female interaction, as an example, might be like in a future that has become “technology rich but value blind” (pp. 203-204). A list of further reading is appended (pp. 205-206). — WEB


In 1995, France established a depository for the systematic preservation of audiovisuals, including television programs.
Now that such an archive exists, the questions arise of how to use it, what research methods to employ, how to interpret research findings, and how to reconcile findings from the perspectives of different academic disciplines — among other questions.

The Cerisy International Cultural Center organizes colloquia annually, bringing together “artists, researchers, teachers, students, but also a vast public interested in cultural exchanges” (p. 6). This volume contains twenty papers on television that emerged from those colloquia in 1998, plus the editors’ Preface. The papers approach the problems and promises of television research.

Part one, “An ever-changing television,” includes papers on the dual, “postmodern” and “archaic” character of television, which, however, actually defies periodization; asking when can we call an expression distinctively “televisional”; on the material and symbolic “terms” [dispositifs] of television; on theories about journalistic vs. other interpretations; on access to televisual sources in data bases, etc., and repetitions of citations in television.

Part two discusses types of programs such as political satire, cooking shows, drama, the environment on daily television, “the threshold of JT” (journaux télévisés), and whether one can understand history through television.

Part three turns to the audience, with papers on “interpretation” and “activation” as two key concepts of the practice of television reception, “the profane word” (i.e., broadcasting of commentaries by people who are not media professionals), characters in television series, and “the double body of the viewer.”

Part four, “To explain by television, to explain television,” first asks, “Can television explain?” then it discusses “television terms [dispositifs] and sociocognitive stakes [enjeux],” “the discourse of politicians on media scenes,” and finally “Rethinking the teaching of television.”

References follow each chapter. There is no index.

WEB


How should able-bodied people act around people who are physically disabled? What should they say? What should they do? This book attempts to answer those questions and provide related useful information.

Most of the research about communication and people with disabilities that has taken place over the last 25 years has been done by people who have a strong personal reason for doing it; either because they themselves are disabled or because they see how loved ones who are disabled are treated. As editor Teresa Thompson, of the University of Dayton, points out in her Introduction, “Almost everyone I know who studies this area has a strong personal reason for doing so” (p. 2). Her own brother, Steve, has cerebral palsy and is severely hard of hearing. Because he is her younger brother, she saw how differently he was treated by others. “Those kinds of experiences impress themselves on one’s heart—they influence the type of person you become and the types of things you study” (p. 3).

Editor Dawn Braithwaite, of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, grew up with a good friend who was deaf. In college, she took notes for and became friends with deaf students. After she began her doctoral studies, one of her cousins was in a car accident and became paraplegic. She was not sure how to act around him. “She thought about it a lot from a communication perspective and decided to do a project on communication with disabled people during her first year of doctoral study” (p. 3). Braithwaite delved into the subject and surprisingly found that most of the studies about disabled people were from a one-sided, able-bodied perspective. “She knew then what she wanted to study,” Thompson reveals. “Communication of people with disabilities from their own perspective” (p. 3).

Thompson and Braithwaite did some of their own research and found some related research that supported theirs. In the book, they present practical suggestions and new research findings, with the goal of promoting successful interactions between people that are disabled and those that are able. Although a growing body of research in this area now exists, the authors encourage more (p. 507).

Meant to be both a resource for those interested in communication and disability and a guide showing how disabled persons and others can successfully relate, the first part of the book presents ways able-bodied and disabled persons can interact. The second section talks about how organizational issues affect people with disabilities and communication. Disability and culture are the focus of the four chapters of the book’s third section. How media and technology affect disability are then emphasized. Information about how to relate to different disability cultures, such as spinal cord injury, HIV/AIDS, and adult dementia, is then presented in section five. The final section points to future research.

Chapter 2, “Society, Sexuality, and Disabled/Able-bodied Romantic Relationships,” by Sally A Nemeth, looks at how romantic relationships develop and are maintained between disabled and able-bodied persons. In the first part of this chapter, the socialization of children who are disabled is discussed.

Disabled children’s physical needs are almost always met, but their social, emotional, and sexual needs are not. They, along with others, see themselves as different. When a person who is disabled reaches adolescence, while other children start coming to terms with sexuality, disabled teens are left out. “Discussions about romance and sex are often avoided ... in a misguided attempt to shelter children with disabilities from emotional pain ...” (p. 39).

Girls with disabilities are not considered marriage
material. Disabled boys are not considered real men. Thus, when they become adults disabled women and men try to "pass" as able-bodied (p. 41). If a disabled person has an able-bodied partner, the able-bodied partner ironically tries to pass the disabled one as able-bodied, "to cloak disability to avoid undue attention, stigma by association, or judged as strange and/or suspect for dating someone with a disability" (p. 42). The able-bodied person doesn't want people to assume that there is something wrong with him/her for associating with a disabled person.

But disabled/able-bodied romantic relationships can be successful. It takes negotiation in some situations, but over time it becomes second nature. "Disabled/able-bodied couples satisfied with their relationships are likely to redefine roles and expectations, reframe dialectical tensions, and develop trust in their abilities to communicate effectively" (p. 46).

The book closes with the editors summarizing the research covered and provoking further research. "We look forward to future volumes and the attempt to answer more of the critical questions," they say. "Taking all this together, the future is bright and communication scholars have their work cut out for them!" they conclude (p. 515). — ADK


The editors begin their Preface by saying that the "ecology of images, media agency and culture" that characterizes the Indian media landscape has changed radically since 1991. This book is considered by them as "an attempt at understanding media not only a mode of communication or technology of dissemination, but also as a network connecting a range of activities of sense-making, including the constitution of community and the construction of social order" (pp. 6-7). They encourage the reader to regard the media "as an ecological system, establishing, carrying and marking out particular relationships between actors which change as the whole field of cultural production shifts in a socially and economically transforming India" (p. 7).

At the time of publication the two editors were completing PhD work, Brosius at the Europa-University Viadrina, Frankfurt, and Butcher at Macquarie University, Australia. Four of the seven other contributors are from India, one is German, one is British, and one works in both Chicago and London.

In the first chapter, "Introduction: Image Journeys," the editors adopt a scenario in which "images can be said to be in a journey, with their own 'careers' unfolding in the context of their movement through time (history), space (social, economic, political, symbolic spheres) and use (construction of meaning)" (p. 11). Using MTV, which since its introduction to India in 1996 had developed to have a current "playlist of 70 per cent Indian pop and Hindi film songs" (p. 20), as an example, they show how the audio-visual media "serve both localising and globalising strategies, contributing to an expansion, as well as a standardisation of cultural diversity" (p. 18).


An Appendix sketches India's demography and some facts and figures about media in India (pp. 308-310). References and select bibliography are collected at the end (pp. 311-325). Each chapter is introduced by a black-and-white photograph. Brief bios of the editors and contributors are supplied, as is an Index. — WEB


The editors begin their Introduction by noting that one major obstacle to scientific progress is that important findings of researchers who publish in languages other than English often are not available to scholars outside their own countries. The editors say that, in reviewing papers in English for international conferences and British and American journals, "time and again we come across manuscripts that would very much benefit from knowledge of existing German research. Moreover, the integration of findings from Germany could also further international comparisons, thus allowing inferences about cross-national generalizations" (p. 1). This yearbook is intended to help break down this language barrier, to some degree, and to facilitate the exchange between German scholars and their international counterparts" (p. 2).

The Introduction sketches "the historical roots and the current state of communication research in Germany" and provides context for the subsequent chapters (p. 2). Communication research in Germany dates to the early 20th century, with the country's first university department of communication, the Institut für Zeitungswissenschaft, inaugurated by the University of Leipzig in 1916 (p. 2).

The eleven chapters (counting the Introduction) review research on nonverbal communication, mass media and elections, media economics, individual patterns of media use, computer-mediated communication, journalism, public relations, children and the media, media and gender, and...
agenda setting.

Contributors, among them some of Germany's leading communication scholars, are, besides Brosius and Holtz-Bacha, Hans Mathias Kepplinger, Manfred Knoche, Uwe Hasebrink, Klaus Beck, Wolfgang Donsbach, Günter Bentele, Michael Charlton, Paul Lühr, Johanna Dorer, Elisabeth Klaus, Patrick Rössler, and Wolfgang Eichhorn.

Donsbach's overview of journalism research (chapter 7) notes how journalism studies, which formed the earliest specialization within German communication studies, has tried to develop a systematic approach to the education of journalists and the practice of journalism, a "rapidly growing field in which many theories and many methodologies are competing" (p. 175).

Charlton and Lühr report that "the relatively good support for research into children's use of mass media has produced a large number of outstanding scientific studies in the comparatively brief period covered by this overview" (p. 240).

The editors plan to publish this yearbook bi-annually. "Future volumes will deal with those aspects of communication research that could not be covered in the first volume" (pp. 5-6).

References follow each chapter. There is no index.

---


The topic for the October, 1998, ITEST workshop was chosen by the board of directors of ITEST, the Institute for Theological Encounter with Science and Technology, "because the family represents in a particularly neuralgic manner one of the major areas of contention between faith and science and technology" (p. i). Because a large number of handbooks about the family already are available, the discussions at the workshop were kept on a more theoretical, theological, and philosophical level, where "real progress" could be made in understanding the basic issues of Christian marriage and family (ibid.).

Papers include discussions of "the future of the family in the light of its past," speculation about families in the 21st century, "Convergence of Trinitarian mutuality and technological truth," and "Sane sex" (in "our misunderstanding of marriage" [p. 66]). The four position papers were written by Lutheran and Catholic theologians, a social worker, and a philosopher.

The last half of the book reports on the workshop's six discussion sessions.

---


This is the second in a developing annual series, the "Eurofiction Report," to provide "systematically documented information on the television industry in the major European countries," as the editor puts it in her preface (p. vii). In addition to the five countries that originally collaborated in the project — Italy, France, Germany, Spain, and the United Kingdom — this second report adds two new participants: Russia and Switzerland (ibid.). It covers "4,771 hours of first run fiction broadcast during 1997" (up 16 per cent compared to 1996) "over the 31 major terrestrial and national networks..." in the first five countries plus the "two guest countries" (p. xv).

Part one, after a brief preliminary chapter on "methodology" (pp. 3-5), by Giovanni Bechelloni, President of Fondazione Hypercampa, presents a comparative overview by the editor. She notes that, while a few fictional programs were remarkably successful internationally, within Europe, "for the time being, national European audiences still favour domestic products. This trend is not accidental, but rooted in the principles which govern television consumption — cultural proximity and a sense of place" (pp. 8-9). Both audiences and producers seemed satisfied with the domestic television programming broadcast in 1997 — a reaction different from that of previous years (p. 9). Except for Germany, the other countries showed a marked preference for rural and small town settings for their television dramas, differing from the urban settings more favored in the United States (p. 25).

Chapters 2 through 6, respectively, cover the five founding countries of the project, while briefer chapters are then devoted to Russia and Switzerland.

Russian TV depended heavily on theatrical films in 1997, with made-for-television films considered "a luxury" (p. 112), but local serial production had shown some signs of revival after a period that had been dominated by Latin American telenovelas, US serials and feature movies, and older Russian classics (p. 112). The competitive ability of newer Russian feature films appears to be increasing (p. 116).

Switzerland's linguistic diversity helps make the market for domestic fiction "very difficult" (p. 120). Production in German, French, and Italian regions is independent from each other; and co-productions with foreign collaborators were "nearly four times" as common as entirely "homegrown" productions (pp. 123-124). The television industries in the other countries tended to be reluctant to undertake co-productions, however, deeming them "more complex and trickier than had been expected" (p. xviii).

Part two is a "Programme Index" consisting of 120 profiles of fiction programs broadcast in the seven countries in 1997. "Each programme profile is divided into two sections: Section One contains technical specifications and credits, while Section Two gives a brief synopsis of the programme" (p. 127). The criteria for selection were flexible: "Therefore, in addition to the top 'hits' of the year, some indexes may
include entries for programmes which created fads or niche markets, shows garnering acclaim from the critics, or even certain ‘interesting’ flops” (ibid.).

An appendix describes the Eurofiction Project. There is no index.

--- WEB


This book is “the first inclusive study of media development in Israel” and is what the author of the Foreword, Itzhak Galnoor, sees as “a most valuable contribution to all who approach this fascinating subject” (p. ix).

The book asks: How do the Israeli media affect the nation’s society? and, is the relationship of media and society in the new state negative, positive, or both simultaneously?

Dan Caspi, who received his PhD from the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and is now Professor in Communication Studies in the Open University of Israel, recently has become known for his opposition to the Israeli media’s control of politics and vice-versa. He has served in a number of public roles and written other books on media and politics.

Yahiel Limor is a senior teacher in the Department of Communication at Tel Aviv University. Before becoming a teacher, Limor had many media positions. He does much research on the Israeli media and media ethics and has co-authored another book on the media.

Caspi and Limor paint precise pictures of Israeli media, and they raise some important questions about their future and how they will be affected by worldwide media trends. They maintain that Israel follows its own media model, which is neither authoritarian nor “conformed to the social responsibility model,” but a mixture of the two: “Social responsibility is perceived as part of democratic norms and information flow is indeed free” (p. xv). But some of the authoritarian model remains. The Israel Broadcasting Authority (IBA), for example, listens and answers to the government. What are seen as “hostile” (p. xv) media are still controlled, and some Israeli people believe they should be.

So, should the media in Israel change? Galnoor believes that “the existing arrangements that enable informal openness and quasi-secrecy should be replaced by a freedom of information law that stipulates restrictions preventing publication of information that could affect vital public interests adversely, but above all recognizes the democratic principle of the right to know” (p. xix).

Eight general sections relate Israeli mass media’s history and political status, from an introductory section on how the mass media act as mediators to a closing section on what the 21st century holds for them.

The fourth section, “Mass Communications and Social Institutions: The Israeli Mixed Model,” starts by recognizing the fact that in Israel “the built-in need for restraint of power bases may clash with such sacrosanct principles as freedom of expression, freedom of the press, or the public’s right to know” (p. 169). There is a clash in the new state of Israel between the democratic freedom of the media and governmental control of public information.

The first topic discussed in this section is the combination of two media theories: the authoritarian and the social responsibility theories. A “mixed model” seems to describe the relationship between media and politics. “The mixed model, the result of extended bargaining over the rules of the game between the two institutions, combines principles of social responsibility, especially in the normative sphere, with remnants of the authoritarian conception...” (p. 172). The question still remains as to whether the political or the communications establishments initiated such a pattern.

The next question asked in this chapter is: Who controls the media? “Any attempt to control the media is perceived ... as a violation of the spirit of social responsibility” (p. 178). However, there are a number of controlling factors, such as owners, the public, and/or advertisers, to name a few.

But how do they control the media? The most popular control method is pressure, pressure that comes with either rewards or sanctions. But the media do have their own power, even when under pressure. The new Israel is, after all, a democracy. “The status of the media institution was and remains one of the most significant tests of Israeli democracy” (p. 187). Yet societal pressure still exists within Israeli media. But Israel is not the only democracy that has some sort of friction between politics and the media.

References, and author and subject indexes close the book.

--- ADK


“Universal service” as a public policy in telecommunications has generated increasing debate in recent years, but even its meaning has been a point of controversy (p. xiii). In the United States, universal service policy was first codified by Congress only in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, underlining the point made by Cherry and Wildman in chapter 1, that such policies “are most immediately, products of government” (p. 3). The same two authors comment that rapidly changing political and technological circumstances make stable definitions of universal public service policy and its scope difficult to establish (p. 3).

“Universal public service is a sociopolitical construct...” (p. 6), and, as Harriet Sawhney and Krishna Jayakar recognize, our conceptualization of it depends on what they call, in chapter 2, a “migration of metaphors” through the

The book closes with acknowledgments and a list of presenters and panelists. There is no index. — WEB


To what degree, if any, does the audience control the media? Curran cites "key pioneers of the new audience research," such as David Morley and Len Ang, as fueling "a growing recognition that audience activity should not be equated with audience control" (p. 9). Many ways to look at media organizations have appeared over the years, arising first out of organizational sociology, and soon becoming somewhat hardened into a tradition that favored an emphasis on media production. Later, with the rise of cultural studies, the media came to be seen primarily as cultural products. "Thus, the media are viewed as an index of shared values in the 'cultural-indicator' approach... as a conduit of dominant ideologies, in a traditional Marxist perspective... and as an extension of the power structure in the radical-structuralist tradition..." (p. 10).

Curran sees no conflict, and in fact a potential complementarity between the two approaches, and "this book deliberately makes space for both media-centric and sociocentric perspectives in order to promote a widescreen approach to the study of the media" (p. 11).

The first part of the book, "Overview," presents the central issues of media in general, the second, "Media as Industry," looks at them as businesses in and of themselves, the third, "Media as Battlefield," looks at media in relation to cultural conflicts, and the fourth, "Media as Cultural Product," concludes the book with four papers that try to integrate the two perspectives to cast light on the ways in which media are socially produced. The editor feels that some recent tendencies in media studies have given rise to "a gathering movement of affirmation," which needs to be questioned, at least in its broad thrust (p. 11).

The book revolves around three basic arguments: 1) the media are affected by the norms of their society, 2) they are products of how their society functions, or 3) they are simply a product of their society’s culture. Some of the papers conflict to a degree with others. But at the same time these opposing
views are not strident, because of the discussions all of the contributors have had with each other. Furthermore, “every contributor to this book (apart from the editor) is or has been a student in the Department of Media and Communications, Goldsmiths College, University of London,” giving them a certain common perspective not seen in a similar venture, according to the editor, “since the brilliant, innovative publications of the students at Birmingham University in the 1970s and early 1980s” (p. 14).

In his chapter on “megamusicals,” which begins the second section, on media as industry, Jonathan Burston argues that live-theatrical production has become a global cultural industry in the course of the past two decades. Megamusicals, as opposed to just really big musicals, are an unprecedentedly large global business. They are seen all over the world, must be able to be accepted by the different cultures to which they play, and demand a lot of monetary support. Burston, a Visiting Scholar in the Department of Culture and Communication at New York University, looks at the commercial, production-based, and aesthetic implications of this global-industrial transformation. He then views the final product and concludes that “We need to consider... the ethical as well as the aesthetic implications of the coming era of the synthesizer in cinematic, televisual and even live-theatrical production” (p. 81). He advises everyone to expect definite and ongoing changes in live theater, as even it is caught up in the rising tide of globalization.

The opening chapter in the section on “Media as Battlefield” considers how the killing of Brazilian street children became an issue in a rising “international public sphere.” Another chapter in that section deals with “new unionism” in Britain as an illustration of the relation between “public-relations campaigning and news production,” while another looks at the transformation of the periodical Marxism Today as an example of “mainstreaming the margins.”

In their considerations of the “media as cultural product,” in the final section, authors discuss literary editors, the recording industry, “media, cultural identity and the state” in Hong Kong, and an introduction to the study of “the direct interactions between media organisations and non-media people as processes of sociological interest in their own right” (p. 273).

— ADK


Melvin L. DeFleur, in his Foreword, says that this “book focuses on much more than how global media corporations are organized and how they are changing. It also discusses the nature of their goals, how they are controlled, controversies over their assumed power, and the implications of their continued growth for the future” (p. xi).

Many changes have occurred recently in the world’s mass media, including mergers of national and transnational media corporations and the extension of the latter’s influence to a larger and larger number of countries. The implications of this for monopolistic control and both economic and political power are disturbing to many (or probably “most”) scholarly critics and to many of the general public. The media industry’s complexity makes it especially difficult to understand and raises suspicions about what that complexity might conceal.

In his Introduction, Demers notes that much of the alarm about media globalization has come from Neo-Marxist critics, and that they have many good arguments. “On the other hand, though, a great deal of scientific research fails to support many of the more radical leftist claims, and the citizen who seeks to be fully informed will have a difficult time finding summaries of that research in the popular press” (p. xxiii). For their part, fault also lies with “the proponents of media globalization, who largely consist of economists and corporate executives” (ibid.). Placing their trust in a naive “faith that the market will produce the most socially responsible media system,” they have failed to respond adequately to the criticism, and consequently have left the public and policy makers with “virtually no access to more balanced accounts of the organizational changes taking place in the communications industry” (ibid.).

Chapter one, “The Good, the Bad, and the Global,” reviews the arguments, pro and con, at the extremes of the debate, but concludes that “neither of these perspectives is completely right or wrong” (p. 6). Demers says that “both critics and proponents of global media have misunderstood the trend. Global media like Disney are agents of social control... But... global media also have a greater capacity than nonglobal or entrepreneurial media to generate content that is critical of traditional authorities and ways of doing things” (p. 7).

Subsequent chapters go on to describe “how the world is shrinking,” to sketch in summary the major corporations that comprise “the global media playing field,” to pose the “paradox of capitalism,” to show one side of that paradox typified as “the global villagers” and the other side as it is described by “the global media critics.”

In chapter seven, he asks, “Are the critics right?” and suggests that an increase in the diversity of published criticism of the media itself contradicts the critics’ claims of increasing homogenization of ideas due to corporate influence. Chapter eight discusses “global media and social control,” and chapter nine views global media’s role in promoting social change.

Chapter ten shifts to “the global managerial revolution, addressing the hypothesis “that knowledge, rather than capital, is becoming the key source of power in society” (p. 138).

Chapter eleven reviews the trends that will shape “global media in the 21st century,” and concludes that, while supporting the dominant values and institutions of elites, the corporate media also have a greater capacity than earlier media to criticize them (p. 173).

An Appendix applies Max Weber’s concept of “corporate forms of organization” to the global media. End notes, by
chapter, embody bibliographic references. — WEB


Although we have entered the 21st century, disagreements concerning mass media education remain the same as they have for decades, according to Dickson. He says that some of mass media education's "most pressing challenges are related to changes in curriculum because of the evolution of the media industries and new technologies" (p. vii). How should mass media education be arranged? Should it be studied alone or with other related fields? Is there still a reason for it? Dickson describes the purpose of this book as being, "to give the reader ... some understanding of how media-related education has evolved as well as the nature of the debate that threatens to cause the disintegration of mass media education into separate academic fields" (p. vii). Dickson wants to sketch mass media education's past to help construct its serviceable future.

The author has been a professor of journalism and mass media at Southwest Missouri State University since 1987. His PhD is from Oklahoma State University, and he has had professional experience as a wire service editor, a reporter, and in editorial positions on both daily and weekly newspapers, as well as authoring and contributing to several books and other publications.

In this book's ten chapters, Dickson traces the founding of mass media education, as it evolved out of "journalism education," discusses its development, and presents some visions of its future. He recognizes the fact that mass media education is changing and wants the book to provide some historical reference to assist in its next stage of development.

In Chapter 9, "Questions Facing Mass Media Education," Dickson gives his responses to 33 questions still facing media educators today, such as, How does the development and growth of the Internet affect mass media education? (p. 180). He thinks that, like former technological advances such as radio and television, the Internet will provide an opportunity for media education to grow. How strong the Internet's effects will be remains to be seen. Dickson argues that "it seems likely that the Internet will become a major component of the media industries and will change them considerably ..." (p. 180).

In the final chapter, Dickson presents some "Visions of Mass Media Education" from 19 mass media educators. They were asked two questions: "What do you see as the major issues facing media-related education at the end of the 20th century? What direction do you think media-related education should take in the first decade of the 21st century?" (p. 182). Respondents included such representative media educators as Maureen Beasley, professor of journalism at the University of Maryland, and David H. Weaver, the Roy W. Howard Professor in Journalism and Mass Communication Research in the School of Journalism at Indiana University - Bloomington, giving their opinions as to how mass media education should be redefined in the midst of a communications revolution.

An appendix containing "Major Reports/ Studies," extensive references, and author and subject indexes follow. A summary of Dickson's professional background and qualifications closes the book. — ADK


The editors note in their Preface that more than 300 bills concerning the Internet were being considered by the U.S. Congress in 1998, and they comment that "there is something about the process of communication that attracts administrative and regulatory zealots" (p. vii) — an attraction seemingly amplified by the incredible complexity of the topic. It has even been suggested that the Internet may have been invented precisely "in order to keep legislators, judges, and lawyers busy for the next several decades" (ibid.). Internationally, "the complexity is compounded by global attempts to regulate the Internet," with the recent imposition of strict privacy laws by the European Union adding a major additional factor to the mix (p. viii).

In Chapter 1, "Legal Geography: The Borders of Cyberlaw Introduction," the two editors present some of the basic concepts entering into both the technical and legal aspects of cyberspace regulation, with special attention to the problems of jurisdiction. They say that the book's chapters "have been gathered to offer historical perspective, current law, and the yardsticks that will shape future laws and judicial interpretations in the development of a body of cyberlaw." (p. 16).

Part I, "Overview," consists of chapters on the intersection of regulatory principles and technology. "Frontiers and legal landscapes, as safety valves open and close," "freedom and liability in cyberspace," and "economics and the Internet" as "the Information Superhighway becomes a toll road." (p. 16).

Part 2, "Communications Decency Act," starts with some "Editors' Comments," then has chapters on "first amendment challenges to restrictions on Internet expression," "...the need for innovation in evaluating restrictions of cyberspace," "history and decency," and "regulation of indecency in electronic communication."

The five chapters of Part 3, "Property Interests," are on "copyright in a digital world," "...property rights and reproduction in the world of cyberspace," "rights of attribution and integrity in online communication," "intellectual property rights and the construction of emergent electronic social spaces," and "selling on, not out, the Internet."

Part 4, "Personal Liabilities," also has five chapters, on
"defamatory speech on computer bulletin boards," "expectations of privacy," "junk e-mail," "ethical issues for a virtual self," and "ethical and legal issues in e-mail therapy.

The authors of this latter chapter, on psychological and psychiatric counseling via the Internet, say that while it offers attractions to therapists and counselees, alike, it also poses huge problems and dangers, among them questions of confidentiality, responsibility, and the ability of the patient to assess the competence of the therapist (pp. 399-418).

Drucker and Gumert teach at Hofstra University and Queens College of the City University of New York, respectively, but the backgrounds and credentials of the other authors are not described. There are author and subject indexes and an index of cases.

--- WEB ---


Society embodies life, and life is all about communication. Everyone, everything, everywhere is affected by communication at all times. But what exactly is communication, and what does it future hold? This book attempts to answer those questions. According to the author, "The plan of this book is to begin with some comment about the status of communication theory, and then move to the explanatory core of communication, namely, medium theory, discourse, and structuring processes" (p. xiii).

In six chapters, Ellis first discusses the construction of communication theory, then narrows his focus to address "medium theory" — a terrain he finds littered with the carcasses of "a great many models and theories of communication...some of them quite limited or minimally useful" (p. 25). The third chapter is on discourse, which binds society together; and the fourth deals with the principles of interdependence that bring about the coalescence of the various elements that organize to form the structures of society.

Chapter 5, "Ethnicity and Its Shadow," covers an abstract sociological level of communication: the issue of ethnicity. Ellis does not pinpoint one ethnic group, yet highlights African Americans. He explains that he "does focus a little more on African Americans as an ethnic group, only because of the importance and interest in the issues and problems" (p. 140). Throughout the chapter, Ellis recognizes that ethnic structure and communication are closely related. Although he sees ethnicity as very influential to communication, he also sees it as impressionable. "It can be fixed and solid in the minds of some and responsible for rigid ideas; for others ethnicity is perpetually being fused and negotiated" (p. 174).

In his final chapter, "Class: The Presence That Dare Not Speak Its Name," Ellis tries to do the same thing for social class ("America's dirty little secret" [p. 173]) that he did for ethnicity, because class is a primary sociological issue that has not been fully addressed in communication. Ellis gives his definition of the term "class," tries to show how someone becomes a member of a certain class, and then argues that "culture is...deeply implicated in class reproduction and maintenance" (p. 206). There have been and always will be stratified societies, stratifications that are fed by different forms of communication.

References and author and subject indexes close the book.

--- ADK ---


The author says that in the first edition of this book he "outlined basic issues in the relation between language and communication," applying elementary concepts in linguistics to interaction processes. The new edition updates that material and "adds many topics that were not included in the first edition" (p. ix). As the back cover summary describes the contents, the book includes "material on the biological bases of language...models of the mind and information processing...discussions of semantics and the creation of new words...conversation analysis with practical applications...[and] a chapter on sociolinguistics, including language and groups, dialects, and personal styles" (back cover).

Ellis says that "communication is a misunderstood discipline," often focused on the means of communication and neglecting the more central point: that all messages use symbols to establish meaning (pp. ix-x).

Parts of different chapters deal with the form of language: rules and structures for organizing and using it. Sections of chapters 4-8 pertain to the strategic use of language, which "focuses on how communication is used to achieve a purpose or goal" (p. x). The author says that the title of the book was intended to reflect "the presentation of topics in the book," and does not "imply that language is prior to communication or can be separated from it" (p. x).

In discussing linguistic relativity, in chapter 4, "Meaning," Ellis says that "words do not relate directly to the world, but flow through our minds. This means that words are subject to all of the conditions of the mind, including a speaker's attitudes and culture" (p. 62). Societies invent or adopt the words they need for their purposes. "Over time, a language evolves toward more efficient and specialized expressions, but this does not mean that speakers of another language are incapable of understanding these concepts" (p. 64).

Chapter 8, "Sociolinguistics and Communication," stresses that "It is simply not possible to study language and communication without considering the impact on society," and that language scholars can help ameliorate social tensions that arise due to different modes of expression by different groups in society (p. 156).

References, combined at the end, constitute a bibliography.

Walter J. Ong, SJ, has been widely regarded as, in the words of Rabbi Jacob Neusner, a "leading philosopher of culture of our century, a mighty figure in the inquiry into the human condition in the social order." Father Ong, University Professor Emeritus at Saint Louis University, is perhaps best known for his popular book, Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word (1982). The work that grew out of his Harvard dissertation, Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue, explores the thought and influence of the sixteenth century Calvinist logician and educator, Peter Ramus. Farrell says that the book on Ramus "should be carefully studied by scholars in any field who, in the words of [T. K.] Scott, want to understand where the modern mind came from" (p. 77). Many of Ong's other works continue his probing of the borderlines between oral, written, print, and electronic forms of communication. Ong's latest book, a collection of writings ranging over his entire career, is reviewed below (under "Ong"); and a fifth volume in that same series is in preparation.

Father Ong's relationship with the Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture, publishers of Communication Research Trends, has been enduring and close from its earliest years. As Father Robert A. White, SJ, points out, in his Introduction, Ong even proposed the Centre's name (p. xviii).

Thomas J. Farrell, of the Department of Composition, University of Minnesota-Duluth, provides, in Chapter 1, a prologue to and overview of Ong's work. Chapter 2 sketches Ong's life, education, professional appointments, and honors. Chapters 3 through 8 survey eleven of his books in roughly chronological order. Chapter 9 is a concluding assessment of Ong's intellectual contributions. The extensive bibliography (pp. 229-287) includes most of Ong's own works, works about him, and works of thinkers such as E. A. Havelock, Marshall McLuhan, and others with whom Ong has interacted or who influenced him, and/or have been influenced by him, and even doctoral dissertations and other writings by his students.

Ong's interaction with the thought of Martin Buber is evident to Farrell, particularly in his use of the word "presence," resonating as it does with Buber's "I and Thou." Farrell remarks that "most people probably will not understand Ong's various contributions to working out an adequate sense of communication and literary history unless they understand Buber." And he goes on to add that, "To understand Buber, people may need to be deeply attuned to the Hebrew Bible" (p. 8).

Ong's early association with Marshall McLuhan, at Saint Louis University in the 1940s, was the foundation for the admiration he voiced for McLuhan, in 1981, as "a superb teacher who could stir people's minds. Even those who found themselves baffled or exasperated generally found themselves changed". Farrell cites this quotation as illustrating Ong's own vision of teaching, writing and lecturing. "His goal is to catalyze and encourage thinking" (p. 195).

The endnotes (pp. 197-228), like the bibliography mentioned above, are extensive, as is the index (pp. 289-309).


The editors remark in their Preface that ambiguity about what is true is so ubiquitous in science "that one could define scientific expertise not so much in terms of accumulation of knowledge but by the skill of recognizing and managing uncertainty" (p. vii). This inherent uncertainty of scientific knowledge poses a considerable difficulty for journalists who try to report on science. This book is intended to explore the nature and construction of scientific uncertainty and to explore "the actions and reactions that result when journalists report about scientific uncertainty" (ibid.). Since another goal of the editors was to "look closely at the actors involved in the scientific communication process," the differing viewpoints of natural, physical, and social scientists, as well as science writers and editors were included in the discussions at the 1996 annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science that were the sources for the volume.

Three parts make up the book: 1) "Interpreting Uncertainty," 2) "Science in the Public Arena," and 3) "Beyond the Basics."

Part one has chapters dealing, respectively, with scientists' representations of uncertainty, how journalists deal with scientific uncertainty, public responses to uncertainty, and "Scientists, Journalists, and the Meaning of Uncertainty," followed by a report on a panel discussion on "Interpreting Uncertainty," involving an editor, a medical journalist, and a climatologist.

Part two presents more concrete cases on "popular beliefs, media, and biotechnology," "the never-ending story of dioxin," "an uncertain social contract: the case of human resources for science," and "reporting on the changing science of human behavior," followed by a report on deliberations of a panel on science in the public arena consisting of an environmental writer, a biologist (Director of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's National Center for Environmental Assessment), and a professor of urban and environmental policy.

The chapters in part three are on: "The importance of understanding audiences," "effective explanation of uncertain
and complex science,” and “using systematic thinking to choose and evaluate evidence.” The subsequent round table discussion involved the Director of the National Science Foundation, a science and medical producer for the National Broadcasting Company,” a social scientist, two science editors, and a Nobel Prize winner in chemistry. — WEB


Although social and behavioral scientists have been interested in human communication processes for a century or more, the study of communication has been shaped into a separate discipline only since the end of the Second World War. That war and the subsequent persistence of near-war time levels of defense preparedness and military spending have inevitably influenced the development of the discipline of communication studies, as they have other social sciences, psychology, economics, and the natural sciences.

The author’s purpose in writing the book is described in his Preface as follows:

This book is a critical examination of the origins of mass communications research from the perspective of an educational historian ... the book does attempt to document, contextualize, and interpret the dominant expressions of this field during the time in which it became rooted in U.S. academic life, and tries to give articulation to the larger historical forces that gave the field of communications research its fundamental purposes. (p. ix)

His is a critical approach, focusing on “troubling foundational questions about the origins of the field,” that he feels have been neglected by more traditional historians of communication, who tend “to simply accept the dominant values and practices...” (p. ix).

Glander feels that the time is ripe to review the field, since it was “institutionalized as a legitimate field of study during the Cold War ... [and] Now that the Cold War is over ... the social climate that created and sustained this research would also appear to be over” (p. xiii).

Chapter 1 looks back before World War II, to review the “propaganda debate between the wars.” It was a period during which the growing importance of electronic mass media became increasingly evident concurrently with growing conflict among ideological movements, each striving to win adherents. Propaganda organs developed during the First World War became highly controversial at the same time that they demonstrated the power a developed propaganda machine could wield domestically, as well as in foreign relations.

Chapter 2, “Communication Research Comes of Age,” deals with the work of communication researchers for the U.S. war effort during the Second World War, in support of such propaganda agencies as the Office of War Information (OWI), on the domestic front, and the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), overseas. The author documents the carry-over of those activities into the postwar period, noting that “like the OWI, the OSS was liquidated in name only when World War II ended,” with OSS functions first moving to the State
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Subsequent chapters discuss, as their titles say, "The Social Ideas of American Mass Communication Experts" (ch. 3), "Paul F. Lazarsfeld and the Bureau of Applied Social Research" (ch. 4), "Wilbur Schramm and the founding of Communication Study" (ch. 5), and, penultimately, "The Universe of discourse in which We Grew Up" (ch. 6).

In his "Conclusion" (ch. 7), Glander rounds out his argument that while communication researchers had become recognized experts on the use of the media — chiefly television — in education and its effects on children, they were unable to view television as the propaganda instrument that it was (p. 203). "Tantamount to having the fox guard the chicken coop, Lazarsfeld and Schramm successfully deflected much of the criticism of television that was taking shape in the 1950s and early 1960s" (p. 205). At the same time, their arguments that "research was not available to either prove or disprove" claims of negative effects were used to urge more funding for research (ibid.).

Following C. Wright Mills, Glander sees a "mass society" with negative implications for healthy community living, emerging from "the historical transformation of communication" (p. 186). Future research might raise questions about the impact "mass communications researchers had on popular conceptions of democracy and education in the postwar period" (p. 212). That reevaluation might include asking how the ideological needs of the Cold War distorted those conceptions and contributed "to our current social predicament" (ibid.).

A substantial bibliography is included (pp. 219-232).

The editors begin their introduction by noting that while "citizen participation in the planning of national development efforts" has been redefined and reemphasized in new forms while undergoing periods of greater and lesser interest in recent decades, the idea itself is enduring. It first attained serious attention from development researchers during the period of dominance of the "modernization" paradigm, after World War II, but it outlasted modernization theory to come more into its own as dialogic processes have come to enjoy increasing theoretical prominence (pp. 1-2).

This book is intended to identify and explore the relevance to development participation research of many of the major social theories of the 1990s, which have largely "been produced in studies of social conditions in the developed north" (p. 4). The editors caution that their "contributors do not all agree on a single definition of participation or of PR [participatory research]." But they go on to stress that the writers "do share a common interest in advancing a theoretical, as well as practical understanding of participatory communication" (pp. 4-5).

Part one of the book "identifies contexts in which participation should be treated." In it, emphasis is placed on "matters overlooked in much previous writing," such as "the discourse of development generally," "how the terms of a discourse define its terrain," and the effect of mass media on the close and complex relation among local, national, and global communication patterns (pp. 5-6).

Part two focuses on assumptions underlying methods and theories employed in the study of development." One question addressed by Servaes and Randy Arnst in chapter 4 is, "Why have the poor always been researched, described and interpreted by the rich and educated, never by themselves?" (P.

Stewart Hoover says at the beginning of his Introductory chapter, “This is a book about change in the communicative order. It’s project is to account for the extent to which the means of communication have come to be both problematic and naturalized in the same historical moment” (p. 1). While recent global technological advancements make it seem that world communication should be at its finest, reality steps in to void that promise. Over the past few years, communication media have greatly advanced, starting with the development of television in the early 1950s. While technological advances have not served communication alone, their effects on communication cannot be overstated.

Each of us learns about and is exposed to communication differently, because of different surroundings and experiences. The effect of the different media in shaping our environment has great consequences for us, who live in that environment. The book is concerned with this human impact, from the “critical humanistic perspectives” of its title, where “humanistic,” in the editors’ definition, means whatever is good for human beings, in contrast to those influences that are dehumanizing. They add that “true values can only be those that recognize the worth and integrity of all human beings” (p. viii).

But what is communication all about? Hoover notes that although it has been defined in many ways, the meaning of communication always depends on certain original premises. “Primary among these conditions was the widespread sense that communication — both mediated and interpersonal — is a natural, tacit practice” (p. 4). Every person learns to communicate in their given environment. Thus communication is also commonplace, but deceptively so. It is that commonness that led one observer to trivialize the communicative tool of television as “nothing more than a kitchen appliance” (p. 5). But what “kitchen appliance” can have such a sweeping impact on human behavior, thought, and culture?

Some argue that some forms of communication, such as mass media, are seen as intrinsically profitable. Despite original thoughts on communication and its purposes, technological access to communication services is now seen as necessary for one to function in today’s world. Communication is not only necessary but also a source of power, both political and economic. We have come to a point where “we now understand nearly all communication practices to be commodities” (p. 6).

But the contributors to this book are unwilling to admit that communication is only a commodity. They put forth some “improper opinions,” advocating a reconstruction of normative discourse, in opposition to the veiled but insidious normativity of commodification. “Each addresses a different element of the seemingly inexorable autonomy of the global market in communications” (p. 6). Some of the opinions contrast with others in the book. James Halloran is unhappy
with the "postmodern," for example, while Stanley Deetz and E. Graham McKinley are willing to accept a nuanced reading of it, according to Hoover. But Hoover feels that all are in total agreement about certain essentials, while emphasizing different facets. For example, Deetz and McKinley stress commitment, while Shalini Venturelli proposes a new citizenship; Halloran and Cees J. Hamelink call for responsibility and accountability, while Kevin Kersten and Paul Soukup emphasize the need for judgment (ibid.). "Each [paper] in its own way works to establish and use a language through which we can look at emerging communications problems. Through their arguments, we can see the workings of a nomenclature that might lead us to a more substantive purchase on contemporary issues — a lexicon that no longer trivializes communications," according to Hoover (p. 10). He sees them as a call to action: private, political, and scholarly — unmet needs exist at all three levels (ibid.).

The papers, except for the specially commissioned contributions of Hoover and Venturelli, were originally delivered at the meeting of the International Communication Association in 1992, but have been revised for publication. The session at which they were delivered was organized by the Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture, of which Kersten was Executive Director, at that time, and Biermatzi was and remains Research Director and Editor of the Centre's journal, Communication Research Trends.

In their papers, Halloran directly addresses the relationship of values to communication research. Deetz and McKinley discuss ethical imperatives and responsibilities that bear on corporations, the media industry and society, and Venturelli probes the relationship between political justice and civil society in the information age. Kersten relates human values to the aesthetics of a television program, while Soukup asks, frankly, "What does the Bible have to do with mass media?" and proceeds to draw out the relationships between communication studies, values, and theological reflection. Finally, Hamelink notes that the assessment of mass media performance often fails to take into consideration the media's largest client community: "their publics, the people" (p. 139). Reviewing international human rights law as it has been expressed in a large number of agreements and documents, Hamelink is forced to conclude that,

we have to establish that there is a disquietingly big gap between the standards of international human rights law and the actual performance of the mass media. This puts on the agenda of the communication research community the question of how norm and reality of media can be brought more in line with each other" (p. 160).

Halloran, from the University of Leicester, and Hamelink, of the University of Amsterdam, both are former presidents of the International Association for Media and Communication Research (then called the International Association for Mass Communication Research). The other authors and the two editors are based in the United States. Deetz is a past-president of the International Communication Association.

— ADK


During the past four decades presidential election campaign debates in the United States have gradually come to assume a central role in the electoral process. In his Preface, Kraus, professor of communication at Cleveland State University, says that this second edition of the book was needed because of the many developments in the practice since the appearance of the first edition, in 1988:

Since that edition appeared, several important changes in the administration of the debates have influenced the practice, if not the policies of presenting them. This second edition documents those changes, adds new research and data to the discussions of the earlier campaign years, and provides many entirely new discussions and analyses, including those of the 1988, 1992 and 1996 debates. (p. xi)

Television, even without debates, has brought campaigns into people's living rooms, and even primary election coverage dominates news broadcasts for months at a time. Although cause and effect relationships might be difficult to establish, the author lists several changes in campaigns that very likely have influenced the election process in recent years. Among them, "campaigns for the presidency begin quite early," compared to earlier elections; television networks start planning for the next presidential campaign immediately after the conclusion of the previous election — a lead time of three years; third-party candidates have assumed greater prominence, even demanding roles in the debates; but the majority of American citizens "do not concern themselves with such matters until the campaigns gain steam and election events dominate the newscasts." "The hoopla that is created in a presidential campaign" is insufficient to encourage, and may actually discourage voter turnout, which dropped to a 36-year low of 48.5% in the 1996 election (pp. 7-8).

Chapter 2 gives an overview of the ways television has interacted with parties, candidates, voters, experts and pollsters, and concludes that, "Although not free from image merchants, the confrontations between presidential candidates appearing together on television for 90 minutes are the most innovative, beneficial events in presidential campaign history. ... They appear to be institutionalized" (p. 24).

Debate formats for each of the debates — in 1960, and the six from 1976 through 1996 — are discussed at length in chapter 3 (pp. 29-145). Negotiations between the candidates over debate formats are critical because a favorable format gives the candidate favorable exposure, increasing his/her chances of winning the debate and the election (p. 134).
interface between the Internet and the 1996 presidential debates is discussed towards the end of that chapter (pp. 130-133), with the recognition that the Internet will be far more significant in the 2000 campaign.

News media coverage of debates is the subject of chapter 4. Chapter 5, describing effects of the debates, concludes that, "From a number of perspectives, voters benefit when televised debates are part of presidential campaigns." That benefit takes the form of increased information about the candidates and issues and stimulation to discuss the issues and to seek further information about them (p. 231). Chapter 6, "Debate Policy: Every Four Years by Mandate," looks at public support for, and criticism of previous presidential debates. It "details events that contributed to the institutionalization of debates, and suggests policy options" for future debates. One of those options is to mandate participation in the debates by candidates.

The evidence reviewed herein clearly shows that voters want debates in presidential elections. Suggestions of compelling candidates to debate by making it a qualifying condition to receive public funds under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 should receive serious consideration. (p. 282)

In an "Addendum," Kraus discusses the participant observation methodology he used in the research for the book, while occupying a role as on-site television reporter, acting as a resource person, etc., in the 1976, 1980, 1984, 1988, and 1996 presidential debates. The pros and cons of that method are analyzed.

References and bibliography — classified by main references, selected related publications, and selected participant observation references — are grouped at the end (pp. 297-311). A name index and subject index are included.

WEB


As a result of the communications revolution, health practitioners are finding more and more tools to help them tailor health messages to the unique needs, interests, and concerns of different individuals. Some of the new tools include "interactive CD-ROMs, the Internet, interactive kiosks, wireless pagers, and personal digital assistants" (p. xiii).

With these new technologies, people have come to expect all communications to be personalized. Cruder forms of that personalization include such unwanted junkmail as the abundant offers of new credit cards and magazine subscriptions with your name in the greeting and in the body of the text and your full name and address already printed on ready-to-mail business reply postcards. Despite that "downside," the new technologies have many positive applications, including health messages that take account of the patient's medical history and other relevant factors.

But health information has so many dimensions that one has to ask, "How exactly can this be done with health messages?" This book provides a handy set of how-tos, focusing primarily on tailoring health messages. It shows "how to create design templates to produce tailored communications, how to develop message libraries, and how to operationalize the messages by creating algorithms, and finally, how to evaluate" (p. xii). After defining the concept of tailored health communication, the book provides a step-by-step approach to tailoring programs.

The authors blend medical science basics with humor and imaginative forms of communication, creating what Barbara K. Rimer of the National Cancer Institute calls, in her foreword to the book, "a ground-breaking contribution and should be read by all who want to communicate more effectively about health" (p. xiii). Rimer also encourages the reader with the comment: "The book is incredibly readable. In fact, I was so fascinated that I read it in one sitting" (p. xi).

Three of the authors are with the Health Communication Research Laboratory of the Saint Louis University School of Public Health, and have long experience in developing tailored health communication programs, while the fourth, David Farrell, is the founder and President of the People Designs firm, which specializes in the development of tailored health communication programs.

The first of the book's fourteen chapters, "What Is Tailored Communication?" explains what tailored health communication can do. It starts by describing a typical doctor's appointment and then puts the same description in the form of tailored health communication, showing how "information can be customized, or tailored, to meet the unique needs, interests, and concerns of a specific individual" (p. 2).

Although tailored health communication is a relatively new practice, tailored communication has been practiced by many service providers, including "effective teachers, physicians, real estate agents, stock brokers, salespeople, and even hair stylists" (p. 2). It simply takes a specific client's needs and develops solutions to serve those needs. It facilitates the one-on-one counseling that is especially desirable in health care. "With the use of computers, it is possible to generate highly customized health messages on a mass scale..." (P. 3).

Having generally defined the concept, chapter one goes into more detail, bringing up related concepts, providing some historical background, and answering some frequently heard questions and concerns about tailoring (pp. 18-23). Subsequent chapters deal with the reasons for tailoring health information, an overview of the tailoring process, background research to understand the health problem and target population, developing a program framework, developing a tailoring assessment questionnaire to measure key determinants, developing design templates that determine the layout of the
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tailed page or "feedback unit," message concepts about what you want each message to say, writing tailored messages, linking messages and algorithms (decision-making rules), creating the tailoring program, implementing a tailored health communication program, and evaluating tailored health communication programs.

The final chapter, "The Future of Tailored Health Communication," recognizes tailored health care's great possibilities. Although the idea is relatively new, and research evaluations are generally preliminary, the authors see tailored health care's success depending on developments in five key areas: new content involving tailoring on different variables, new methods for tailoring on multiple variables simultaneously, new settings, new media, and new basic research. "These are just some of the many important and as yet unanswered questions in tailoring research" (p. 247). This book is meant to lead the way to answers to those questions.

References (pp. 249-264) and an index are provided. — ADK


The two editors start their introduction by saying that "a misplaced emphasis on communication production and dissemination can lead to a basic confusion as to the purpose of public relations, and a tendency to measure programmatic initiatives in terms of communication output rather than in relational or behavioral outcomes" (p. xi). They then present a brief history of public relations, noting that, while it traces its beginning to the late 1800s, it only emerged "as a powerful corporate tool" in the early 20th century, when industrial and business leaders had to defend their enterprises from the assaults of muckraking investigative journalists. Some early PR practitioners considered themselves the "conscience" of their organizations, defending the interest of the public — and that view survives in the "social consciousness perspective" of public relations — but "many organizations still view public relations primarily as a means of generating favorable publicity" (p. xii).

Within public relations there are numerous perspectives on what it is or should be doing, and it "is a field that continues to seek a theoretical framework to guide its practical application" (ibid.). Ledingham and Bruning identify relationship management as one of the most intriguing of those perspectives. It is seen as managing relationships of the organization with its publics in such a way that those relationships are mutually beneficial (p. xiii).

The book's twelve chapters are grouped into three sections: "The State of Organization-Public Relationship Research" (3 chapters), "Applications of the Relational Perspective" (6 chapters), and "Implications of the Relational Perspective" (3 chapters). The editors and all but one of the authors are based in the United States, the exception being Assistant Professor Yi-Hui Huang of Taiwan's National Chench University. A few of the topics they deal with, as illustrated by their titles, are "A Longitudinal Study of Organization-Public Relationship Dimensions: Defining the Role of Communication in the Practice of Relationship Management," "Crisis Management: Advantages of a Relational Perspective," "Issues Management: A Relational Approach," "Public Relations: Toward a Global Professionalism," and "'Relationship' and the Evolution of Network News."

The empirical research for the study of relationship in network news asked whether network television news broadcasts contained higher proportions of reports that emphasized impersonal descriptions of content or of reports that tried to relate the broadcast content to the lives of the viewers. The longitudinal study found a definite shift towards more relationship news on the evening news broadcasts of all three major American networks between 1977 and 1997. Although the networks were able to bolster their declining ratings by this emphasis on "soft" news their viewers found more relevant to their daily needs, they did so at the cost of a decline in their international news and other "hard" topics. Fortunately, CNN maintained its emphasis on US politics and world affairs, but at a cost in its own ratings. — WEB


Are today's children being overwhelmed by media opportunities? How does this affect them? The German journal, TelefZIon, published twice a year, focuses on national and international media for children and young people. The journal is published by the Internationales Zentralinstitut für das Jugend und Bildungsforschung (IZI — The International Center for Youth and Educational Television). It is intended for a general audience: anyone interested in how children and young people are affected by the media, especially television but also the newer media. Today's "New Media" (p. vii) have made young people's exposure to the influence of the media even more common and easily accessible, with such personal technologies as "...their own radios and televisions, Walk- and Disc-man, audio and video cassette recorders and — in recent years increasingly and inexorably — computers with their opportunities for games and communication, their incentives for learning and an expansion of experience" (p. vii). Each issue of TelefZIon envelopes a theme and is free to subscribers. Past issues are
sent upon request, if still in print, and out of print articles can be accessed on the Internet. This book, based on articles from *TeleviZlon*, is meant to spark media conversation about various issues that have been the focus of German media experts for the last decade.


The first section, "Do Children Need Television?" begins with a paper by developmental psychologist Bruno Bettelheim, asking that question. Bettelheim first recognizes that "Any new form of mass entertainment is viewed with considerable suspicion until it has been around for some time" (p. 3). Historically, movies, comics, operas, music halls, and other forms of popular entertainment have been chastised for badly influencing the young. Television now joins the crowd. Yet it has always been recognized that young people do have their own faults, independent of media influences.

Bettelheim argues, "Today as well, those who evaluate the impact of television on children ought to understand truly what children are all about..." (ibid.). He says that children need television these days, as they needed movies before television was invented. Everyone needs to daydream, but children and young people need it more because their lives are so controlled by adults. What a child finds attractive in television depends on his or her personality and life issues at a particular time. As researcher Wilbur Schramm said more than 20 years ago, "The chief part television plays in the lives of children depends at least as much on what the child brings to television as on what television brings to the child" (p. 5).

And television is a "quick fix," a child can just turn it on when needed and off when he or she is satisfied. Bettelheim sees the problem as lying in the fact that television only presents children with one side of the story in an oversimplified way. "This is why a young child will not truly learn by watching even the best programmes..." (p. 7). Parents need to be there to provide input and guidance to form children's take on television. As Bettelheim concludes, "The fact remains that our personalities and values will have much more effect than television in shaping our children and their outlook on life" (p. 7).

The third section, "Internet and Multimedia," starts with a chapter, "Taking off for the virtual world," by Jo Groebel, Director General of the European Institute of the Media, in Dusseldorf. Groebel sees the Internet as both an opportunity and a risk for children to escape the real world. "In this new environment everyday realities are done away with" (p. 131). This can be both attractive and at the same time dangerous. It can paint a distorted picture of life.

Groebel foresees the Internet as developing similar to the way film did, but it is doing so with greater, and scarier, possible outcomes. He emphasizes that children must be taught that the Internet does not present reality. Understanding that would make it less risky and laden with more constructive opportunities. Groebel sees roles for both schools and the traditional mass media in these lessons. He closes his discussion by predicting, "In total, both new and old media varieties will form the future" (p. 133).

A list of contributors identifies each of the 22 authors, 18 of whom are based in Germany, 3 in Britain, and 1 in the United States. References follow each chapter. There is no index.

---


As an Iranian graduate student at American University, Washington, DC, during the 444-day hostage crisis at the American embassy in Teheran, the editor says: "I could not ask for a better chance to observe and study the role that media play in American democracy" (p. xi). As he pursued the subject through the time of his graduate studies he became impressed by the degree to which U.S. media adhered to U.S. government policies on foreign affairs issues, but also by the scarcity of resources for the in-depth study of the interaction between news media and foreign policy. "This book is an attempt to add to a limited existing literature on the subject matter" (p. xiii).

The thirteen papers are divided between two parts of the book: "Theoretical Perspective" and "Empirical Studies" — five in the first part and eight in the second.

Part I begins with an "integrated review of news media and foreign policy," then goes on to propose a framework of analysis for media and foreign policy, takes steps toward a theoretical framework for studying media diplomacy and foreign policy, and explores aspects of "information liberalization and the restructuring of international relations" and of "social identification and media coverage of foreign relations.

The studies in part II are concerned with "the president, congress, and the media in global affairs," "appropriating the 'public mood' of other nations in press-foreign policy management," the press and foreign policy dissent in the Gulf War, the Carter administration human rights policy and media coverage of Latin America, the adaptation of global news to meet domestic needs, "elite U.S. newspaper editorial coverage of surviving communist countries in the post-Cold War Era" in terms of the impact of media and images on foreign policy, Botswana as a case study in African news media and foreign policy, and Malek's own study of the *New York Times* position during the Iran hostage crisis.

In his chapter 2, Hamid Mowlana notes many effects the media have on foreign policy, such as agenda-setting, acting as catalyst, both clarifying and distorting issues, accelerating or impeding government policies, and serving as knowing or unknowing propaganda tools (p. 39).
In her discussion of information liberalization, Shalini Venturelli concludes that the central questions in “policy issues invoked in the liberal internationalist vision of a worldwide multimedia network” might be distilled to a debate between commercial vs. non-commercial development of the digital bandwidth” (p. 74).

Malek, now teaching at Howard University, revisited the Iran hostage case and found similarity between New York Times editorials and the Department of State Bulletin in their treatments of Iran, but his research also revealed some improvements in New York Times editorials’ treatment of international topics, although agenda-setting by the media remained excessive, and little or no improvement was seen in coverage of internal conditions in other countries that hold possibilities for future turmoil, unrest, and revolution (p. 245).

Appendix A is a list of topics and subtopics (p. 247). Contributor identifications are provided (pp. 249-250). All the contributors are based in the United States, except one, who is from a Canadian university. — WEB


“ Australians took to the movies very quickly and with a passion,” with the first Australian picture screened in 1896. Father Malone agrees with a commentator of the time that the subject of that first film was somehow appropriate to Australians’ “laid back” reputation: a horse race, the running of the Melbourne Cup (p. 5).

This book was inspired by Malone’s feeling that, despite Australian cinema’s antiquity and many accomplishments, the history of the Australian Film industry had been neglected. But, he says, “The history of the Australian Film Industry holds its highs and its many lows. It is a story worth telling” (p. 3). He also wants to be sure that history is kept in its cultural context: “Australian films are Australians telling stories visually. To appreciate the films, one needs to appreciate the stories and the telling” (ibid.).

Chapter one (pp. 5-17) gives an overview of Australian cinema history from the 1890s to the 1990s. He expresses some surprise, given the country’s secular veneer, that the first feature movie — as distinguished from the earlier short films — was religious: Soldiers of the Cross, made by the Salvation Army in 1899-1900 (pp. 5-6). The next feature, not made until 1905, was about the famous outlaw and sometime folk-hero, Ned Kelly. From then on, the industry developed apace with that in the United States and elsewhere.

It slumped during World War II and recovered only slowly thereafter, aided somewhat by British and American films with Australian locations and themes (pp. 10-11). Boosted by government subsidies, the industry began to take off in the 1970s, especially with Peter Weir’s internationally acclaimed Picnic at Hanging Rock and Fred Schepisi’s The Devil’s Playground, with its less-than-sympathetic treatment of a Catholic boys’ school.

Quality films continued to come out through the 70s and 80s, including Weir’s The Last Wave and Gallipoli, and Bruce Beresford’s Breaker Morant as examples. Successful feature film production continued through the 1980s, as Australian directors and actors moved into international production, especially in the United States, and a big breakthrough in internationally marketed television series.

The author then discusses Australian storytelling, using film examples, including Gallipoli, analyzed using the category, “myth” — “described as the profound and positive story. It creates world. It creates world in the sense that the story can use for plot and characters real/historical personages or fictitious persons and tell a story where meaning is the important thing” (p. 26).

In chapter three, Proof, “a film about a blind man who took photographs,” is seen as a “film parable.” “A film parable is said to ‘subvert’ the world of its story,” according to Malone (p. 27).

Subsequent chapters focus on Strictly Ballroom, Malcolm, The Man From Snowy River, and Mad Max.

Finally, in chapter eight, the author foresees a continued strong future for Australian films in the 21st century, based on some of the same factors that have given the industry strength during the past two or three decades: intensive international involvement, outstanding film schools, innovative independent filmmakers.

Father Malone has been President of OCIC-World, the international Catholic film and audio-visual organization, since 1998.

A one-page bibliographical note highlights the key books on Australian cinema. There is no index. — WEB


In January of the 1996 U.S. election year, a representative sample of 466 potential American voters was scientifically selected by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) and assembled for four days at the University of Texas at Austin for a “National Issues Convention” (NIC), designed “to gauge what citizens would think about the issues if they engaged them much more than in their everyday lives — or than in answering ordinary surveys — by learning, thinking, and talking more about them” (p. 3). This technique, called a “Deliberative Poll,” had been used in two earlier studies, in Britain in 1994 and 1995. In contrast to ordinary polling methods, wherein it is important to keep the sampled individuals apart from, and unable to influence each other, to ensure that they could “represent the population as it is,” the
NIC’s Deliberative Policing was intended to promote greater citizen engagement, “to give a representative microcosm both opportunity and incentives to behave more like ideal citizens: to pay attention, to acquire information, to share their views and listen to others,” and to think their positions through” (p. 4).

The process began well before the Convention, when the participants were selected, interviewed, and invited to participate. “In anticipation of the weekend, the participants-to-be begin to behave more like ideal citizens. They begin to pay attention to the news, to discuss the issues with friends and family, and to read the briefing materials. Then comes the deliberation on the weekend itself, in small group discussions and dialogues with experts and politicians. Then, finally, the participants are polled again, to see what their opinions are after deliberation” (p. 4).

The three chapters of the first of the book’s three sections describe the process from sampling and recruitment through the delegates’ small group discussions.

Part two presents reactions to NIC by a wide range of professional journalists and both media and public opinion analysts.

Part three looks at the larger implications, both in historical context and in terms of applications to future elections and democratic deliberations in general.

Chapter 5, by Davis “Buzz” Merritt, who was Senior Editor of the Wichita (Kansas) Eagle at the time, says that the NIC was “a (largely missed) learning opportunity” for journalists, fewer than 50 of whom from out of state attended (p. 105). He contrasted his interpretation of the ways Walter Lippmann and John Dewey might have reacted to NIC. In Merritt’s view, Lippmann, “who bears much responsibility for the culture of American journalism,” would have found the NIC “irrelevant,” but Dewey “would have been totally absorbed” by it. Imbued with Lippmann’s philosophy, the author feels that “most American journalists” would ask “What does the sound of average Americans talking about how to fix things that bother them have to do with real politics or, for that matter, anything else that might concern journalists confined in the Lippmann tradition” (p. 106). Merritt comes down on the side of public journalism, seeing it as an important way for news media to realize their unique responsibility to bring “public direction and legitimacy” to bear on a democratic process too often controlled by “special interests and dominant elites” (p. 109).

In her chapter, “The Cultivation of Conversation,” historian Susan Herbst says: “It is clear that NIC picks up on and extends some of the outstanding features of 19th-century democracy, in particular: its rootedness in localities, the pleasure people get from political discussion, and the orientation around elections” (p. 204).

Three appendixes contain, respectively, the texts of the interviewer-administered questionnaire used by NORC in the participant selection process, a self-administered questionnaire completed by participants at the close of the NIC, and the schedule of the NIC’s four days.

The fifteen contributors are identified in brief biographical sketches.

--- WEB ---


What does it mean to be an American woman? Is popular media’s depiction of women accurate? Or are media messages regarding women biased and confusing? Should women be concerned about how they are portrayed in the media? Marian Meyers, editor of this book and associate professor in the communication and theater department at Saginaw Valley State University in Michigan, believes that “Considerable research indicates that the images do affect us, that they work, cumulatively and unconsciously, to create and reinforce a particular world view or ideology that shapes our perspectives and beliefs about the world, our neighborhoods, and ourselves” (p. 3). For example, there is a research basis for relating the thinness of females in the media to unhealthy eating disorders among women in the real world.

Published 20 years ago, the book Hearth and Home: Images of Women in the Mass Media, by G. Tuchman, A. K. Daniels, and J. Benet, was the first book to focus on women’s portrayal in the media. Since then, no book has attempted to examine in such a wide-ranging way women’s portrayal in mediated popular culture, according to Meyers. She says that the present book aims, “to provide a current look at the images of women, to examine their mediated representations as they appear at this historical point in time, and to demonstrate how media texts promote particular understandings of women’s lives and roles” (p. 5).

The book attempts to give a glimpse of mediated women in popular culture, while also taking a look at related research. Meyers admits that one book cannot cover all of the mediated visions of women. Rather than a quantitative study, however, Meyers believes the study must be qualitative. “This book ... attempts to understand the meanings behind the representations of women in popular culture through primarily qualitative textual analyses of films, television programs, the news, magazines, music videos, and advertising” (p. 6).

Five parts, including 22 chapters, make up this qualitative textual analysis. After Meyer’s first, introductory part, Part II: “Reinforcing Stereotypes,” looks at “how popular culture continues to embrace patriarchal and racist stereotypes ... in its depiction of women” (p. 15). The third part, “Limit/ed ing Challenges,” shows how some things may seem to be revolutionary but are actually just reinforcing women’s accepted norms “as mothers, daughters, wives, and sex objects” (p. 16). Part IV, “Complexities and Contradictions,” “provides examples of how women’s representations can contain ambiguities and contradictions that defy containment in traditional forms” (p. 17). Part V, “Representing Progress,” presents several examples of truly improved portrayals of
women. All together, the five parts and 22 chapters of this book are a forward-thinking representation of women as they are seen in popular culture. But, as Meyers concludes, "whether the mediated representation of women within popular culture can be considered progressive or not will depend, ultimately, on the viewer" (p. 18).

The first chapter of Part II, "Messages to Women on Love and Marriage from Women's Magazines," by Susan H. Alexander, an assistant professor of sociology at Lycoming College in Williamsport, Pennsylvania, argues that it can be seen how women and men are socialized into their traditional roles by simply looking at the media messages they absorb. Alexander "synthesizes and presents the findings acquired from examining messages about love and marriage that have been communicated to American women through the medium of nonfiction articles in popular magazines" (p. 26). Alexander also shows how the media reinforce traditional outlooks on what a man's and a woman's worlds are.

In the end, her study found that media promote behavior for women that is not realistic, just behavior that the media themselves find attractive and therefore present. "The data fail to acknowledge the dramatic changes that have occurred in American family patterns" (p. 35). Women no longer see the picture of having a husband who provides for her and their children as ideal. Magazines do not promote the fact that less than 15 percent of today's families fit that pattern (p. 36). Popular magazines "continue to bombard the public with stereotypical images of gender roles and family prescriptions, while still making a clear-cut distinction between the masculine and feminine world" (p. 36).

Extensive author and subject indexes close the book.

— ADK


Are focus groups the best way to answer media-related questions?

Morrison's interest in this topic comes from his broader interest in research methodology. He says, "the background to this book is quite simple: it stems from an interest in methodology, and a concern about the rise in the popularity of focus groups within mass media research" (p. ix). He argues that focus groups are a valuable research method, but they can be overused and abused. A focus group can be a good methodological tool as long as it is well designed and used appropriately. Focus groups were invented as a way to organize knowledge. The author sketches their history as follows:

First developed in 1941 by Robert Merton ... the use of focus groups formed part of university-based knowledge, but then was lost to sight within that domain, to be later taken up and taken over by market research, only to be rediscovered by academia, in particular by researchers into the media audience. (p. xii)

So they made a full circle: Focus groups went from organizing intellectual knowledge to collecting pragmatic market data, then back to intellectual uses.

The history of media focus groups is recounted by Morrison in light of his personal interest in the institutionalization of knowledge, as well as his work in researching several organizations. "I will argue," he explains, "that the career of focus group research cannot be truly appreciated without understanding research as practice" (p. xii). Morrison believes that the use of focus groups to aid media research is limited and dangerous because the method is often used incorrectly. "The culprits for this state of affairs, and there are many, will become obvious as the story unfolds," he says in the Introduction (p. xii).

This book was not written to remedy the problem, only to provide useful guidance and to advise against the "abuse" (p. xiii) of the technique. The correct methods for focus groups are mapped out and the author shows why certain methods are chosen by some. Yet the book is not meant to be a "how to do" research manual (p. xiv). It is only meant to offer the basics. Morrison concludes that, "if ... focus groups are going to be a central part of media research, it is time to examine them in some detail in an effort to try and gain a perspective on their benefits and drawbacks" (p. xv).

In the eight chapters of the main body of the book, Morrison goes from tracing the history to discussing the ethics of focus group research. He then adds an Afterword on the relationship between focus groups and the two main arenas in which they are used: market research and university social science research. In that context, he warns that, although focus groups are relatively inexpensive they cannot be used as "shortcuts" to attempt to bypass expensive survey methods in research whose successful accomplishment requires the latter.

In the seventh chapter, "Good and Bad Practice in Focus Group Research," Morrison first recognizes the inherent flexibility of focus group research, saying that "there is no set way to conduct focus groups" (p. 207). Researchers can simply decide which form of focus group is best for their study, and they will be able to judge from the progress of the discussions whether they are producing quality information of the kinds needed. "It is not uncommon after conducting a focus group to find researchers saying to one another, 'this is not working,' and then examine why it's not working and come up with solutions to make it work" (p. 208). Focus groups are a thoroughly reflexive operation with optional procedures for the researcher to employ for maximum benefit.

Preparation for conducting a focus group is as key as it is in all research, which includes preparation of questions. And if possible, researchers should be familiar with the area under examination. "Thus, it is not a good idea for an academic project, even if affordable, to employ a professional moderator to run the groups" (p. 209). The moderator is often responsible for the success of the focus group. Morrison cites the reasons.
why the moderator is so important to the big ultimate outcome, and he then goes on to give tips for guiding the focus group discussion.

A problem with focus group discussions is that different groups have tendencies to have similar outcomes because of moderator guidance. “This underscores the point that it is dangerous to draw general conclusions from the small numbers involved in focus group research, especially given that the form of questioning generally speaking is not designed for quantification” (p. 219).

Yet the conduct of the focus groups must be similar over all the groups to be compared to be sure the outcomes are truly comparable.

Morrison gives a number of tips for focus group moderators so the outcome will lead to understanding because, as he puts it, “The basic purpose of the focus group is to get people to talk about what you want them to talk about, but to do so in their own words” (p. 200). Market research companies have had such success with focus groups that there are now many new areas of application.

An extensive bibliography and an index close the book.

—ADK


Rev. Walter J. Ong, SJ, Emeritus University Professor of Humanities at Saint Louis University, is perhaps best known for his book, Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word (1982), and is widely quoted as one of the outstanding thinkers of the past half-century in the field of the culture-history of language. Ong’s Harvard dissertation, on the influence of the Renaissance logicians and educator Peter Ramus, was his initial foray into Western intellectual history. That study opened significant new perspectives for the study of sixteenth century thought, and it served as the springboard for Ong’s subsequent production of more than 15 major books and literally hundreds of articles and reviews. Although he has been a professor of English, his expertise and inquiring mind have ranged far beyond departmental boundaries, penetrating especially into topics relating to anthropology and communication studies, as well as to the classics, American studies, spirituality, and psychology, among others.


The editors link Ong’s name with that of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, S.J., whom Ong knew in Paris during his doctoral research on Ramus. Another influence on him was Marshall McLuhan, who was advisor for his MA thesis at Saint Louis University in the 1940s. Like Teilhard and from a different perspective like McLuhan, Ong brings a worldview that is both “Catholic” and “catholic” to an informed and insightful encounter with modern science and technology. His continuing productivity, at the age of 87, is illustrated by a contribution by him to Communication Research Trends too recent to be included in this book: “Digitization Ancient and Modern: Beginnings of Writing and Today’s Computer” (CRT, Vol. 18 (1998), No. 2, pp. 4-21).

Thomas J. Farrell’s foreword, “Walter Ong and Harold Bloom,” compares Bloom’s treatment of “outwardness and inwardness in certain characters developed by Shakespeare,” in Bloom’s, Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human (1998), with aspects of “Ong’s work on interiorizing and personalizing trends in Western culture” – particularly with regard to his remarks on St. Ignatius Loyola’s Spiritual Exercises (p. vii).

References, collected at the end of the book (pp. 239-251), supply a bibliography.

See also, the review of Thomas J. Farrell’s Walter Ong’s Contributions to Cultural Studies, above. —WEB


There are some things we just don’t want to talk about. But at the same time, there are some things that need to be told. This book suggests ways to reach a beneficial balance between the two, “to be social yet autonomous, known yet unknown, independent yet dependent...” (p. xiii). It tells how best to survive in this communicative world, in which various facts need to be concealed, while others need to be revealed.

In her Preface, Petronio says: “The main issue for the public-private dialectic is to understand how to achieve goals that allow both disclosure and the ability to keep private or secret those things that make us feel vulnerable” (ibid.). Positive interactions are the goal of these lessons. Achieving
that goal requires adaptations to particular circumstances, and in the various chapters "...each author proposes an alternative vision of how individuals adjust the costs and benefits of revelation and concealment" (p. xiv).

What should be kept secret? What should be told? The many theories advanced regarding ways to reach a balance are divided. "These authors present a more multifaceted view that goes farther than simple symmetry between the paradoxical needs of being public and private" (ibid.). Different methods of balance are suggested to adapt to different situations: polarization, equilibrium, weighted proportions. Many new directions are offered, "using the theme of balance to shape our understanding of significant communicative problems and issues we face in today's world" (p. xvi).

The first chapter, "Overview of the Ways Privacy, Secrecy, and Disclosure Are Balanced in Today's Society," by Lawrence B. Rosenfeld of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, first takes a look at the roots of self-revelation to see why people have trouble with this type of communication. Starting with Heidegger in 1927, self-disclosure philosophies are discussed. Rosenfeld looks at the pros and cons of being open and closed, recognizing that "Interpersonal life consists of the tension between these opposites" (p. 4). He points out that the chapters in this book look at the relationship between being open and closed and how they relate to privacy and secrecy. Rosenfeld then goes on to look at each of the eight parts and the 20 chapters of the book. He concludes that "...the chapters in this book raise more questions than they answer" (p. 17), saying that there is no easy way to discuss the balance of privacy, secrecy, and disclosure because when all is said and done, everyone has different circumstances and therefore acts differently.

The last chapter, "Some Possible Directions for Future Research," by Leslie A. Baxter and Erin M. Sahlstein, of the University of Iowa, promotes scholarly discussion and research examining the effects and ramifications of being open and being closed, moving beyond the already highly researched area of private life. They conclude that "we think the intellectual conversation on disclosure, privacy, and secrecy can only be enhanced with the addition of more perspectives at the scholarly table" (p. 300).

An epilogue by Susanne M. Jones and the editor, Sandra Petronio, both of Arizona State University, summarizes one theme that runs through the book, as follows: "In many social areas, such as health care, intimate relationships, the media, across cultures, and in policymaking, the balancing act is tricky. The weight of avoidance and privacy protection leads to a heightened awareness of the need for balance. However, the significance of balance is more evident because we also learn in these chapters that revealing is beneficial" (p. 302). They further emphasize that, "although individual characteristics have an impact, social and cultural issues are equally important to the balance calculus" (ibid.).

The references are gathered at the end of the book (pp. 303-335).


In the Preface, the three authors relate, separately, how they came to write the book. Rabow, a Professor Emeritus of Sociology at UCLA, was prompted by three incidents involving his own children at a supposedly "excellent" public school to begin a "process of self-education" to be able to teach his own students "that there were better ways to teach and learn" (pp. x-xi). Chin, a PhD candidate in sociology at UCLA, relates her experience in volunteer tutoring of "a group of high-school-aged guys, recently on parole from L.A. County lock-up" (p. xiii). Fahimian, a medical student at the UCLA School of Medicine, found that her previous extensive experience in tutoring university students was insufficient to help her when she volunteered to tutor two second-graders in "a non-profit, community-based organization involved in educating and counseling immigrant, poor, and minority families" (p. xv).

"Tutoring has become the great solution to America's social problems" – at least if one believes the political rhetoric about it, and "the opportunities are endless," and "everyone will admit that it sounds like a good idea," but "the number of people tutoring still doesn't match the hype" (pp. xix-xx). The authors feel that one reason more people do not undertake volunteer tutoring is that they simply do not know how to do it, and do not know how to find out. Many who might want to tutor ask, "Is it right to sign up for something, especially something important, if you don't know what you're doing?" (p. xx).

This book is designed "to make it possible for you to feel as confident and successful at tutoring as you do in the other aspects of your life" (p. xxi).

The titles of the six chapters describe their contents: "Attitudes, Anxieties, and Expectations," "Building Relationships," "Teaching Techniques," "Race, Gender, Class, and Background Differences," "Other Adults: Parents, Teachers, and Administrators," and "Good-byes: Ending the Tutoring Relationship." Each chapter is followed by a list of recommended readings, with comments about each title recommended.

An appendix lists "Twenty-Five Final Pointers for Tutors" (pp. 183-184), a closing note gives some resources, including Rabow's and Chin's e-mail addresses (p. 185), and it is followed by a two-page bibliography (pp. 187-188).

There is no index.


Communication Research Trends

Volume 19 (1999) No. 4 - 39

— ADK
Volume 22 of this annual series continues, as the editor notes, the policy "begun with Volume 19, of publishing state of the art reviews of communication research" (p. x). Although contributions were solicited across a wide range of specialties, the final "selection of chapters was based entirely upon their judged quality" (p. xi). As a result of that approach some imbalance toward or away from particular specializations might have been expected, but Roloff credits "the vibrancy of all our research specializations" with providing enough quality papers to cover a wide range of subfields (ibid.).

The sixteen authors of the book's eleven chapters all are based in the United States (one, Howard Giles, holds a position at the University of Wales, Cardiff, in addition to being Chair of Communication at the University of California, Santa Barbara), as is the editor.

Contents include a critical discussion of claims and evidence in Deborah Tannen's book, You Just Don't Understand, about male/female communicative differences; an approach to eliminating Western, individualistic bias in cross-cultural studies of motivations of verbal communication; an organizational framework for studying harmful speech in intergroup encounters; a summary of existing data on reactions of criminal sexual offenders to pornography; and the life space of personalized conflicts. The remaining chapters concern a meta-analytic review of the effects of opposing arguments in persuasive messages; upward influence of followers, members, and protégés; a study of normative critiques of news media failures in political communication; the role and impact of communication in customer service interactions; the literature on communication in families with an aging parent; and examples of intercultural patterns of adult friendship.

Extensive references follow each chapter.

--- WEB

---


Romme begins her Introduction with a tongue-in-cheek quotation from a 1994 article that called the Internet "by far, the greatest and most significant achievement in the history of mankind" (p. 1). Without fully subscribing to that view, she notes the importance the Internet achieved in the 1990s. It is "a communication that can be effectively harnessed to coordinate intra- and interorganizational activities and to help overcome dispersion in terms of both geography and time zones" (p. 2). Consequently, it also has become a tool for political manipulation, not only within, but also between organizations.

The author, Foundation Professor of Information Technology at Central Queensland University, Australia, wrote the book "to fill a gap that currently exists in both theory and empirical research on the role that e-mail plays in organizational dynamics, with particular emphasis on its use in political manipulation" (p. 2).

In sketching the origin and evolution of e-mail, in her Introduction, Robb cites several features of virtual communities that make them different from face-to-face communities. Interruptions are easier to accomplish in computer communication, but they are less disruptive than in face-to-face communication. Virtual communities are "noisefree," in the sense that, since the other party cannot be seen, factors extrinsic to the communication — "such as gender, status, ethnicity. . ." etc. — do not cloud the communication, although their absence may "introduce ambiguity and confusion," and the medium used (e-mail, fax, etc.) introduces differences in the kind of virtual community that exists. The shared goals and ideals that enter into the creation of a virtual community also give it a high degree of robustness, although, like face-to-face communities they can range "from highly robust to ephemeral." Virtual communities may overlap to varying degrees with face-to-face communities, creating another variable in the range of types of virtual communities (pp. 4-5).

Subsequent chapters discuss e-mail's technical features, some basic concepts of organizational communication, a survey of research that has been done on e-mail both as a dependent variable and an independent variable, "issues that are central to the literature on political behavior in organizations," and a description of a "Virtual Politicking model" that "represents an attempt to link e-mail explicitly with power and politics" (p. 39).

Chapters 7 through 15 consist of 9 case studies done in United States, Australian, and Israeli universities that are introduced to support the model (p. 39). The titles of those 9 chapters suggest their contents: "Efficiency or Dictatorship," "Harassed or Harasser?" "Rebellion on E-mail," "Building an Empire," "Electing a New Dean," "The Library Debate," "Battle of the Sexes," "Promoting the Unpromotables," and "Electronic Industrial Relations."

A concluding section consists of two chapters, on "Synthesizing Case Data," and "The Future." The synthesis focuses, first, on the risk e-mail contains for top management, and second, more generally on e-mail's political effects, which can be both democratizing and controlling, centripetal and centrifugal (pp. 215-216).

Robb concludes that e-mail is politically potent because of the synergy among its characteristics of: "accessibility, speed, multiple addressability, recordability, processability, and routing" (p. 217). It can contribute to social unrest, but also can be abused by managers to peer into their employees' conversations" (p. 218). However, "several cases presented here attest to the double-edged nature of e-mail, namely, the fact that it can backfire, turning against the political actors who try to exploit it" (p. 219).

In assessing the future, Robb cites predictions that "the major development...for the Internet in the year 2000 is making it accessible to the general public" (p. 222).

References, gathered at the end, constitute a bibliography (pp. 229-236).

"That's just my advice." Just advice. Just an opinion. Pretty unimportant, right? Jeswald Salauce thinks that “the ability to be an effective advisor is often the difference between success and failure on the job...” (p. ix). Furthermore, he points out that bad advisors aren’t always people who are bad at their jobs. They are simply people who don’t know how to give advice well. The purpose of this book is to show anyone who is interested how to give good advice. "It is aimed at all professionals — indeed, all persons who seek to help others through advice" (p. ix).

Salauce is a law professor at Tufts University. He lectures and is consulted widely, advising governments, businesses, international organizations, universities, and foundations.

In nine chapters, the author presents what he sees as the basics on advising, from his definition of the word to what he thinks should always, and never be done when giving advice.

The first chapter, “Advisors and Clients,” paints a distinct picture of the advisor, including his or her attributes, and then gives what Salauce sees as the seven rules of “the art of advice” (p. 16). The rules embody basic principles that can be applied to different situations. He argues that it just takes practice.

The following seven chapters are devoted to looking at each rule in detail: “You must know your client.” “Help, or at least do no harm.” “Agree on your role.” “Never give a solo performance.” “Play it clear and constructive.” “Keep your advice pure.” “Agree on the End at the Beginning and Know when to Stop” (pp. 15-16).

The last chapter, “Appreciating the Art of Advice,” looks at advice from the advisee’s side, asking, “How can I evaluate an advisor on a subject that I know very little about?”

Because training in every profession, from medical to monetary, requires advice, a reading list is provided, classified by different professions. An index is provided.

— ADK


In this collection of previously published papers, the author, a researcher with the National Council of Scientific and Technical Research of Argentina, offers a personal analysis of communication and culture in Latin America since the 1960s. He is noted, according to the remarks by Carlos Mangone and Jorge Warley on the back cover, for “continuing to pursue old questions with regard to new phenomena, for example, the technological ‘revolutions’...” (Back cover).

The papers, some first published in the 1970s and 80s, but most in the 90s, are grouped under seven headings: “The Return of Words” (El Regreso de las Palabras), “Technologism” (Tecnologismo), “That which Continues from Yesterday to Today (In Studies of Communication)” (Lo Que Va de Ayer a Hoy [En Los Estudios de la Comunicación]), “Education for Technology?” (¿Educación para la Tecnología?), “The Loss of the Aura” (La Pérdida del Aura), “Nostalgia of Politics” (Nostalgia de la Política), and “Opinions” (Opiniones).

As one of the two selections in part one “The Apocalyptic Times Announced by the Technical” (Los tiempos apocalípticos anunciados por la técnica), first published in 1987, Schmucler cites Martin Heidegger and Umberto Eco in support of his own contention that ideology — whether Nazi, Communist, or North American Capitalist — now grows out of technology, in a violation of the natural order of things. He quotes the words of George Steiner, “Technology has devastated the earth, degraded natural forms to pure utility. Man has worked and thought against the essence of things, and not with it” (La tecnologia ha devastado la tierra y ha degradado las formas naturales a una para utilidad. El hombre ha trabajado y pensado contra la esencia de las cosas, y no con ella)

— p. 36, quoting Steiner, Heidegger. Mexico City, 1983).

There is no index, and all references are in footnotes.

— WEB


In an attempt to shed light on the important, but constantly shifting role of religion in United States politics — and especially on how religion can be expected to influence the presidential election in 2000 — the Center for the Study of Religion in Public Life at Trinity College gathered the contributors to this volume for a planning session in the fall of 1998, and in the following April brought together “some two dozen journalists from news organizations around the country” to meet with the contributors and allow their input to reinforce the remarks of the latter in their papers for the book (p. 4).

The book is for journalists. As the editor describes it, “The goal is to orient journalists to religion in American politics today — a moving target if ever there was one” (ibid.).

The authors are leading scholars in history, sociology, political science, and law.

John F. Wilson, a historian, notes that the U.S. Constitution avoids religion, and the First Amendment does little except to “simply disallow federal engagement with it” (p. 7). Consequently, the relations of religion to government
have remained fluid, and "There is no end in sight to the expression of political positions or objectives, including divisive ones, through religious ideals and idioms" (ibid.). Religion remains a powerful factor in American society. "Accordingly, we need to pay closer attention to religion in the contemporary political culture" (p. 17).

Political scientist John C. Green then explores the "confrontations and coalitions" that made the 1990s an especially active period in the interaction between religion and politics. Nevertheless, it is simply "a new variation on an old theme," since "even a casual review of American history reveals that religion has often been a source of intense confrontations as well as stable party coalitions" (p. 19). Green presents 11 tables of data from "the National Elections Studies for 1994, 1996, and 1998...and the 1998 National Surveys of Americans on Values..." but he cautions that "religious traditions and traditionalists are often difficult to identify by means of survey data" (p. 21). The tables show opinions of different religious groups and subgroups on a number of moral and political issues, as well as their political alignments.

Mark J. Rozell also introduces survey data comparing respondents identified as "Christian Right," with journalists on various points of demographics and of religious beliefs and behavior. He concludes that journalists do listen to the views and positions of religious-based political groups," but especially "those that are better organized and have the resources to contact newspaper reporters and editors" (p. 48).

In the remaining chapters, Rhys H. Williams looks at "Social Movements and Religion in Contemporary American Politics," Michael Kazin discusses "Pietists and Pluralists: Religion and American Politicians," and law professor Marci A. Hamilton gives an overview of "Religion and the Law in American Politics." Hamilton cautions that "oversimplification of any issue involving religion is always a danger" (p. 85). She also notes that the framers of the Constitution built it "on a foundation of distrust, distrust of all those who hold and wield power" (p. 86). That included religion, according to her. "Religion could be a constructive force, but it was also to be distrusted because it was capable of abusing its significant power" (ibid.).

There is no index. — WEB


The editors and authors of this book make clear their general view that, in order to live peacefully in an ethnically diverse society, everyone must join in a conversation about racial issues. Race must not be reserved for discussions only in the public sphere, but it needs to be dealt with by families at home. Home is where children can be taught how to interact in an increasingly ethnically diverse world. In this book, it is argued that racial issues should first be discussed among families.

As Molefi Kete Asante of Temple University explains in the foreword, "Exploring the multiple layers of familial interactions in three types of families, Black, White, and biracial, the authors suggest that more importance should be attached to the domestic realm than social scientists have done heretofore" (p. viii). Conceptual and theoretical approaches to this journey are reviewed. Finally, the roadblocks encountered while researching for the book are discussed.

The book represents a collaborative study of interethnic communication. The ten chapters go from an introductory explanation of this kind of communication to a discussion emphasizing the importance of family communication in regard to race relations. The epilogue then characterizes the book as "a testimony to the efforts of Black and White colleagues to write together on difficult issues as well as efforts by Black and White scholars to risk joining a dialogue of immense importance to our field" (p. 232).

In chapter four, "Race and Electronic Media in the Lives of Four Families: An Ethnographic Study," Sheri L. Parks reports that considerable difference was found in the ways Black families and White families used television, a difference that has developed only in recent years, as more programming specifically for Blacks has become available (p. 71).

Race appeared to play a major role in the selection and interpretation of favorite television programs for Black families. They also identified those programs as playing a role in the racial socialization of their children. Although racial identity did not appear overtly to factor into the selection of programs for the White families, the tendency to choose programs from across the racial spectrum may be an indication of racial privilege. It seemed that the racial stakes were not as high for the White families. (pp. 87-88)

The eighth chapter, "Communicating About 'Race' in Interracial Families," by Mark P. Orbe, of Western Michigan University, looks at how multiethnic families talk about race. "Specific attention is given to how parents approach their communication regarding such matters" (p. 167). Orbe explains. While the thoughts expressed in this chapter are relevant to any kind of multiethnic family, Orbe's insights are primarily for African American and European American families. Orbe concludes that individual family members' thoughts and actions regarding racial issues are representative of the societal approach of the time.

The two editors and each of the twelve contributors are then each succinctly profiled, followed by author and subject indexes. — ADK

“What’d you say?” Everyone fails to hear something sometimes, but with the hard of hearing it is very common. In the United States, alone, there are 28 million people with hearing loss. The author, who teaches sociology and serves as an Assistant Dean in the General College of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, is herself hard of hearing, as is her father.

This book is based on meetings of an organization called Village Self Help for Hard of Hearing People (SHHH), designed so that people who are hard of hearing can share practical advice to others in the same situation and help them overcome the problems they encounter. Stenross came into contact with Village SHHH because of her father’s hearing problem. He had avoided getting a hearing aid, although obviously in need of one, until he was 70 years old, and even then neglected to get it cleaned and consequently it was inoperative much of the time. His wife helped him in many ways. When she died, he once more faced a problem encountered by many hard of hearing people upon the death of a spouse. Tom, the husband of Ann, the founder of Village SHHH, and owner of a company supplying equipment of various kinds for the hard of hearing, told the author: “Most of our customers come in because a spouse has died. They’ve been depending on family to call, the husband or wife to do the telephoning and make the appointments. All of a sudden, there is no spouse, and they’re in all sorts of trouble” (p. 4).

Stenross, in search of a research project, volunteered to be the recording secretary of Village SHHH and asked the group if she could record and write about their meetings. Everyone was for it. “We want more people to know what it’s like,” commented one group member (p. 4). The author describes her book as being about “how a few missed sounds in conversation can create large gaps in communication” (p. 6). But, as she points out, the book aims to do more: “It offers a message of hope” for the hard of hearing (p. 7).

Chapter 1, “Missed Connections,” shows how failing to understand a word or two can lead to complete misunderstanding. As one SHHH woman said, “I think one of my biggest frustrations is missing the one or two crucial connecting words that let me know what really happened” (p. 8). That’s because the crucial words are heard as sounds, not words, just noise. The hard of hearing miss out on life because they miss some sounds. They can get lost in any conversation at any time. As the leader of Village SHHH, Ann, admitted, “When a person is hard of hearing, the ability to communicate with others is out of order” (p. 18).

How a person who has trouble hearing affects the whole household is looked at in Chapter 10, “At Home.” One SHHH member described an incident that brought her husband, Joel, and her to the meetings: “I asked Joel to pass the peas. He answered, ‘What’s that about kidney beans?’” (p. 95). But these kinds of interactions aren’t always humorous. They’re often unpleasant. And people often think the hard-of-hearing hear when they really want. Dr. Samuel Trychin defends the hard of hearing, saying there are many reasons they hear sometimes, but not at others: “If I talk to Howard from two feet away at this volume level, he understands me. But if I move four feet away, my voice is not half as loud…” (p. 97). This sort of occurrence can be very confusing to family members. Many other factors, besides distance, make hearing difficult for the hard of hearing, such as pitch, volume, or the first words on a new subject.

Several practical tips are offered to family members wanting to improve communication (pp. 101-104): a) Get Close — get the listening person’s attention and let him or her see your face; b) Mark Transitions — make changes of subject known; c) Create Turns — don’t overlap other’s words or talk at the same time as someone; and d) Don’t Rely on Another’s Ears — you never know if the person you’re relying on can always help in this way.

Stenross concludes this penultimate chapter by saying, “Communication involves more than talking and listening” (p. 105) Even family members who have no problems hearing sometimes do not understand what the other is saying. They must “unite through talk” (ibid.).

A Postscript about how a loss of hearing rederts your life, References, a Selected List of Resources, and an Index close the book.

— ADK


The authors begin their first chapter by describing the book’s purpose as follows: “This book develops a thesis, that communication is the essential ‘modality,’ to use [Anthony] Giddens’ (1984) term, for the constitution of organization and, more generally, of society” (p. 3). The “modality” of a society, still according to Giddens, “explains how those properties of a society that give it continuity over expanses of time and across many geographically dispersed situations come to be manifested in day-to-day human interaction” (ibid.). In other words, “it is how social structures inform social systems...” and how organizations can be “bounded by constraints of space and time and yet transcending them” (ibid.). The theory of communication followed in the book is described as one that views cognition “as the product of the interaction of the parts of a network, each of which, separately considered, is a local information processor but which, collectively considered, form a patterned representation of their environment that none of them singly can be said to hold” (p. 4).

Taylor and Van Every wish to build on two earlier approaches, one of which emphasizes “the relatively permanent structuring of text,” and the other “the relatively chaotic (or at least unpredictable) processes of conversation,” to bring the two approaches together in an analysis that “expands the usual interpretations of those words conversation..."
and text to recognize conversation as an essential sociality and text as a structuring principle with more than one manifestation..." (P. 31).

The new "bidimensional" model is elaborated in chapters 2 through 4, which, respectively, view communication as "coorientation," discuss "how the a priori forms of text reveal the organization," and consider "language as technology and agent."

Part two, "Theory of Organization," first (in chapter 5), reinterprets organizational literature, as represented by Karle Weik, Anthony Giddens, Bruno Latour, and William Labov, from whom the authors have drawn some of their ideas (p. 136). Then, in chapter 6, they express dissatisfaction with "computational" theories that they feel obscure "from view large areas of cognition, namely, those that have to do with the representation and computation of social data" (p. 206). In chapter 7, they attempt to remedy the deficiency in that approach "by imagining what its network would look like if translated into the terms of an ordinary human conversation," but they have to conclude that way also is too limited to serve as a general theory of human organization" (p. 206). Chapter 8 is devoted to a critique of two seminal articles by Karl Weick in which, together with Weick's later book, Sensemaking in Organizations (1995), he "comes very close to what we are saying, but Weick does not take the idea any further, stopping short, as the authors perceive it, of "an understanding of the organization as a communicational construction or an awareness of the institutionalizing of human society that accompanies organization with its many internal contradictions and tensions, an aspect of organization that Max Weber, good jurist that he was, at least hinted at" (p. 275).

Finally, in chapter 9, the authors first admit that "there is a danger in emphasizing, as we do in this book, the role of language as the site and surface of organizational emergence. We risk losing sight of the situational reality of all communication" (p. 277). To help rectify this deficiency, they view the organization as "a territory, a partly physical, partly social life space occupied by a diverse population... that perspective requires maps to be made as "an indispensable instrument for the governance of the territory" (p. 279).

They sum up the idea they have been developing in the book, saying: "An organization is a form of life. It is a structuring of the social and cultural world to produce an environment whose forms both express social life and create the context for it to thrive" (p. 324).

The collected references at the end form a substantial bibliography (pp. 327-340).

--- WEB


In his Preface, Andrew Puddephatt, Executive Director of Article 19, counters the easy explanation of the war(s) of the 1990s in the former Yugoslavia, that the conflicts were the inevitable outgrowth of ancient tribal enmities, by saying flatly:

This conflict, like many other civil conflicts, was created, nurtured and encouraged by competing political forces. And the media played a major role in manufacturing the conflict — just as it did in Rwanda. The combatants in Bosnia and latterly in Kosovo have long recognized that control of public opinion is as important as control of the battlefield. All sides have sought to mobilize and manipulate public opinion. The media no longer merely comment on war — they are part of the front line. (p. xi)

As Yugoslavia broke up along ethnic lines, in the early 1990s, the media also split up, and the few efforts to establish media institutions that would be truly neutral and objective were undermined by threats and actual violence. The national media, under Communism, were easily bent into molds suited to regional nationalisms. Puddephatt goes on to say, "Thompson's analysis of what we might call the ethnic nationalist media in Serbia, Bosnia and Croatia makes clear their role in literally forging the war. The fragmentation of the media in what was formerly Yugoslavia both contributed to and presently reinforces the causes of conflict" (p. xii).

Thompson is a British journalist specializing in Eastern European affairs and a close observer of events in the Balkans since the current situation there began to unfold in the late 1980s. In his Introduction, he remarks that Yugoslavs had lived together peacefully since 1918, except for the Second World War period, and, accordingly, "a campaign of intense propaganda was needed before war was thinkable in Yugoslavia, let alone 'inevitable'" (p. 1). The media war extended far outside the Balkans, too, as the various sides used propaganda to muster support from Eastern or Western Europe, America, and the Middle East. It was almost literally "made for television war," as its battles were beamed across the world, sometimes live (pp. 2-3). Reporters' access to the fighting was easy, although casualties among them were high (p. 4).

Chapters 1 and 2 describe the media situation in Yugoslavia under communist rule, including the process of media disintegration along ethnic lines that foreshadowed the political breakup of the country soon after (cf., p. 19). After describing the pan-Yugoslav media, such as Tanjug news agency in the previous chapter, in chapter 3 the author carries his story on to the post-1994 period. Chapters 4 and 5 focus on developments in Serbia; 6 and 7 on Croatia; and 8 and 9 on Bosnia and Herzegovina. Chapters 2, 4, 6, and 8 describe the situation in each context up through 1994, and the odd-numbered chapters update each one since 1994.

Chapter 10, "Reflections on the media, the politics of fear and the fear of politics," draws some lessons out of the tragedy of the Balkan wars, linking them with some observations about the media. A free media is seen as essential to popular democracy; but "Does not the literal passivity of television-
watchers, defined by their posture of acquiescence, serve to confirm an explicit message that viewers should trust their leaders?” (P. 304). Thompson notes that “events in Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia during the 1990s showed that popular access to information markets can still be drastically curtailed by governments in Europe” (ibid.). They also illustrate that “neo-tribal messages transmit very nicely by microwave link” (ibid.).


A Glossary is added, including a guide to Serbo-Croatian pronunciation and acronyms that appear in the book.

The Bibliography (pp. 369-372) includes titles in Serbo-Croatian, as well as English.

Article 19, The International Centre Against Censorship, describes itself on the book’s inside back cover. Its name is derived from Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, on the right to freedom of opinion and expression. It “works impartially and systematically to identify and oppose censorship world-wide...” and it “works on behalf of victims of censorship...” and “...monitors individual countries’ compliance with international standards protecting freedom of expression.” It is based in London, and has a web site: http://www.article19.org.


Irish diplomat Sean MacBride chaired UNESCO’s International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems, which was formed in 1977 to explore the many inequities prevailing between rich nations and poor nations in their access to appropriate communication arrangements. The Committee’s report — Many Voices, One World: The MacBride Report — was published in 1980. Although the 15 Commission members represented 5 continents and various ideologies, the report appeared at a time when vehement debates were raging about international communication policies. With the withdrawal of the United States, Britain, and Singapore from UNESCO — partly over this issue — and consequent reductions in UNESCO’s funding, that organization greatly reduced its involvement in discussions of world communication imbalances.

In an effort to keep the issue alive, several non-governmental and Third World intergovernmental organizations conceived the “MacBride Round Table,” which first met in Harare, Zimbabwe in 1989, to evaluate progress or regression in the implementation of a “new world information
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and communication order” (NWICO) in the ten years since the MacBride Report had appeared. The MacBride Round Table became an annual event, with ten such meetings being held, in widely separated locations around the world, up to including one in Amman, Jordan, in 1998 (p. ix). This book grew out of those meetings and was designed to “offer a look at issues highlighted by the MacBride Commission and thereafter elaborated by the Round Table, on the eve of the 21st century” (ibid.).

The editors feel that, “although many epitaphs have been written on the death of NWICO, the movement `towards a new, more just and more efficient world information and communication order’ is very much alive, although no longer under the same slogans. It has taken on new issues and concerns — the 1995 MacBride Round Table was on Africa and the Internet — yet it is still steeped in the old NWICO principles” (p. x).

Part one consists of two chapters, by John Galtung and Majid Taherian, respectively, proposing a new global vision incorporating NWICO principles aimed at strengthening means of self-expression, democratic diversity, and cultural pluralism among that majority of the world’s peoples who “hitherto have been objects rather than subjects of history” (p. 1).

The seven chapters of part two, “Prospectives and Perspectives,” look forward to the ways more specific areas of concern will develop in the 21st century. Topics treated in those chapters range from theories and research, through the “cyber-right to communicate” and “development journalism” to the role of indigenous minority groups in communication access and policy formulation.

Part three, “Excursions Around NWICO,” includes chapters on the concept of “communicative democracy,” on “transcending the dialectic of culture,” and on “unsearched assumptions of the MacBride Report.” The last of these (chapter 12), by Michael Basil, finds six bothersome assumptions in the report that need clarification if the argument for NWICO is to be strengthened. They include three assumptions of media effects that research findings have called into question: that “technology drives society,” that “communication is a defining technology” and that “more and newer technology is better” (pp. 224-227). The remaining three are “assumptions of positive effects: that “new media will not usurp interpersonal communication” (p. 227), that media have “no negative effects on local culture” (p. 228), and that media have “more positive than negative effects” (p. 229).

The three chapters in part four, “The MacBride Legacy,” explore the “great media debate” that has been the context of the MacBride movement, provide an evaluation of the MacBride Report’s recommendations in terms of the conditions of today’s world, and present a brief biography of Sean MacBride (p. 233).

Eight appendices contain the texts of closing statements of the MacBride Round Tables for 1989 through 1997.

The 18 authors and editors are identified in an appendix, “About the Authors” (pp. 353-354). The 10 who currently are based in the United States include several of other national origins, and others represent France, Germany, the Netherlands, Britain, Ireland, and Finland.

References follow each chapter. — WEB


Sick of it? Tired of a doctor finding something wrong and not being able to talk about it? “The quest to find explanations and meanings are among the defining characteristics of humans” (p. xi). The book aims to explain illness. When a patient is faced with a severe illness and in some way asks the doctor, “Why me?” the question moves from explanation to meaning. “Should health professionals even be involved in that territory?” (p. xii). The book emphasizes doctor-patient communication. Its main purpose is for researchers, to explain illness; and for students, to spark interest and provide information. But, at the same time, it can be used by facilitators to help patients understand illness. “For above all, the research reviewed should ultimately find its way to persons creating the messages to explain illness — those working in the health care system” (p. xv).

The first part of the book, “Foundational Theoretical Issues,” looks at the different ways to explain illness. The last chapter of the section, “Explaining Illness as Bad News: Individual Differences in Explaining Illness-Related Information,” by communication instructors Catherine Gillotti of Purdue University and James Applegate of the University of Kentucky, looks at the importance of communication in health care interaction. “For instance, health care providers are faced with challenges of gaining patients’ and family members’ understanding of complex procedures under extreme anxiety, performing difficult clinical procedures while trying to comfort patients and explaining the complexities of illness and courses of treatment” (p. 102).

It is pointed out that health care professionals have neither supportive research to turn to nor are they trained to explain illness to patients. While medical schools are trying to provide bad-news-delivery training to clinicians, not enough is being taught emphasized. How health care information is delivered is important to patient satisfaction and compliance. Research is improving communication training for health professionals. A transformation in the medical care culture is under way. “There is a struggle in all change, but responding to the call and the needs of the changing health care system will lead to a more complete educational experience for health care providers and, more important, to competent communication in the health care context” (p. 118).

The third and final section of this volume, “Cocultural Issues and Explaining Illness,” looks at how to relate illness to culturally diverse groups, including Native Americans and African Americans. The closing chapter of the section is by
Barbara Korsch of Children's Hospital in Los Angeles. Korsch summarizes each chapter of the book, starting by pointing out that this book includes writings by some well respected individuals in communication fields, as well as several doctors and a pharmacist. She applauds the book's efforts to explain illness, saying that "this monumental text ... constitutes a treasure trove when it comes to a relatively uncharted aspect of health care practices" (p. 325). Because the field of health communication is so undeveloped, she sees this book as paving the way for the health care practitioner-patient relationship, no matter how different their backgrounds may be. She concludes, "It is not an easy read, but absolutely worth the effort" (p. 326).

Extensive Author and Subject indexes close the book. — ADK


How does one get others to participate? Can people be instructed in ways that facilitate participation? Or is it a communication tool? Robert Chambers, in his Foreword, says that, unfortunately, participation may theoretically arise from the grassroots, but in reality it is often top-down. In practice, "facilitation has been seen as something people can be told to do, not as a skill to be learnt or an art to be practiced" (p. 8). So how does one best facilitate participation? Chambers believes that the contributors to White's book aim to answer that question, and "to an unusual degree it includes authors who are honest and open about their experiences, their failures as well as successes and what they have learnt" (ibid.).

White is a Professor Emeritus in the Department of Communication at Cornell University. "She has pioneered the field of participatory communication through her teaching, graduate student guidance, and research" (p. 360).

White introduces the book in her opening chapter, "Participation: Walk the Talk!" She assures readers that she and her 22 fellow contributors present their actual experiences in trying to facilitate participation in more than 18 countries, ranging from Australia to Zimbabwe. These experiences are presented to provide guidance, not to instruct. White encourages readers to feel free to contact the contributors, and she gives each of their profiles for reference at the end (pp. 351-360). She explains that her "goal is for you, the reader, to feel the support of this group in your own development pursuits" (p. 32).

The contributions are grouped in three broad sections, all aimed at contributing to mastering the art of facilitating participation. The first, "The Art of Activation," begins by presenting the concept of catalyst communicator and ends with a piece describing how best to do participatory work with children. Part 2, "The Art of Technique," looks at different approaches to successful facilitation in different situations, from women in agriculture to internet services assisting with development. The last part, Part 3, "The Art of Community Building," is about several tried-and-true examples that promote the role of strong communication in the building of community.

The fourth chapter, "Synergizing Participation: Are You Able to Enable?" is by Simone St. Anne, a native of Goa and graduate of St. Xavier's College in Mumbai (formerly "Bombay"), India, who is currently doing doctoral studies on the management of creativity at Cornell University. "She advocates 'creative collaboration' — a method of working together modeled on the ways of the creative artist, scientist, discoverer — as a powerful way to create the team dynamic that is so vital for productive and satisfying participation" (p. 68), as White summarizes St. Anne's contribution. St. Anne upholds the idea that people are the keys to facilitated participation, people who can envision the outcome of their group's participation.

White supports St. Anne's belief that people are key in facilitating participation in the last chapter of the book, "So What's All the Limping About?" White believes that since people are so important, "the development debate must center on the goal of providing a broader range of choices for the world's future generations" (p. 337). She concludes that the facilitator must accompany the people on their road to participatory involvement, to guide them in reaching the destination most successfully.

The book closes with profiles of the editor and each contributor, followed by a detailed index. — ADK


Whether we know it or not, we all are affected by the media. We are living in the "entertainment age" (p. vii) of television, radio, music, billboards, athletics, story-telling and most recently, digital technology, "a previously unimaginable wealth of entertainment choices" (ibid.). The chief characteristic of Western media entertainment is the audiences' expectation that they can just sit back and let the media entertain them, with no activity on their part. It is argued that this pattern is spreading throughout the world, accompanied by the challenge entertainment media already face on a smaller scale in the West: to learn to satiate "the entertainment needs of vastly diverse audiences with vastly diverse intellectual, aesthetic, and emotional interests ..." (ibid.). Media entertainment must therefore learn how to create emotional responses: knowing what will make people happy and what will make them sad in many different cultures.

Surprisingly, there has been very little research about how people are entertained. "All too often, commercial prerogatives
limit research to staking out consumer interest in particular formats without concern for the more fundamental issues of entertainment” (ibid.). The question of how people are entertained is now being explored, but the answers have not found a common ground. This book attempts to provide that ground. “An overview of what is currently known about the appeal and function of the essential forms of media entertainment is provided, and some degree of integration is offered” (ibid). Since the late 1990s, contributors have been solicited from all over the world, “this in an effort to cover all major aspects of the media-entertainment cornucopia” (p. ix).

The book’s first chapter, “The Coming of Media Entertainment,” by Dolf Zillmann of the University of Alabama, begins by tracing the media-entertainment phenomenon, from the early humanoids, to Homo erectus, to Ancient Egyptian culture, to the Roman Empire, to Christianity’s birth and influences, to the entertainment arts in the mid-1900s, when theater, opera, concerts, sports, recreation, games, and reading for pleasure were frequently enjoyed. “All this changed drastically,” Zillman acknowledges, “with the invention of the technology for sound recording and transmission, soon to be followed by that for the transmission and recording of imagery” (p. 16), making movies, records, radio, and television common tools for the transmission and recording of entertainment at home, where entertainment is now at everyone’s fingertips.

Such technological advancements have not only brought entertainment closer to individuals, they have made individual labor timed much less demanding. “Between 1850 and 1950, the average workweek shrank from 70 to 40 hours” (p. 17). This created more leisure time, thus more time to spend on entertainment activities. Zillmann finally asks what the future will hold. He concludes that “... whatever form the future of pleasure-seeking will take, there can be little doubt that entertainment will define, more than ever before, the civilizations to come” (p. 18).

Mary Beth Oliver, of Pennsylvania State University, considers the important role gender plays in responses to media entertainment in the twelfth chapter, “The Respondent Gender Gap” (p. 215). She first discusses “chick flicks” ... those melodramatic films that many females adore but that males only tolerate at best, if not abhor” (p. 216). She then looks at what makes men tend to like, “the ever-popular sporting event” (p. 217), noting that research suggests that this is because men have a greater appreciation of media violence, which can exist in any type of entertainment, but especially “the slasher movie,” and other horror films. Horror films often contain sexual imagery, which research confirms is enjoyed by males.

Pornography is then discussed by Oliver, including that found in magazines, books, films, and photographs. Research suggests that males have more frequent exposure to and use of pornographic entertainment. Oliver agrees, pointing out that “the romantic yet heart-wrenching world of the melodramatic tear jerker belongs to females, whereas the more action-packed and explicit world of sports, violence, and pornography belongs to males” (p. 222).

Why do males and females experience entertainment differently? Oliver sees no one simple answer, boiling the discussion down to content- and viewer-related characteristics that cause different reactions. In the end, she concludes that “the he said-she said debate that often occurs in the video rental store should not be seen as a commonplace example of the war between the sexes, but rather a manifestation of the complexities of biological and culture forces that lead her to the melodramas and him to the action adventures” (p. 230).

The next chapter, by James B. Weaver III of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, looks for connections between individual personalities and media entertainment preferences, which he says “... has long been recognized as a key component to understanding both the uses and effects of the mass media” (p. 235). He points out that since the 1940s, research has linked personality and media entertainment preferences. In the 1990s, personality-type groups were classified as extraversion (E), neuroticism (N), and psychoticism (P) (p. 240). He goes on to recognize that the media industry has traditionally linked individual traits with media-content preferences. “... Despite increasing content specialization and audience fragmentation,” he explains, “analysis of the content preferences of media audiences solely on the basis of demographic strata remains the modus operandi for most media organizations” (p. 241). Personality types therefore play a key role in media content preferences. But “there are... recent alternative conceptualizations of personality that offer well-integrated dispositional models” (p. 245). Weaver thinks that future research must consider these more complex findings, along with greater consideration of personality characteristics.

“Finally,” Weaver concludes, “the potential mediating role of personality characteristics on individuals’ attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors toward newer media technologies should not be overlooked” (ibid.). How different personalities relate to the Internet, for example, still must be studied. — ADK