COMMUNICATION RESEARCH TRENDS

IN THIS
ISSUE

Threads of Intersection and Distinction: Joining an Ongoing Conversation within Organizational Communication Research

Sarah Bonewits Feldner & Scott C. D'Urso
Marquette University

A QUARTERLY REVIEW OF COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

Table of Contents

Threads of Intersection and Distinction:
Joining an Ongoing Conversation within
Organizational Communication Research

Organizational Communication

Editor's Introduction

After the family, people most likely spend the majority of their "communication time" interacting in organizations—work for many, but also a host of voluntary organizations. In addition to that, people also interact with organizations ranging from government offices to health care providers to manufacturers and sales groups, to almost anything imaginable. Human life today is lived in organizations.

Not surprisingly, communication scholars have long focused attention on organizational communication, examining the nature and characteristics of that communication as well as the context. As Bonewits Feldner and D'Urso point out in this issue of COMMUNICATION RESEARCH TRENDS, most communication specialities, from rhetoric to interpersonal studies to mass media studies, appear within organizations. Early communication scholarship, then, examined organizations as sites for communication activity. That early scholarship also tended to limit its scope to business organizations and many times took its lead from concerns of business administration. Public speaking occurred in business settings, so speech and debate programs examined business speech. Interpersonal relationships, often client-provider or superior-subordinate, also merited study as types of the larger world of interpersonal communication. Businesses made use of a variety of media in order to tell their stories or to advertise their products. Communication happened in organizations.

By the 1980s, organizational communication scholarship had developed both a set of problems and a set of methodologies to examine those problems. It still accepted, though, an understanding of organizations based on other disciplines. Taking the lead from social psychology, communication scholars read classic works such as Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn's *The Social Psychology of Organizations* (1978), which proposed an "open system approach to the study of organizations" (p. iii). Katz and Kahn go on to note:

> Research is no longer contained within the boundaries of a single organization but crosses those borders to deal with environmental forces, relationships with other systems, and the effects of organizations on individual members as human beings and members of the larger society.

> That social psychological principles can be applied to all forms of collective organized effort is now acknowledged in many disciplines. (p. iii)

Communication scholars were no different. They devoted their efforts to understanding organizations, using principles and models drawn from their body of knowledge, examining, for example, the role of communication in organizational conflict, the communication between organizational units or within organizational units, and the connection between communication and a variety of things like organizational satisfaction, power, decision making, change, rewards, motivations, and organizational culture.

Other scholars applied a communication lens to key problems for organizations like recruitment, socialization and training, public relations, and networks. In the late 1980s, communication scholars published the first edition of the *Handbook of Organizational Communication* (Jablin, Putnam, Roberts, & Porter, 1987), noting that it presented "an interdisciplinary perspective." As an indication of how communication scholars understood the growing area of organizational communication, the editors organized the handbook into four parts: Theoretical issues, Context (internal and external environments), Structure (patterns of organizational relationships), and Process (communication behavior in organizations). As an indication of the scope of the study, we see that individual chapters address the information environment of organizations, corporate discourse, communication climate, organizational culture, cross-cultural perspectives, communication networks, superior-subordinate communication, informal and formal communication, information technology, conflict, negotiation, decision making, power, and organizational entry and assimilation. Sage Publications has regularly updated this handbook, offering a snapshot of how organizational communication has developed within communication study, with each edition showing development in the area.

Here, Bonewits Feldner and D'Orso provide an updated look at organizational communication, asking how the field understands itself today, examining the last 12 years of publications across a fairly comprehensive set of communication journals.

Threads of Intersection and Distinction:
Joining an Ongoing Conversation within Organizational Communication Research

Sarah Bonewits Feldner & Scott C. D'Urso
sarah.feldner@marquette.edu   scott.durso@marquette.edu

In any given discipline, there seems to be an ongoing battle of definition, a certain degree of consternation about who we are and where we fit. In this review we argue that the discipline of organizational communication is no different. In fact, journals and handbooks have published several special issues that have attempted to tackle this same challenge. These moments of identity crisis hold significance in both their frequency—in many ways they mark time as it passes—and function—they serve as markers of trends and currents of thinking between and amongst scholars.

It should come as no surprise to note that academic disciplines spend so much time considering their identities. The context of a constantly changing society virtually demands refining a disciplinary identity. With economic crises, an explosion in technological advancement, and increased awareness of our existence within a global community, disciplines like organizational communication must consider how they fit within the larger social structure and systems to remain current, relevant, and significant. Therefore, it is not only salient but also essential to occasionally take a moment to step back and survey the research and publications within a discipline to discern how that discipline's identity evolves along with society.

As a construct of organizational communication, identity is that which makes an organization distinct. Yet at the same time, establishing an organization's identity is not simply about what makes one different, but it is also about what makes one the same as others with whom the organization engages and interacts. In the end, identity makes one the same but different. In this essay, we take up the identity question once again—but in a renewed way—approaching the question as joining an ongoing conversation and seeking to position organizational communication as simultaneously the same and different from other disciplines in communication and the same and different from ongoing conversations on key issues and topics that shape our world. Toward this end, we take up the questions of identity as the field of organizational communication has traditionally addressed it over the past decade, then we look to points of intersection in current research both with traditional disciplines and with current topics, trends, and issues. Finally, we acknowledge where we find the points of distinction that lead the conversation down a slightly different path.

1. Organizing Disciplinary Identity: A Framework

Definitions at their heart are statements of identity (Gioia, 1998). As such, seeking to delineate research trends involves at its essence an act of identity construction. Disciplines construct their identities through the research, publication and commentaries that comprise the field. That said, in reviewing organizational communication literature, by definition we seek to understand the identity of organizational communication as a discipline. To be certain, the task of defining any scholarly field or discipline presents a daunting challenge. However, in many ways, a review of organizational communication research with an eye toward understanding what constitutes "organizational communication" seems particularly well suited for a framework revolving around identity. We situate this review around identity because, as with all fields, organizational communication is evolving and changing as society changes. In addition, identity itself forms a key area of inquiry within organizational communication.

In order to use organizational identity (in this sense) as a guiding framework for this review, we must first ask to what extent we might consider an academic discipline as an "organization" in need of an identity. This move requires adopting a particular understanding of the concept of "organization," one that takes a stance of organization as a verb—or rather as a process. Drawing from Karl Weick's *Social Psychology of Organizing* (1979), an orientation toward communication as constitutive of organizations marks, in part, organizational communication in the past decade (see Deetz, 2001). This shift in perspective opens space for considering organizational communication beyond the contexts of organizations as containers (Smith, 1993; Smith & Turner, 1995). This leads to an understanding of organizations as something other than physical structures. Instead organizations become particular patterns of interactions (Cheney, Christensen, Zorn, & Ganesh, 2004). In this light, disciplines are indeed particular organizations with particular identity narratives.

While we have long associated identity with individuals, with increasing frequency organizational communication scholars recognize that organizations themselves have particular identities (e.g., Cheney & Christensen, 2001; Pratt & Foreman, 2000). Organizational members actively seek to communicate a particular identity to both internal and external audiences. The most often cited definition of organizational communication comes from Albert and Whetten (1985) who suggest that an organization's identity consists of the statement of what is central, distinct, and enduring about the organization. This, largely discursive, perspective on identity comes from the view that identity acts as both the medium and outcome of discursive acts (Kuhn & Nelson, 2002). The research in any given area constitutes a particular discourse about that discipline. These discourses serve as the material resources from which we might begin to understand the identity of the discipline.

A. Identifying organizational communication

The discipline of organizational communication does not differ from the many things whose identities are contested and constantly in flux (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991; Scott & Lane, 2000). Scholars have devoted a number of manuscripts, chapters, and journal issues to the question of the nature of organizational communication as a discipline. We offer here a brief history of organizational communication along with an outline of a few of the key perspectives on organizational communication as a discipline.

Redding (1985) contends that the move to adopt and use the term organizational communication marked the most significant conceptual shift for the field. The use of the term organizational communication, which Redding attributes to the Organizational Communication Conference of 1976 at the Marshall Space Center, repositioned the study of organizational communication in two ways. First, the use of the term moved away from viewing organizations solely as business or industrial entities. Second, it broadened our perspective on communication beyond training and the development of speaking skills. Redding and Tompkins (1988) saw organizational communication coming from concepts and proto-theories that derived from three primary sources: (a) traditional rhetorical doctrine, (b) the old version of "human relations" theory, and (c) various components of management-organization theory. From here, many of the goals of this discipline have formed. The discipline has continued to evolve from this point, adopting Weick's conception of organizing (1979), integrating the interpretive turn (Weick & Daft, 1983), incorporating a systems perspective, and finally addressing a critical perspective. For complete histories see Meisenbach and McMillan (2006).

While these histories begin to sketch out a clearer sense of organizational communication's identity, scholars have sought to construct an identity and to establish organizational communication as a discipline through a series of models, classification, schemes, and key problematics. Deetz (2001) suggests that in seeking to understand the foundations of organizational communication we must recognize that each scheme gives us a particular means of "perceiving, thinking about, and talking about organizational life" (p. 6). In offering his scheme for organizational communication he looks at paradigms of research; in this he offers four discourses of organizational communication (normative, interpretive, critical, and dialogic). In contrast, Krone, Jablin, and Putnam (1987) offer four somewhat functional categories for understanding organizational communication research: mechanistic, psychological, symbolic-interpretive, and systems-interactive. Conrad (1999) offers yet another perspective that suggests we best understand organizational communication by understanding the relationship between an organization's structure and the action of individuals within these structures. Putnam, Phillips, and Chapman (1996) propose a series of metaphors for understanding organizational

communication (conduit, lens, linkage, performance, symbol, voice, and discourse). Finally, Mumby and Stohl (1996) provide an often-cited set of key problematics in organizational communication (voice, rationality, organization, and organization society).

A number of key texts and expositions on organizational communication have taken up Mumby and Stohl's problematics. However, as noted, identity construction is an iterative process and the process is ongoing. And so, in the last 10 years, key themes in publications in the area of organizational communication focus on determining the nature of organizational communication, interrogate the role of the organizational communication scholar, and question the place for engaged scholarship in organizational communication (e.g., Allen, 2002; Cheney, 2007; Jones, Watson, Gardner, & Gallois, 2004).

B. Organizational communication as difference and sameness

While much of the discussion on organizational identity focuses on identity construction processes as a boundary setting process (Christensen & Cheney, 1994), Cheney and his colleagues point out the extent to which, historically, identity as a concept finds its roots in an understanding of sameness. From this historical vantage the community ascribed identity onto an individual. That is, the community was needed in order to fully understand the identity of the individual. In this vein, organizational identity functions at the

same time as a statement of difference ("the unique") and sameness ("the held in common"). Indeed, in terms of establishing an organizational identity understandable in a broader context, organizations need other organizations. We define one organization against the identity of other organizations. And so, we need definitions of other disciplines to add clarity to any definition of organizational communication.

To date, most of the writing that seeks to set out a definition of organizational communication has focused on difference—for example, Mumby and Stohl's problematics focus on what makes organizational communication different from other communication disciplines. We agree on this useful and necessary step in understanding the identity of organizational communication. Yet, at the same time, we wish to heed Cheney's call to remember identity contains within it a sense of sameness. We will use the sameness/difference dichotomy as a means for organizing this literature review.

Traditionally, literature reviews may not subscribe to a particular method. However, in an attempt to identify key points of intersection with other disciplines and primary points of distinction from these same disciplines and to discern organizational communication's trends from a vantage point other than our own direct experience, we sought to systematically review work in organizational communication over the past 12 years (1998–2009). We searched the indexes of all of the ICA and NCA affiliated (national and

Journal	Publisher
Human Communication Research	International Communication Association
Communication Theory	International Communication Association
Journal of Communication	International Communication Association
Journal of Computer Mediated Communication	International Communication Association
Communication Monographs	National Communication Association
Journal of Applied Communication Research	National Communication Association
Communication and Critical / Cultural Studies	National Communication Association
Communication Research Reports	Eastern Communication Association
Communication Quarterly	Eastern Communication Association
Western Journal of Communication	Western States Communication Association
Communication Studies	Central States Communication Association
Communication Research	Sage
Journal of Management	Sage
Journal of Business Communication	Sage
Management Communication Quarterly	Sage
Journal of Business and Psychology	Springer

Table 1. Index of Reviewed Journals (1998-2009)

regional) journals during this time period along with *Management Communication Quarterly*, *Journal of Business Communication*, and the *Journal of Business and Psychology*, seeking to identify research that focused on topics traditionally associated with organizational communication and to locate articles published by scholars who traditionally identify as organizational communication scholars. (See Table 1 on page 6 for the complete list.) While we sought to be thorough, we recognize the necessary incompleteness of our catalogue and the certain degree of subjectivity that arises when we seek to draw such boundaries. After we identified the articles, we examined the topics, issues, and discussions to discern themes that emerged. As we read, re-read, grouped and regrouped this body, we did so against the backdrop of the principle that we use to frame this discussion: the areas of

intersection between this set of organizational communication materials and other areas of communication research (i.e., other communication disciplines) and the points where the perspectives point to distinctions. In what follows we provide an overview of the points of intersection and areas of distinction in turn. Our goal here is not to be comprehensive in addressing every bit of research that has been published. Rather, we seek to provide an overview of the types of research done across the discipline in the past 12 years. In presenting these points of distinction, we provide a catalogue and description of the topics, issues, and kinds of research that has been conducted most recently, stopping short of examining the details of each finding. In essence, we seek to provide a map of the landscape of organizational communication research from a broad and expansive viewpoint.

2. Identity in Sameness: Organizational Communication's Intersection with Subdisciplines of Communication Studies

In adopting a view of identity construction rooted in the recognition that identity entails both sameness and difference and situated within a systems perspective, a number of intersections not surprisingly appear between organizational communication research over the past 12 years and communication theories and perspectives associated with the larger communication discipline as a whole. First, research over the past 12 year reveals connections between specific subdisciplines of communication and organizational communication. Second, the review of literature demonstrated the degree to which organizational communication scholars grapple with some issues and topics that have universally captivated the imagination of communication scholars across the disciplines.

As we surveyed research in organizational communication, we discovered streams of research that intersect with several key subdisciplines of communication (e.g., rhetorical communication, interpersonal communication, and critical/cultural studies of communication). These intersections point to a first key aspect of the identity of organizational communication as a discipline—its solid situation within the communication discipline as a whole. All communication research ultimately has an interest in interaction and meaning. Rather than focusing on drawing borders between organizational communication and other areas

of communication, recent trends in research suggest a foregrounding of commonalities. This itself clearly reveals the interdisciplinary potential of organizational communication.

A. Organizational communication and rhetoric & discourse studies

Identifying interactions between rhetorical studies and organizational communication proves an easy task. As Meisenbach and McMillan (2006) note, a rhetorical perspective on organizational communication has existed since the inception of organizational communication as a distinct area of communication study. However, many scholars feared that a focus on organizational rhetoric had stagnated. But it seems that the tide has turned as recent research includes a resurgence in rhetorical perspectives. In this, organizational communication scholars have taken up rhetorical devices as a particular object of study and further make use of the tools of rhetorical analysis as a mode of inquiry. A series of articles in 2008 (Conrad & Malphurs, 2008; Hartelius & Browning, 2008; Whittle, Mueller, & Mangan, 2008) took up the question of rhetoric as a particularly salient perspective for understanding managerial perspectives.

The use of rhetoric from a management perspective stands in contrast to perhaps a greater understand-

ing of organizational life from a rhetorical perspective, which comes from surveying the research done in the area using particular rhetorical tools. Scholars have examined topics that range from exploring maternity discourse using Burke's classic pentad (Meisenbach, 2008), to understanding how organizational rumors might be understood within the context of guilt and purification (Scheibel, 1999), to addressing workplace bullying by analyzing associated metaphors (Tracy, Lutgen-Sandvik, & Alberts, 2006), to examining labor unions' uses of rhetorical strategies to advance their causes (Brimeyer, Eaker, & Clair, 2004).

While focusing on organizational rhetoric is a valid endeavor in its own right, the past 12 years have yielded a few particular focus points. First, organizational communication scholars look to narrative as a means of considering how organizational members frame meanings and establish identities for both individuals and the organizations themselves. Lucas and Buzzanell (2004) provide an exemplar of this focus on narrative in their examination of the stories told by miners as they construct and make sense of the meanings embedded in work experience. The stories of the miners function as a means of socializing miners into their occupations and in the end contribute to an overall process of identity construction. In like manner, narratives of managers have been examined to establish the means by which managers use stories to exercise power (Coopman & Meidlinger, 2000; Smith & Keyton, 2001), resolve conflict and influence decision making (Jameson, 2001), and manage multiple meanings of workplace experience (Barge, 2004). Related work on narrative in organizations looks beyond traditional forms of storytelling to understand the ways in which everyday organizational phenomena such as list making (Ziegler, 2007) and suggestion boxes (Opt, 1998) both function as narratives themselves and generate stories that ultimately shape the organizational culture.

Beyond considering particular narratives, organizational communication research has moved to include narrative analysis as a particular means of interrogating organizational life. In 2001, *Management Communication Quarterly* incorporated a special forum that provided analyses of best-selling management books (Boje, 2001; Carlone, 2001; Jackson, 2001). This forum used classical rhetorical methods to uncover the ways in which the discourses of the popular press served to construct larger societal meanings of workplace and organizational life. The use of rhetorical analysis extends beyond traditional texts as organizational scholars also interrogate the use of nontraditional media to create or construct particular meanings for organizational life (e.g., Gossett & Kilker, 2006).

Taking several of these views of narrative together, Boje and Rosile (2003) demonstrate how entire episodes of organizational discourse can be understood within the traditional narrative frameworks. Boje and Rosile examined the case of Enron and argued that the events played out largely as an epic tragedy. In this, they used rhetorical methods to identify narrator, storyline, and characters in order to understand the way in which narrative can function as a means of absolving public actors of accountability for the events that occurred.

Thinking in terms of intersections, a consideration of organizational rhetoric lends itself to a particular focus on public relations scholarship and its connection to organizational communication. An explicit focus on the rhetorical in organizational communication in many ways blurs the lines between public relations scholarship and organizational communication. One may go as far as to argue that one way of viewing public relations scholarship sees it as a subset of organizational rhetoric. As such, it is salient to note the scholarship that draws from a rhetorical perspective while addressing the relationship between organizations and their publics. Scholars commonly employ the rhetorical perspective when considering how organizations address crisis situations (e.g., Ulmer, 2001). In addressing crisis response from a decided rhetorical perspective Rowland (2004) examines the rhetorical tool of apologia.

Expanding this further, a related thread of research—on organizational discourses and their role in creating meaning for organizational life—also marks organization communication research over the past decade. Examining discourse does not exclusively fall under the rhetorical tradition; however, clear points of intersection emerge as a focus on discourse includes a focus on the way in which people construct meaning through systems of organizational messages. Like specific rhetorical studies, some work focuses on theorizing the nature of organizational discourse and its functions in organizations. First, some work establishes typologies of organizational discourses (Tracy, 2007). Sillince (2007) goes beyond typologies of the discourse itself to argue that discourse is meaningless without context; as such he argues for viewing the particular discourses that themselves construct context. Finally,

Bisel (2009) focuses on the degree to which discursive studies take a dualistic approach; in response Bisel calls for more organizational communication research that adopts a more holistic or dialectic perspective.

In taking a discursive approach, scholars view organizational communication both broadly by identifying the ways in which organizational discourses (in general) contribute to the construction of an organization's culture (Ruud, 2000) and more narrowly by looking at discourses surrounding particular issues as did Scott (2008) who examined specific discourses tied to organization risk, considering how firefighters made sense of this risk through touch. Finally, others regard discourse as a resource used by organization members for reaching goals. For example, Gordon and Stewart (2009) examine the specific discursive strategies used within appraisal interviews.

Beyond looking at discourses as objects of study or at particular strategies used by organizational communication, organizational communication research has evolved to a point that organizations themselves become discursive structures. Fairhurst and Putnam (2004) advance this claim as they argue that viewing organizations as having discourses forms only one of three perspectives that one might take in examining discourse in organizations; a second perspective views discourse as shaping organizational practice; and finally, a third perspectives sees discourses as themselves creating organizations.

In all of these perspectives that focus on rhetoric and discourse, organizational issues remain in the foreground, thus establishing what they regard as unique and distinct to organizational communication. Yet, at the same time, these studies highlight a view held in common with particular sub-disciplines of communication. Like rhetorical studies, as it has evolved, organizational communication has continued to link its identity to a belief that understanding an organization at the broad discursive level gives us greater understanding of the human experience.

B. Interpersonal communication

Whereas organizational communication's ties to the rhetorical emphasize a macro level perspective, intersections with interpersonal communication draw largely upon a microlevel perspective. This shift turns the focus of organizational communication to look more specifically on the interactions between individuals in organizations. Themes that emerge in looking at the intersection with organizational communication fall into work that looks at particular types of communication relationships and strategies, and work that looks at larger issues tied to relational development and family communication.

Organizational communication scholars have a general interest in the kinds of relationships that develop in organizations and how they impact organizational satisfaction (Avtgis & Brogan, 1999), the relationship between relationship quality and information received (Sias, 2005), relational development as a means of understanding how organizational members integrate into workplaces (Teboul & Cole, 2005), and the connection between trust and peer relationships (Myers & Johnson, 2004).

Beyond the particular effects associated with workplace relationships, scholarship in this area further solidifies the intersection with interpersonal communication. Organizational communication scholars take up many of the same issues found within general communication research but they focus on these issues in an organizational context. Sias (2004) examines the ways in which individuals disengage from relationships but in a workplace context. Henningsen, Braz, and Davies (2008) interrogate flirting behaviors in the organizational context. Finally, other work takes up interpersonal topics that extend beyond relational development to look at conflict negotiation strategies within organizations (Jameson, 2004; Oetzel, Meares, Myers, & Estefana, 2003).

While retaining a tie to interpersonal communication in its focus on the role of communication in relationship development, organizational communication research extends understanding to focus on those particular relationships most commonly considered within organizational contexts. The first, a focus on leadership communication, still draws on a salient tie to interpersonal communication. Despite the time that has passed since its introduction, leader member exchange (LMX) continues to serve as a key construct used to investigate leader behaviors in organizations. LMX posits that the quality of the relationship between leaders and followers can impact followers' perceptions of the organization. Toward this end, research has focused on LMX in the contexts of job and organizational satisfaction (Fix & Sias, 2006; Mueller & Lee, 2002), organizational justice (Lee, 2001), gender (Lee, 1999), and intercultural exchanges (Botero & Van Dyne, 2009).

LMX as a theoretical construct continues to have relevance in current research. However, recent work in the area of leader/follower relationships also looks at

the extent to which organizational communication needs new perspectives on leadership (Chen, 2008; Tourish, 2008). One proposal includes discursive (making connections with other perspectives on organizational communication) views of leadership (Fairhurst, 2008; Krone, 2008; Svennevig, 2008); another perspective on leadership advances conceptions of leadership that embrace reflexivity (i.e., a consideration of how one's values and viewpoints influence actions) and courage (Barge, 2004; Jablin, 2006).

Related to, but distinct from the leader/follower relation is the relationship between superiors and subordinates. Research on superior/subordinate communication falls into three basic categories: (a) supervisor communication style, (b) the relationship between the perceived quality of interaction with supervisors and particular organizational outcomes, and (c) supervisory/subordinate communication in stressed organizations. First, scholars have addressed issues of supervisor style (Lee, 1998; Sager, 2008) including a focus on humor as a specific managerial style (e.g., Rizzo, Booth-Butterfield, & Bekelja Wanzer, 1999). Second, research has addressed specific tactics used in conflict (Martin, Anderson, & Sirimangkala, 1999) or negative interactions such as sanctions and reproaches (Carson & Cupach, 2000; Kobayashi, Grasmick, & Friedrich, 2001). Finally, work in supervisory/subordinate communication continues research historically associated with organizational communication, for example, the examination of the connection between perceptions of the quality of interactions with supervisors and satisfaction (Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 2001; Teven, 2007); perceptions of supervisor effectiveness, credibility, or attractiveness (McCrosky & Richmond, 2000; Neuliep, Hintz, & McCrosky, 2005); and perceptions of trust (Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 2001).

Studies of supervisor/subordinate communication remain largely focused on supervisory communication behaviors. However, this topic has expanded to consider the strategies used by subordinates to influence their managers (Olufowote, Miller, & Wilson, 2005). In particular, the question of employee expressions of dissent has generated a great deal of research in the past 12 years. Much of the work in dissent stems from the investigations of Kassing and his colleagues (Kassing, 2000, 2001, 2007, 2009; Kassing & Armstrong, 2002; Kassing & Avtgis, 2001). Kassing's research focuses on supervisory communication strategies and events that trigger dissent as well as the strategies used by subordinates to express dissent.

The examinations of dissent highlight that not all interactions are positive. Organizational communication scholarship in part has taken up this issue in its exploration of workplace bullying, aggression, and employee mistreatment. In keeping with a focus on interpersonal interaction, this stream of research retains a focus on interactions between individuals. While bullying in the workplace has long existed as an unwelcome phenomenon, research in the area has only recently emerged. When considering bullying, scholars seek to understand the strategies used by victims to resist bullying (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2006) or alternately to consider metaphors that capture the emotions experienced by the targets of bullying (Tracy et al., 2006). In a topic related to bullying, studies of abusive workplaces have emerged in the past 12 years (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2003; Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2008; Meares, Oetzel, Torres, Derkacks, & Ginosar, 2004). Whether considering employee abuse or bullying, this line of research addresses emotionally scarring interactions in the context of structural and systemic issues. In this approach, these topics demonstrate the degree to which, while overlapping with interpersonal issues, organizational communication research takes a decidedly different stance.

Bullying and abusive relationships certainly take an emotional toll on organizational members; emotion forms a key aspect of interpersonal interaction. And so organizational communication scholarship shares this interest in emotion with Miller (Miller, 2004, 2007, 2008; Miller, Considine, & Garner, 2007) providing the primary voice on the topic of emotion in the workplace. Her work highlights the degree to which organizational life includes intense emotional experiences that people and organizations must manage within the contexts of organizational interactions. Beyond acknowledging the intensity of these experiences, other scholars suggest that the management of emotion constitutes a particular kind of labor (Shuler & Davenport, 2000). Focus on emotion and emotional labor reveals the degree to which daily interaction within organizational contexts intersects with theoretical perspectives relevant in the realm of interpersonal communication.

Conversation about emotion in the work place often leads to a consideration of individual experiences that extend beyond the workplace. Here family issues hold the key place. Communication and negotiation of family relationships and issues have long provided a focal point of interpersonal scholarship; this area then represents a final point of intersection between organi-

zational communication and interpersonal communication as organizational communication scholars have taken up the issue of work/life balance in a variety of contexts. Organizational communication scholars have a strong interest in the means by which organizational members negotiate their responsibilities at home with their work lives (Butler & Modaff, 2008; Buzzanell, Meisenbach, Remke, Liu, Bowers, & Conn, 2005; Cowen & Hoffman, 2008; Golden, 2009; Medved, 2004). These studies all focus on the degree to which employees (most often mothers) develop communication patterns and routines that allow them to make sense of both roles—as parent and employee. Focusing on sensemaking at the individual level provides only part of the picture of the work/life balance issue; other scholars have taken up this issue at the level of policy and discourse. In this, rather than considering how individuals communicatively establish routines and boundaries, these scholars give attention to how organizations construct policies and the ways in which broader discourses shape the meaning of work/life balance (Hoffman & Cowan, 2008; Kirby & Krone, 2002; Medved & Kirby, 2005).

In looking at this line of research, the intersection between interpersonal communication and organizational communication becomes clear as both sub-disciplines take the role of communication seriously in establishing and negotiating relationships between individuals. In this sameness, the differences become clear at the same time as scholars in organizational communication pay particular attention to the interplay of organizational context with relational issues.

C. Critical/cultural communication

Taking up the research on work/life balance as a transitional point, we now turn to intersection between organizational communication and critical cultural studies of communication. As organizational scholars have examined the ways in which policies are enacted and the ideologies embedded within work/life discourse (Hoffman & Cowan, 2008; Kirby & Krone, 2002), they began to push into the kind of cultural critique employed by the growing area of critical/cultural studies within communication studies. Critical/cultural studies in communication focus on the role of power and ideology in society on a variety of levels. Drawing on both critical neo-Marxist and postmodern theories, this subdiscipline chooses "culture" as its object of study. It assumes that culture permeates all aspects of life and that power and ideology infuse culture and as

such shape the way culture influences our life. Organizational communication research has included a critical/cultural perspective for over 20 years, and this trend has continued in the past decade. Identifying the discrete themes tied to the critical/cultural perspective on communication poses a challenge because of the great diversity of critical communication research and because it simultaneously falls within other topic areas of organizational communication. For this review, we have focused on two primary issues addressed by critical/cultural organizational communication scholars— power/resistance and gender and race studies—as they seem most representative of this particular intersection.

When the first author met Dennis Mumby, one of the leading critical organizational communication scholars, he suggested that, in his view, communication was all about "power, power, power." While his comment occurred in jest, this perspective is not altogether inaccurate. Organizational communication scholars who have taken up the critical perspective hold a particular interest in the ways in which organizations enact power through particular communication behaviors and, further, in the ways in which organizational members resist this power. First, an examination of power occurs at the organizational level. For example, Zoller (2003, 2004) examined the ways in which health promotion programs draw upon larger managerial discourses that delimit the employees' experiences and that encourage hegemonic responses. Other studies in this vein have examined the ways organizational discourses function to delimit and control organizational members identity construction processes (Tracy, 2000) and the means by which they are able to participate in organizational processes (Thackaberry, 2004). Critical/cultural studies as a sub-discipline focuses on larger societal discourses and their influence on a variety of institutions. Some organizational communication scholars situate their work at the intersection of these discourses and organizational issues. Any number of societal discourses influence organizational life, but a primary focus for organizational communication in the United States remains the discourse of capitalism. Research in this vein examines the ways in which capitalism as a discourse becomes embedded in organizational practice and also the extent to which these discourses shape our understanding of organizational issues. In particular, organizational communication scholars have taken up the question of capitalism in the context of communicative labor (Carlone, 2008; Dempsey, 2009).

The recognition of the existence of power by organizational communication scholars does not denote a mindset in which organizational members lack recourse. A number of studies examine the ways in which individuals resist the power of discourses both on the macro-level as activists challenge the representations offered by Nike, for example (Knight & Greenberg, 2002); as employee groups resist organizational policies via websites (Gossett & Kilker, 2006); or as individuals resist broader social discourses centered on the process of ageing for female professionals (Trethewey, 2001). Studies of power and resistance have a broad reach in organizational communication and, as such, the past 12 years have also provided an opportunity to revisit earlier discussions of resistance and power—affirming, modifying, and extending this research agenda. In particular, *Management Communication Quarterly* (2008) devoted an entire issue (Volume 21) to exploring the power/resistance dynamic in organizational life. Beyond this, Dixon (2007), Nadesan (2001), and Cloud (2001) all suggested ways in which study of power and culture in organizational communication could expand to include postmodern and post-fordist perspectives. In a call for a different kind of expansion, other scholars have identified a need for integrating more global (Ganesh, Zoller, & Cheney, 2005) and post-colonial perspectives (Broadfoot & Munshi, 2007) into power/resistance communication research.

As a key aspect of critical/cultural studies, this last issue of expanding critical studies of organizational communication to include alternative perspectives holds particular salience because of its interest in drawing attention to the experience of individuals marginalized in some way. For example, focusing on racial diversity within organizations provides one means of fulfilling this goal. Clearly a number of studies examine racial diversity in organizations but not from a critical perspective (e.g., the language dilemma case and responses in *Management Communication Quarterly,* 2002; Grimes & Orlando, 2003). Yet, when considering research that focuses on diversity in terms of race, the dominant perspective within the past decade has taken a critical perspective. Indeed, Ashcraft and Allen (2003) argue for an examination of the racial foundations of organizational communication. In particular, they note the extent to which the very ways people address race often functions to preserve "organized Whiteness." In like manner, Grimes (2002) challenges the ways in which whiteness retains its position of cen-

trality even within diversity management literature. While examination of race within critical organizational communication appears to lag behind studies of gender, Parker (2001, 2002) has contributed research that examines the ways in which African American women negotiate identities and resist dominant racial discourses in the workplace.

Studies of gender in organizational communication have followed the same basic trajectory as research on racial diversity. However, feminist issues in organizing have received much more attention. Like racial diversity, work on gender does not restrict itself to the critical perspective (e.g., Gribas, 1999; Lizzio, Wilson, Gilchrist, & Gallois, 2003; Martin, 2004), yet the preponderance of work in this area does devote itself to critical feminist critique of "gendered" workplaces. Research in feminist organizing addresses both the experience of women in the workplace and in the discursive construction of gender in workplaces. Identity forms a key construct in feminist organizing. Scholars investigating this issue focus particularly on the ways in which women negotiate a sense of identity within the context of organizational cultures and narratives that may limit their options (e.g., Jorgenson, 2002; Trethewey & Corman, 2001). Related to focus on identity, feminist organizational communication scholars such as Edley (2000), Gibson and Schullery (2000), and Meisenbach (2008) each challenge the role of discourse in organizing workplace communication where that discourse subordinates women's experiences. Each of these studies offers suggestions for ways in which a feminist perspective might offer alternative communication practices that would give women more options. Still other feminist scholars look beyond the negotiation of meaning within women's experiences to see how societal discourses construct particular policies and understandings of women in the workplace (Buzzanell, 2001; Buzzanell & Liu, 2005; Perriton, 2009). Finally, critical organizational communication scholars have extended research on gender to include an understanding of masculinity and sexuality (e.g., Mumby, 1998; Forbes, 2002, 2009; Tracy & Scott, 2006).

The intersection between organizational communication and critical/cultural communication studies is a fruitful one. Both sub-disciplines share an interest in understanding the relationship between broader cultural structures and the daily lives of individuals. Research at this intersection scrutinizes discourses of power with an eye toward unveiling sources of power,

identifying the influences of this discourse, and, finally, in agitating for change. Within these points of similarity, this review of literature has highlighted the ways in which organizational communication researchers distinguish their subdiscipline. Rather than aimed at a general cultural critique, critical organizational scholarship specifically focuses its goal on identifying ways to give voice to marginalized organizational members. Further, we have seen that critical organizational communication scholars ultimately focus their efforts on opening space for greater participation in organizational communication dynamics.

3. Identity in Distinction: How Organizational Communication Enacts Difference

As we have surveyed the landscape of organizational communication research from the past decade, we have noted the extent to which the identity of the discipline has roots in similarities to several sub-disciplines of communication studies. Identifying what the areas hold in common helps refine our understanding of the contributions of organizational communication to broader conversations about human interaction processes and meaning. But along with similarity, we find difference. While organizational communication scholars do employ some of the same theories, concepts, and analytical tools and do interrogate some of the same issues and questions as other communication disciplines, the approach of organizational communication research is decidedly different. We have alluded to these points of distinction along the way: an interest in the creation of meaning as a particular organizing process and a focus on the interplay between structure and communication processes. In what follows, we address each of these issues in greater detail, highlighting some particular streams of research that exemplify these dynamics.

A. Negotiations of meaning

While meaning holds a central place in the study of communication in general, organizational communication scholars most often consider meaning from a sensemaking perspective. That is, organizational communication research in the past 12 years has emphasized the degree to which meaning results from active negotiation between individuals, between individuals and organizations, and between organizations and societies.

This tendency to conceptualize meaning as the result of negotiation follows from the adoption of Weick's view of organization. When considering organization as a verb (as Weick does), one emphasizes the degree to which language/communication functions to organize meaning. Organizational communication scholars deploy this perspective in research in order to examine the organization of meaning in a variety of perspectives. It would not be possible to delineate each context here as the range in topics extends from work on the way in which medical organizations accomplish authority through interaction (Benoit-Barne & Cooren, 2009) to unpacking the meaning of blue collar work (Mills, 2002) to understanding how people construct the meaning of customer satisfaction (Turner & Krizek, 2006). When examining the ways in which scholars study the negotiation of meaning, the methods employed include a full range of qualitative methods (e.g., conversation analysis, rhetorical criticism, discourse analysis) (Cooren, 2004).

Instead of attempting the insurmountable task of cataloging all work that addresses meaning as an active negotiation process, we will focus on identity construction as one particular line of research that encompasses both the breadth and depth of viewing meaning construction as sensemaking and negotiation. If any one topic seems to dominate the landscape of organizational communication in the past decade, it is research on identity construction. Scholars approach "identity" as a construct on two different levels—that of the individual and that of the organization.

In looking at individual identity, we begin by noting that the absence of an operational definition curiously marks this area of research. That is, few have made attempts to define what constitutes identity. Tracy and Trethewey (2005) fill this void as they provide a review of work on identity construction. They argue that many scholars have contributed to a discussion of identity from a post-structuralist perspective and in this they address identity as fluid and constituted in discourse. Tracy and Trethewey critique treatments of identity that perpetuate a real self ↔ face self dichotomy. They conclude that this tendency results in three responses on the part of individual ("engaging in strategized subordination, crafting perpetually deferred

selves, and practicing auto-dressage" p. 178)—each of these responses represents a particular form of negotiation. In the end they suggest a view of identity as a crystallized self instead. The crystallized self is one that, while solid, may take on differing forms depending on the context.

Beyond theoretical discussions and meta-analyses of identity, a series of publications address identity construction processes in the context of ideological discourses at work in organizations. Jorgensen (2002) and Tyler and McCullough (2009) address the ways in which individuals negotiate a sense of self in the context of gendered organizations. Parker (2002) addresses issues of both gender and race in her analysis of African American women's strategies of negotiating workplace interactions. Taking an even broader view, Lair, Sullivan, and Cheney (2005), Tracy (2000), and Ganesh (2003) analyze identity construction in the context of market discourses, emotional labor, and technology, respectively. Both of these series of studies situate identity construction as an active negotiation process in which individuals must make sense out of organizational and societal discourses.

In a more narrow focus, scholars have addressed meaning making and identity from the perspective of role negotiation. In this context, organizational communications scholars have examined how people negotiate particular roles within the organization—in this sense they focus not on an encompassing identity but rather on the fulfillment of a particular function in the organization (e.g., Kramer, 2009; Miller & Johnston, 1999). Scholars have also applied this same perspective to the question of how individuals make sense of their identities as professionals or in the context of a particular career (Barge & Hackett, 2003; Canary & Canary, 2007; Meisenbach, 2008).

Consistent with the guiding framework for this literature review on the question of identity of organizational communication as a discipline, we note that the past 12 years have seen several rounds of commentaries on the status of the discipline (e.g., Allen, 2002; Cheney, 2007; Jones, Watson, Gardner, & Gallois, 2004). Each of these represents an identity negotiation in its own right. These commentaries have come in the context of forums and invited reviews that have addressed the role of the academic/scholar in the context of a profession. Further, scholars have grappled with the idea of organizational communication scholars as engaged scholars. Finally, they discussed the identity of the field in the context of how a communication scholar might function in an applied context. These forums represent a particular discourse that serves as an enactment of the very sensemaking/negotiation of meaning perspective that we argue is a distinguishing and defining feature of organizational communication.

Consideration of identity does not only apply to the individual alone. Organizational communication scholars also give attention to the ways in which organizations establish identities for themselves. The approach most often taken in understanding organizational identity is rhetorical. In this scholars have considered values (Aust, 2004), mission statements (Feldner, 2006), and the role of rhetoric (Sillince, 2006) in communicating a particular identity for organizations. Organizational communication research in this vein rests on the premise that organizations themselves function as actors with individual identities.

B. Interplay of meaning, structure, and process

In order to completely understand a sensemaking and negotiation-centered perspective on meaning as a distinguishing feature of organizational communication, we need to add the layer of the structure/process relationship. Organizational communication scholars cannot completely address meaning as a negotiation and sensemaking achievement without also incorporating an understanding of meaning making as a process mediated by particular structures. At its core, organizational communication rests on the assumption that organizational structures alter communication processes just as communication processes alter structure. While this defines structuration theory, an area of research within the discipline, we argue here that even research not explicitly conducted from a structuration perspective retains an orientation toward the interplay of process and structure. Organizational communication scholarship over the past 12 years rarely considers communication as a variable or event; rather organizational scholarship always casts communication as a particular process, one always situated in a particular organizational context. The organizational context in turn is central to any interpretation of the constructed meaning. To illustrate this identifying feature, we will review three threads of organizational communication research: organizational identification, socialization, and organizational change. All three of these research areas represent organizational phenomena that form the core communication processes shaped by structure of the organization itself.

In the previous section, we ended by considering how scholars conceive of and investigate identity within organizational communication at both the individual and the organizational level. Organizational identification as a topic of inquiry falls naturally in these areas of research in that organizational identification is a process through which organizational members begin to see themselves as sharing the same values and interests as the organization. In other words, as members make sense of their identity they see it fitting naturally with the identity of the organization. The process then exemplifies the interplay of structure and process. Identification evolves over time and is clearly tied to the structure of the organization itself. Scott, Corman, and Cheney (1998) outlined a theory of identification explicitly grounded in a structuration approach. Further, Scott (2007) connected theories of social identity to organizational identification. Both of these articles help to draw the lines between the meaning, structure, and process within organizations. As an exemplar of the interplay of structure and process and organizational identification, Larson and Pepper (2003) examined how organizational members made sense of their identities and identifications during times of transition in the organization. In this, as the structure of the organization changed, so too did the resulting identities with which organizational members identified.

Research in organizational identification over the past 12 years has focused in part on the organizational factors and attributes that contribute to the development of identification or, alternately, consider the outcomes of highly identified members. For example, scholars examined the relationship between organization identification and employee dissent (Kassing, 2000), identification and supervisory and subordinate communication (Myers & Kassing, 1998), and identification and organizational prestige (Ale, 2001). In addition, other research on organizational identification has considered the process in the context of various organizational types. Finally, organizational communication scholars interested in member identification have considered the process in the context of virtual organizations (Wiesenfeld, Raghuram, & Garud, 1999), as well as traditional business organizations (specifically agribusiness) (Morgan, Reynolds, Nelson, Johanningmeier, Griffin, & Andrade, 2004). Research has also extended beyond organization type to consider the ways in which changes in an organization's environment may challenge traditional thinking on organiza-

tional identification. In particular, Scott (2001) explored the ways in which the new economy impacted both customer loyalty and employee identification, while Gossett (2002) challenged traditional thinking of organizational identification in the context of a growing contingent and temporary workforce.

Researchers have not yet formally advanced a connection between organizational identification and organizational socialization (also known as assimilation); yet, the ties seem clear. The process through which members learn the ropes in a new organization partly facilitates the beginnings of an individual's self-identity moving closer in line with an organization's identity. However, despite organizational socialization's remaining an area of interest since the 1970s, research in the area stagnated for some time until just before this decade began when *Communication Monographs* published a series of articles that both affirmed and challenged traditional approaches to the study of organizational communication socialization. One view suggested that traditional stage models bound the means of studying organizational communication too tightly (Kramer & Miller, 1999), while the other agitated for a change to embrace new perspectives on socialization (Bullis, 1999; Clair, 1999; Turner, 1999). These debates set the stage for the decade to come as work in socialization more or less falls along those two lines. First, scholars continued to investigate organizational socialization from traditional perspectives seeking to refine and apply measures of socialization (e.g., Lamude, Scudder, Simmons, & Torres, 2004; Myers & Oetzel, 2003; Myers, 2005) and considering how socialization functions in workgroups (Anderson, Martin, & Riddle, 2001; Myers & McPhee, 2006). At the same time, work in organizational socialization extended to consider socialization as an ongoing process (e.g., Kramer & Noland, 1999), within the context of nontraditional groups such as customers (e.g., Fonner & Timmerman, 2009) and as tied to advances in technology (Waldeck, Siebold, & Flanagin, 2004) and virtual organizations (Ahuja & Galvin, 2003).

Organizational socialization provides one process through which organizational members construct meaning for their organizational lives. But organizations remain constantly in flux and as their structures change, so too must the members' sensemaking process continue. Organizational change as an area of inquiry, then, matters both within the academy and beyond. Simply stated, in today's turbulent economy, organiza-

tions merge, "rightsize," and restructure with frequency. Organizational communication scholars are rightfully sensitive to the impact that these changes have on both communication structures and processes. Zorn, Page, and Cheney (2000) provided a comprehensive review of the change literature as they offered a case study that examined change within a public sector organization. In this, they argued that even popular discourse reflects discussions of the change that impacts organizational life, and, as such, scholars must examine the various perspectives more closely. Other scholars have heeded this call as numerous studies have examined the change process in a variety of contexts. One of the most common ways of considering change emerges from the examination of communication behaviors and discourses surrounding downsizing, mergers, and acquisitions. In this, scholars look at these changes in terms of information needs (Tourish, Paulsen, Hobman, & Bordia, 2004; Zhu, May, & Rosenfeld, 2004), in terms of the contradictions that emerge in how managers frame downsizing (Fairhurst, Cooren, & Cahill, 2002), and in light of the uncertainty that emerges during change (Kramer, Dougherty, & Pierce, 2004). Several methodological starting points present ways to examine organizational change; the past 12 years have given rise to an emphasis on the discourses, narratives, metaphors, and stories of change (Coopman & Meidlinger, 2000; Fairhurst, et al., 2002; Lewis, Schmisseur, Stephens, & Weir, 2006).

These two ways in which organizational communication distinguishes itself from other subdisciplines in communication are interrelated. We cannot separate understanding meaning construction as sensemaking and ongoing negotiation from viewing organizations' structures and processes as existing in a reciprocal relationship. Taken together, they contribute to particular identity for the discipline of organizational communication at this moment. That identity has its roots in a commitment to investigating human interaction at a variety of levels—rhetorical, interpersonal, and cultural—but in a way that focuses explicitly on how people and organizations organize meaning in practice and on the structures and communicative action that create these organizational structures and experiences.

4. Identity in Action:
Organizational Communication Scholarship Addressing Current Issues

Organizational communication scholarship both resembles and differs from the larger discipline of communication studies. This particular identity allows organizational communication scholars to participate in broader conversations about contemporary issues with a particular voice—a voice that has an orientation toward the active negotiation of meaning (sensemaking) and that emphasizes the interplay of structure and process. To that end, our research has identified three key topic areas that continually intersect with organizational communication: new communication technology use, globalization, and knowledge management. Each of these topic areas provides the discipline with additional depth of what it means to study organizational communication and provides us with a greater sense of our identity. Examining new communication technology (NCT) in the organizational context resembles studying the intersection of other communication disciplines (such as interpersonal communication or rhetoric) due to the breadth of impact that NCTs have had on communication in general. Secondly, one must only look to the recent economic crisis gripping the globe to realize that the concept of globalization holds critical importance to the study of organizational communication today. Finally, knowledge management provides a thread that connects many aspects of organizational communication as expanded use of technology and globalizing forces have not only increased knowledge generated but also increased access to that knowledge.

A. New communication technologies

In considering new communication technologies (NCTs) and computer-mediated communication (CMC), one struggles to determine whether technology forms a topic within a larger field or represents a field in its own right. In some respects, communication technology represents a broad pseudo-subdiscipline of communication that has intersections with nearly every aspect of human communication (see D'Urso, 2009), but at the same time technology forms a pervasive part of today's society. The past 12 years of research at this intersection of NCTs and organizations has yielded a focus on three topic areas: organizational use and prevalence of NCTs,

virtual teams/groups/communities, and impacts associated with NCT usage in organizations.

NCT use over the decade has also changed and, as Vielhaber and Waltman (2008) noted, so have the users. While a great deal of organizational communication research on NCTs focuses on furthering our understanding of traditional communication theories, such as Media Richness, Channel Expansion, and others particularly as they apply to the selection and use of NCTs in organizations (D'Urso & Rains, 2008; Sheer & Chen, 2004; Stephens, 2007; Timmerman, 2003; Van den Hoof, Groot, & de Jonge, 2005), most of the research focuses its attention on the actual use of NCTs within the organizational setting (D'Urso & Pierce, 2009). Organizational communication scholars who focus on the use of technology often look to the ways in which technology facilitates, modifies, or expands previously examined communication processes such as organizational assimilation (Waldeck, et al., 2004), communication apprehension (Scott & Timmerman, 2005), work-life balance (Boswell, 2007), and the communication of negative information (Timmerman & Harrison, 2005).

In addition to research that extends established communication theories, scholars have investigated the ways in which groups have adopted or rejected technologies. Investigating two ends of the adoption spectrum, Stephens and colleagues (Stephens, Sornes, Rice, Browning, & Saetre, 2008) examined the expanded and coordinated use of NCTs, while Leonardi (2009) investigated rejection of NCTs and the potential impacts of those decisions. The reality is that NCT adoption on the whole is on the rise (e.g., D'Urso & Pierce, 2009). This increased use has changed the way that people work. Stephens and Davis (2009) provide a key example of this by exploring how NCTs enable multitasking by employees during meetings; they then tried to understand the impacts of such use. Another area of research in organizational NCTs lies in their use within alternative organizational structures, with particular emphasis on the virtual team/group/organization. Scholars have explored virtual organizations (Daugherty, Lee, Gangadharbatla, Kim, & Outhavong, 2005; Rothaermel & Sugiyama, 2001) in an effort to understand the intersections and distinctions between these newer structures and those of traditional organizations. As part of this research effort, other scholars have explored interpersonal aspects of organizational communication such as socialization (Ahuja & Galvin, 2003) and leadership within NCTs (George & Sleeth, 2000). Other areas of interest focus on group processes' relationship with NCTs. For example, Markman (2009) looked at particular uses of NCTs such as chat-based virtual meetings; Rains (2005) provided a thorough review of group support systems (GSS) in organizations; and Tullar and Kaiser (2000) examined the use of virtual groups for training and development.

Great insights into organizational processes have emerged with the consideration both of the ways in which NCT use is meaningful and of the alternative structures particularly suited to NCT use; these areas contribute to a final aspect of NCT research in organizational communication, which focuses on the impact of NCT use. To see some of the potential impacts that NCTs have had on organizations over the past decade, people need only look around their workplace or even at their own computer screens to notice the changes. Current organizational communication research in technology also provides some clear evidence of some of the impacts of NCT use, such as Berry (2006) finding that the use of asynchronous communication technologies can actually improve team processes and decision-making in groups as compared to face-to-face conditions. Byron and Baldridge (2007) argued that personality can influence how individuals interpret non-verbal cues from e-mail messages sent to them, as well as their impressions of the sender. Finally, Jackson (2007) examined how emerging technologies might change the scholarship of business communication and offers a number of paths by which future research could be conducted.

Workplace surveillance has generated a good deal of renewed interest of late. Paralleling public concerns regarding surveillance, NCTs have also caused concern as they have the ability to act as tools of organizational surveillance. D'Urso (2006) examined this topic in depth and offered a model of how to measure the impact of surveillance that comes from the use of NCTs, as well as from an organization's structure and policies on surveillance. Allen, Coopman, Hart, and Walker's (2007) article employed the use of communication privacy management theory as a lens to understand the complexities of electronic workplace surveillance as they reviewed the dimensions of managing one's privacy in the organization. Finally, Snyder and Cornetto (2009) found that employees feel that a great deal of surveillance occurs via e-mail in the workplace and that this and other monitoring of employee communication is inappropriate. As individuals and organ-

izations become more connected to and dependent on NCTs, surveillance will likely remain a key area of both concern and potential research in organizational communication.

B. Organizational knowledge and networks

NCTs in the workplace provide greater ease in creating and managing knowledge in the organizational setting. A significant amount of work over the past decade has examined the creation of and management of knowledge in organizations. Both Schneider (2001) and Heaton and Taylor (2002) found that the creation of knowledge, particularly through the writing and reading of textual information, holds the key to understanding and maintaining the modern organization. Kuhn and Jackson (2008) offer up a framework that assists in the investigation of organizational knowledge and knowing. They posit a methodology rooted in social practice theory and focus on activities that generate knowledge communicatively. Additional research has explored both the sharing of (De Vries, Van den Hoof, & de Ridder, 2006) and retrieval of (Palazzolo, 2005) knowledge from the organization and related processes. Iverson (2008) examined the use of communities of practice as one potential method of understanding the knowledge process in organizations through a dynamic process of mutual engagement and interaction. In studying the potential impacts of knowledge management practices in organizations, Child and Shumate (2007) found that the perception that a work team accurately knew who held specific knowledge related positively to perceived team effectiveness.

One result of the increased knowledge is that more communication networks have emerged. Here, research often intertwines with research on NCTs, employee turnover, and interpersonal communication. Chang and Johnson (2001) analyzed communication networks using social contagion theory to predict the use of NCTs by organizational members. Feeley (2000) presented a communication network model to predict employee turnover based on network centrality. Finally, Raile, Kim, Choi, Serota, Park, and Lee (2008) explored the role of friendship networks at work and found a positive relationship with job satisfaction.

C. Interorganizational relationships

Another growing area of organizational network research falls under the heading of interorganizational relationships (IORs) and related communication practices. Oliver (1990) defines IORs as "the relatively enduring transactions, flows, and linkages that occur among or between an organization and one or more organizations in its environment" (p. 241). Key work in this area includes Taylor and Doerfel's (2003) look at the process of building IORs and the network dynamics among nongovernmental organizations in Croatia. Flanagin, Monge, and Fulk (2001) focused on the benefits of organizational federations, especially for those participants that actively communicate and interact with the IOR. Cooren (2001) utilizes another form of IORs, organizational coalitions, to create a new method of analysis to study the strengths and weaknesses of these IORs during their formation. Following the loss of the Space Shuttle Columbia, the investigation showed that the IORs at NASA acted as potential contributors to the accident. Garner (2006) investigated these IORs from a resource dependency and structuration perspective to understand the issues involved with the various relationships.

D. Organizational communication gone global

As NCTs contribute to knowledge generation, and as knowledge generation adds to the complexity of communication networks, all of these areas take place in the context of globalization. While the topic of globalization has held an important place in organizational communication research in recent decades and still attracts a great deal of research (Darling-Wolf, 2008; Weaver, 2001; Wiley, 2004; Zoller, 2004), a more interesting spin on global influence has emerged in recent years. In the field of organizational communication, research has often taken on an ethnocentrism, with the emphasis on the United States. Over the past decade, however, we find that scholars exert more interest and effort to examine the organizational communication on a more global level. The decade began with research examining management communication in Australia (More & Irwin, 2000), studies identifying issues facing Chinese organizations as they connected with the global economy (Chen, 2000), and research investigating organizational communication issues with Italian multinational corporations (Cesaria, 2000). Zaidman's (2001) research crossed borders and cultures as it examined business communication interactions among Israeli and Indian business people. The focus returned to China in 2007 with Lin and Clair's (2007) exploration of the impact of Mao Zedong on organizational communication practices in that nation. Research then went halfway around the globe and to the southern hemisphere with work that examined both the development of organizational communication and the challenges and future of research in the field in Brazil (do

Carmo Reis, 2009; Marchiori & Oliveira, 2009; Putnam & Casali, 2009). This increase in international organizational communication appears to continually gain interest among scholars globally. Notably, Nelson-Marsh, Broadfoot, Munshi, and colleagues (Broadfoot, K. J., Cockbum, Cockburn-Wootten, do Carmo Reis, Gautam, Maishe, Munshi, Nelson-Marsh, Okwori, Simpson, & Srinivas, 2008; Nelson-Marsh, Broadfoot, & Munshi, 2008) have sought to engage the research community with an international online community and conference (COMMUNEcation) devoted to this interest and have promoted collaborative efforts for more research.

The connections between these issues that currently (re)shape society matter in their own right. Even more, it is difficult to address any one of the topics of technology, knowledge, networks, or globalization without integrating perspectives and issues raised by the others. This reality alone merits the level of scholarly attention that they have received in organizational communication research. However, we include them here for reasons that extend beyond this. The extent to which these issues interest other disciplines and society in general again highlights organizational communication as similar to other fields. Yet, the way in which organizational communication scholars tackle these issues and the differences that distinguish organizational communication scholars from others are clear. NCT research in organizational communication does not focus on simply its use but rather it concerns the meaning of this use and the ways in which NCT alter both the structure and processes of organizations. In like manner, knowledge and knowledge network research sees the knowledge creation as part of negotiation process shaped in part by its organizational context. Finally, organizational communication research in global contexts considers how the meanings of communication structures and processes change within international and intercultural settings.

5. Organizational Communication: An Evolving Identity in a Changing Society

In this age of globalization, technological advancement, and the ever-increasing amount of knowledge and information that connects us all together, organizational communication has had to continually reinvent itself to remain a contributor to conversations both within the discipline and with society as a whole. In this, we hope that organizational communication will continue to think of the richness that exists in embracing sameness with other disciplines while continuing to enrich the conversation by participating with a particular voice that capitalizes on difference.

We conclude here by highlighting some threads of research that we believe might contribute to the ongoing construction of organizational communication's identity narrative. The combined influence of globalizing forces and technology have contributed to growing networks and growing access to information about organizations, with the result that organizations face increased scrutiny. Because of this, organizational communication has taken a closer look at corporate social responsibility initiatives (see MCQ special issue). We can only imagine that this trend will increase as greater access to organizational information leads to increased calls for transparency within organizational practice. At the same time, scholars recognize the role that they can play as advocates for change and social justice (see MCQ issues on engaged scholarship). We believe that this results in the development of research on surrounding issues of voice, democracy, and participation—all areas in which work has already begun. Stohl and Cheney (2001) provided an analysis of participatory practices in organizations. Cheney also collaborated with Cloud to call for increased attention to democratic processes that give voice to employees and that call attention to labor issues. We anticipate this will continue as scholars turn to issues of the contingent work force (Gossett, 2001), labor unions (Cloud, 2001), and community-based organizations (Heath, 2007) as a means of providing voice to marginalized individuals and issues. As further evidence, we point to the growth in critical/cultural studies of organizational communication. In this organizational communication will seek to add to knowledge and understanding of the same issues that scholars, politicians, and citizens are tackling in today's societies but do so in different ways that allow the discipline to focus on making organizations more about the people who live and work within them.

References

Ahuja, M., & Galvin, J. E. (2003). Socialization in virtual groups. *Journal of Management, 29*, 161-185.

Albert, S., & Whetten, D. A. (1985). Organizational identity. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 7, pp. 263-295). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Ale, S. (2001). The impact of employee communication and perceived external prestige on organizational identification. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*, 1051-1062.

Allen, B. J. (2002). Translating organizational communication scholarship into practice: Starting where we are. *Management Communication Quarterly, 16*, 101-105.

Allen, M. W., Coopman, S. J., Hart, J. L., & Walker, K. L. (2007). Workplace surveillance and managing privacy boundaries. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 172-200.

Anderson, C. M., Martin, M. M., & Riddle, B. L. (2001). Attitudes, style, and socialization: Predictors of commitment and satisfaction workgroups. *Communication Research Reports, 18*, 241-254.

Ashcraft, K. L., & Allen, B. J. (2003). The racial foundations of organizational communication. *Communication Theory, 13*, 5-38.

Aust, P. J. (2004). Communicated values as indicators of organizational identity: A theme for organizational assessment and its application in a case study. *Communication Studies, 55*, 515-535.

Avtgis, T., & Brogan, S. M. (1999). Quality of organizational relationship as a function of work locus of control. *Communication Research Reports, 16*, 65-71.

Barge, K. J. (2004). Reflexivity and managerial practice. *Communication Monographs, 71*, 70

Barge, K. J., & Hackett, S. (2003). The intersection of cultural and professional identity in nonprofit management. *Communication Research Reports, 20*, 34-44.

Benoit-Barne, C., & Cooren, F. (2009). The accomplishment of authority through presentification: How authority is distributed among and negotiated by organizational members. *Management Communication Quarterly, 23*, 5-31.

Berry, G. (2006). Can computer-mediated asynchronous communication improve team processes and decision making? Learning from management literature. *Journal of Business Communication, 43*, 344-366.

Bisel, R. S. (2009). On a growing dualism in organizational discourse research. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22,* 614-638.

Boje, D. M. (2001). Corporate writing in the web of postmodern culture and postindustrial capitalism. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 507-516.

Boje, D. M., & Rosile, G. A. (2003). Life imitates art: Enron's epic and tragic narration. *Management Communication Quarterly, 17*, 85-125.

Boswell, W. R. (2007). The use of communication technologies after hours: The role of work attitudes and work-life conflict. *Journal of Management, 33*, 592-610.

Botero, I. C., & Van Dyne, L. (2009). Employee voice behavior: Interactive effects of LMX and power distance in the United States and Colombia. *Management Communication Quarterly, 23*, 84-104.

Brimeyer, T. M., Eaker, A. V., & Clair, R. P. (2004). Rhetorical strategies in union organizing: A case of labor versus management. *Management Communication Quarterly, 18*, 45-75.

Broadfoot, K., & Munshi, D. (2007). Afterword: In search of a polyphony of voices. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 281.

Broadfoot, K. J., Cockburn, T., Cockburn-Wootten, C., do Carmo Reis, M., Gautam, D. K., Maishe, A., et al. (2008). A mosaic of visions, daydreams, and memories: Diverse inlays of organizing and communicating from around the globe. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22,* 322-350.

Bullis, C. (1999). Mad or bad: A response to Kramer and Miller. *Communication Monographs, 66*, 368-373.

Butler, J. A., & Modaff, D. P. (2008). When work is home: Agency, structure, and contradictions. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*, 232-257.

Buzzanell, P. M. (2001). Gendered practices in the contemporary workplace: A critique of what often constitutes front page news in the *Wall Street Journal*. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 517-537.

Buzzanell, P. M., & Liu, M. (2005). Struggling with maternity leave policies and practices: A poststructuralist feminist analysis of gendered organizing. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 33*, 1-25.

Buzzanell, P. M., Meisenbach, R., Remke, R., Liu, M., Bowers, V., & Conn, C. (2005). The good working mother: Managerial woman's sensemaking and feelings about work-family issues. *Communication Studies, 56*, 261-285.

Byron, K., & Baldridge, D. C. (2007). E-mail recipients' impressions of senders' likeability. *Journal of Business Communication, 44*, 137-160.

Canary, H. E., & Canary, D. J. (2007). Making sense of one's career: An analysis and typology of supervisor career stories. *Communication Quarterly, 55*, 225-246.

Carlone, D. (2001). Enablement, constraint, and *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People*. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 491-497.

Carlone, D. (2008). The contradictions of communicative labor in service work. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies, 5*, 158-179.

Carson, C. L., & Cupach, W. R. (2000). Facing corrections in the workplace: The influence of perceived face threat on the consequences of managerial reproaches. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 28,* 215-234.

Cesaria, R. (2000). Organizational communication issues in Italian multinational corporations. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 161-172.

Chang, H.-J., & Johnson, D. J. (2001). Communication networks as predictors of organizational members' media choices. *Western Journal of Communication, 65*, 349-369.

Chen, L. (2000). Connecting to the world economy. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 152-160.

Chen, L. (2008). Leaders or leadership—Alternative approaches to leadership studies. [Editorial Material]. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 547-555.

Cheney, G. (2007). Organizational communication comes out. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 80-91.

Cheney, G., & Christensen, L. T. (2001). Organizational identity: Linkages between internal and external communication. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (pp. 231-269). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Cheney, G., Christensen, L. T., Zorn, T. E., & Ganesh, S. (2004). *Organizational communication in an age of globalization: Issues, reflections, practices*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Child, J. T., & Shumate, M. (2007). The impact of communal knowledge repositories and people-based knowledge management on perceptions of team effectiveness. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 29-54.

Christensen, L. T., & Cheney, G. (1994). Articulating identity in an organizational age. In S. A. Deetz (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 17* (pp. 222-235). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Clair, R. P. (1999). Ways of seeing: A review of Kramer and Miller's manuscript. *Communication Monographs, 66*, 374-381.

Cloud, D. L. (2001). Laboring under the sign of the new: Cultural studies, organizational communication, and the fallacy of the new economy. *Management Communication Quarterly, 15*, 268-278.

Conrad, C. (1999). *Bibliographic addendum, 1996-1999 [to Conrad & Haynes].* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, San Francisco.

Conrad, C., & Malphurs, R. (2008). Are we there yet? Are we there yet? *Management Communication Quarterly, 22,* 123-146.

Coopman, S. J., & Meidlinger, K. B. (2000). Power, hierarchy, and change: The stories of a Catholic parish staff. *Management Communication Quarterly, 13*, 567-625.

Cooren, F. (2001). Translation and articulation in the organization of coalitions: The great Whale River case. *Communication Theory, 10*, 178-200.

Cooren, F. (2004). The communicative achievement of collective minding: Analysis of board meeting excerpts. *Management Communication Quarterly, 17*, 517-551.

Cowen, R., & Hoffman, M. F. (2008). The flexible organization: How contemporary employees construct the work/life border. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication, 8*, 37-41.

D'Urso, S. C. (2006). Who's watching us at work? Toward a structural-perceptual model of electronic monitoring and surveillance in organizations. *Communication Theory, 16*, 281303.

D'Urso, S. C. (2009). The past, present, and future of human communication and technology research: An introduction. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14*, 708-713.

D'Urso, S. C., & Pierce, K. M. (2009). Connected to the organization: A survey of communication technologies in the modern organizational landscape. *Communication Research Reports, 26*, 75-81.

D'Urso, S. C., & Rains, S. A. (2008). Examining the scope of channel expansion: A test of channel expansion theory with new and traditional communication media. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 486-507.

Darling-Wolf, F. (2008). Getting over our "illusion d'optique": From globalization to mondialisation (through French rap). *Communication Theory, 18*, 187-209.

Daugherty, T., Lee, W.-N., Gangadharbatla, H., Kim, K., & Outhavong, S. (2005). Organizational virtual communities: Exploring motivations behind online panel participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 10*(4). Retrieved January 25, 2010 from http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol10/issue4/daugherty.html

De Vries, R. E., Van den Hoof, B., & de Ridder, J. A. (2006). Explaining knowledge sharing: The role of team communication styles, job satisfaction, and performance beliefs. *Communication Research, 33*, 115-135.

Deetz, S. (2001). Conceptual foundations. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnum (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (pp. 3-46). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dempsey. (2009). Critiquing community engagement. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *57*, 1-32.

Dixon, M. A. (2007). Transforming power: Expanding the inheritance of Michel Foucault in organizational studies. *Management Communication Quarterly, 20*, 283-296.

do Carmo Reis, M. (2009). The social, political, and economic context in the development of organizational communication in Brazil. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*, 648-654.

Dutton, J. E., & Dukerich, J. M. (1991). Keeping an eye on the mirror: Image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*, 517-554.

Edley, P. P. (2000). Discursive essentializing in a woman-owned business. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14,* 271-306.

Ellis, K., & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (2001). Trust in top management and immediate supervisor: The relationship to satisfaction, perceived organizational effectiveness, and information receiving. *Communication Quarterly, 49*, 382-398.

Fairhurst, G. T. (2008). Discursive leadership—A communication alternative to leadership psychology. [Editorial Material]. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 510-521.

Fairhurst, G. T., Cooren, F., & Cahill, D. J. (2002). Discursiveness, contradiction, and unintended consequences in successive downsizings. *Management Communication Quarterly, 15*, 501-540.

Fairhurst, G. T., & Putnam, L. L. (2004). Organizations as discursive constructions. *Communication Theory, 14*, 5-26.

Feeley, T. H. (2000). Testing a communication network model of employee turnover based on centrality. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 28*, 262-277.

Feldner, S. B. (2006). Living our mission: A study of university mission building. *Communication Studies, 57*, 67-85.

Fix, B., & Sias, P. M. (2006). Person centered communication, leader-member exchange, and employee job satisfaction. *Communication Research Reports, 23*, 35-44.

Flanagin, A. J., Monge, P. R., & Fulk, J. (2001). The value of formative investment in organizational federations. *Human Communication Research, 27*, 69-93.

Fonner, K. L., & Timmerman, C. E. (2009). Organizational newc(ust)omers: Applying organizational newcomer assimilation concepts to customer information seeking and service outcomes. *Management Communication Quarterly, 23*, 244-271.

Forbes, D. A. (2002). Internalized masculinity and women's discourse: A critical analysis of the (re)production of masculinity in organizations. *Communication Quarterly, 50*, 269-291.

Forbes, D. A. (2009). Commodification and co-modification: Explicating black female sexuality in organizations. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*, 577-613.

Ganesh, S. (2003). Organizational narcissism: Technology, legitimacy, and identity in an Indian NGO. *Management Communication Quarterly, 16*, 558-594.

Ganesh, S., Zoller, H. M., & Cheney, G. (2005). Transforming resistance, broadening our boundaries: Critical organizational communication meets globalization from below. *Communication Monographs, 72*, 169-191.

Garner, J. T. (2006). Masters of the universe?: Resource dependency and interorganizational power relationships at NASA. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 34*, 368-385.

George, G., & Sleeth, R. G. (2000). *Leadership in computer-mediated communication:Implications and research directions. Journal of Business and Psychology, 15*, 287-310.

Gibson, M. K., & Schullery, N. M. (2000). Shifting meanings in a blue-collar worker philanthropy program. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 189-236.

Gioia, D. A. (1998). The identity in organizations. In D. A. Whetten & P. C. Godfrey (Eds.), *Identity in organizations: Building theory through conversations* (pp. 40-79). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Golden, A. G. (2009). Employee families and organizations as mutually enacted environments: A sensemaking approach to work-life interrelationships. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22,* 385-415.

Gordon, M. E., & Stewart, L. P. (2009). Conversing about performance: Discursive resources for the appraisal interview. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*, 473-501.

Gossett, L. M. (2001). The long-term impact of short-term workers: The work life concerns posed by the growth of the contingent workforce. *Management Communication Quarterly, 15*, 115-120.

Gossett, L. M. (2002). Keep at arms length: Questioning the organizational desirability of member identification. *Communication Monographs, 69*, 385-404.

Gossett, L. M., & Kilker, J. (2006). My job sucks: Examining counterinstitutional web sites as locations for organizational member voice, dissent, and resistance. *Management Communication Quarterly, 20*, 63-90.

Gribas, J. (1999). Organizational sports metaphors: Reconsidering gender bias in the team concept. *Communication Research Reports, 16*, 55-64.

Grimes, D. S. (2002). Challenging the status quo?: Whiteness in the diversity management literature. *Management Communication Quarterly, 15*, 381-409.

Grimes, D. S., & Orlando, C. R. (2003). Could communication form impact organizations' experience with diversity. *Journal of Business Communication, 40*, 7-27.

Hartelius, E. J., & Browning, L. D. (2008). The application of rhetorical theory in managerial research: A literature review. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*, 13-39.

Heath, R. G. (2007). Rethinking community collaboration through a dialogic lens: Creativity, democracy, and diversity in community organizing. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 145-171.

Heaton, L., & Taylor, J. R. (2002). Knowledge management and professional work: A communication perspective on the knowledge-based organization. *Management Communication Quarterly, 16*, 210-236.

Henningsen, D. D., Braz, M., & Davies, E. (2008). Why do we flirt?: Flirting motivations and sex differences in

working and social contexts. *Journal of Business Communication, 45*, 483-502.

Hoffman, M. F., & Cowan, R. L. (2008). The meaning of work/life: A corporate ideology of work/life balance. *Communication Quarterly, 56*, 227-246.

Iverson, J. O. (2008). Communicating knowledge through communities of practice: Exploring internal communicative processes and differences among CoPs. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36*, 176-189.

Jablin, F. M. (2006). Courage and courageous communication among leaders and followers in groups, organizations, and communities. *Management Communication Quarterly, 20*, 94-110.

Jablin, F. M., Putnam, L. L., Roberts, K. H., & Porter, L. W. (Eds.). (1987). *Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jackson, B. G. (2001). Art for management's sake?: The new literary genre of business books. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 484-490.

Jackson, M. (2007). Should emerging technologies change business communication scholarship? *Journal of Business Communication, 44*, 3-12.

Jameson, D. (2001). Narrative discourse and management action. *Journal of Business Communication, 38*, 476-511.

Jameson, J. K. (2004). Negotiating autonomy and connection through politeness: A dialectical approach to organizational conflict management. *The Western Journal of Communication, 68*, 257-277.

Jones, E., Watson, B., Gardner, J., & Gallois, C. (2004). Organizational communication: Challenges for the new century. *Journal of Communication, 54*, 722-750.

Jorgenson, J. (2002). Engineering selves: Negotiating gender and identity in technical work. *Management Communication Quarterly, 15*, 350-380.

Kassing, J. W. (2000). Investigating the relationship between superior-subordinate relationship quality and employee dissent. *Communication Research Reports, 17*, 56-69.

Kassing, J. W. (2001). From the looks of things. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 442-470.

Kassing, J. W. (2007). Going around the boss: Exploring the consequences of circumvention. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 55-74.

Kassing, J. W. (2009). "In case you didn't hear me the first time": An examination of repetitious upward dissent. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*, 416-436.

Kassing, J. W., & Armstrong, T. A. (2002). Someone's going to hear about this: Examining the association between dissent-triggering events and employees' dissent expression. *Management Communication Quarterly, 16,* 39-65.

Kassing, J. W., & Avtgis, T. A. (2001). Dissension in the organization as it relates to control experiences. *Communication Research Reports, 18*, 118-127.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Kirby, E. L., & Krone, K. (2002). "The policy exists but you can't really use it": Communication and the structuration of work-family policies. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 30*, 55-77.

Knight, G., & Greenberg, J. (2002). Promotionalism and subpolitics: Nike and its labor critics. *Management Communication Quarterly, 15*, 541-570.

Kobayashi, E., Grasmick, H., & Friedrich, G. (2001). A cross-cultural study of shame, embarrassment, and management sanctions as deterrents to noncompliance with organizational rules. *Communication Research Reports, 18*, 105-117.

Kramer, M. W. (2009). Role negotiations in a temporary organization: Making sense during role development in an educational theater production. *Management Communication Quarterly, 23*, 188-217.

Kramer, M. W., Dougherty, D. S., & Pierce, T. S. (2004). Managing uncertainty during a corporate acquisition: A longitudinal study of communication during an airline acquisition. *Human Communication Research, 30*, 71-101.

Kramer, M. W., & Miller, V. D. (1999). A response to criticisms of organizational socialization research: In support of contemporary conceptualizations of organizational assimilation. *Communication Monographs, 66*, 374-381.

Kramer, M. W., & Noland, T. L. (1999). Communication during job promotions: A case of ongoing assimilation. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 27*, 335-356.

Krone, K. J. (2008). Forum introduction—Reflections on discursive and psychological approaches to leadership from around the globe. [Editorial Material]. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 508-509.

Krone, K. J., Jablin, F. M., & Putnam, L. L. (1987). Communication theory and organizational communication. In F. M. Jablin, L. L. Putnam, K. H. Roberts, & L. M. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 18-40). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kuhn, T., & Jackson, M. (2008). Accomplishing knowledge: A framework for investigating knowing in organizations. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 454-485.

Kuhn, T., & Nelson, N. (2002). Reengineering identity: A case study of multiplicity and duality in organizational identification. *Management Communication Quarterly, 16*, 5-38.

Lair, D. J., Sullivan, K., & Cheney, G. (2005). Marketization and the recasting of the professional self: The rhetoric and ethics of personal branding. *Management Communication Quarterly, 18*, 307-343.

Lamude, K. C., Scudder, J., Simmons, D., & Torres, P. (2004). Organizational newcomers: Temporary and regular employees, same-sex and mixed-sex superior-subordinate dyads, supervisor influence techniques, subordinates communication satisfaction, and leader-member exchange. *Communication Research Reports, 21*, 60-67.

Larson, G. S., & Pepper, G. L. (2003). Strategies for managing multiple organizational identifications: A case of competing identities. *Management Communication Quarterly, 16*, 528-557.

Lee, J. (1998). Effective communication in superior-subordinate relationships. *Western Journal of Communication, 62,* 181-208.

Lee, J. (1999). Leader-member exchange, gender, and member's communication expectations with leaders. *Communication Quarterly, 47*, 415-429.

Lee, J. (2001). Leader-member exchange, perceived organizational justice, and cooperative communication. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 574-589.

Leonardi, P. M. (2009). Why do people reject new technologies and stymie organizational changes of which they are in favor? Exploring misalignments between social interactions and materiality. *Human Communication Research, 35*, 407-441.

Lewis, L. K., Schmisseur, A. M., Stephens, K. K., & Weir, K. E. (2006). Advice on communicating during organizational change: The content of popular press books. *Journal of Business Communication, 43*, 113-137.

Lin, C., & Clair, R. P. (2007). Measuring Mao Zedong thought and interpreting organizational communication in China. *Management Communication Quarterly, 20*, 395-429.

Lizzio, A., Wilson, K. L., Gilchrist, J., & Gallois, C. (2003). The role of gender in the construction and evaluation of feedback effectiveness. *Management Communication Quarterly, 16*, 341-379.

Lucas, K., & Buzzanell, P. M. (2004). Blue-collar work, career, and success: Occupational narratives of Sisu. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 32*, 273-292.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P. (2003). The communicative cycle of employee emotional abuse: Generation and regeneration of workplace mistreatment. *Management Communication Quarterly, 16*, 471-501.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P. (2006). Take this job and...:Quitting and other forms of resistance to workplace bullying. *Communication Monographs, 73*, 406-433.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P., & McDermott, V. (2008). The constitution of employee-abusive organizations: A communication flows theory. *Communication Theory, 18*, 304-333.

Marchiori, M., & Oliveira, I. D. (2009). Perspectives, challenges, and future directions for organizational communication research in Brazil. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*, 671-676.

Markman, K. M. (2009). "So what shall we talk about": Openings and closings in chat-based virtual meetings. *Journal of Business Communication, 46*, 150-170.

Martin, D. M. (2004). Humor in middle management: Women negotiating the paradoxes of organizational life. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 32*, 147-170.

Martin, M. M., Anderson, C. M., & Sirimangkala, P. (1999). Subordinates' socio-communicative orientation and their use of conflict strategies with superiors. *Communication Research Reports, 16*, 370-376.

McCrosky, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (2000). Applying reciprocity and accomodation theories to supervisor/subordinate communication. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 28*, 278-289.

Meares, M. M., Oetzel, J. G., Torres, A., Derkacks, D., & Ginosar, T. (2004). Employee mistreatment and muted voices in the culturally diverse workplace. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 32*, 4-27.

Medved, C. E. (2004). The everyday accomplishment of work and family: Exploring practical actions in daily routines. *Communication Studies, 55*, 128-145.

Medved, C. E., & Kirby, E. L. (2005). Family CEOs: A feminist analysis of corporate mothering discourses. *Management Communication Quarterly, 18*, 435-478.

Meisenbach, R. J. (2008). Working with tensions: Materiality, discourse, and (dis)empowerment in occupational identity negotiation among higher education fund-raisers. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*, 258-287.

Meisenbach, R. J., & McMillan, J. J. (2006). Blurring the boundaries: Historical developments and future directions in organizational rhetoric. *Communication Yearbook, 30*, 99-141.

Miller, K. I. (2004). Dedication to Larry Smeltzer. *Management Communication Quarterly, 18*, 3-4.

Miller, K. I. (2007). Steps (and missteps?): During the adolescence of MCQ. *Management Communication Quarterly, 20*, 437-443.

Miller, K. I. (2008). Financial feeling: An investigation of emotion and communication in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36*, 8-32.

Miller, K. I., Considine, J., & Garner, J. (2007). "Let me tell you about my job": Exploring the terrain of emotion in the workplace. *Management Communication Quarterly, 20*, 231260.

Miller, V. D., & Johnston, J. R. (1999). A test of antecedents and outcomes of employee role negotiation ability. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 27*, 24-48.

Mills, C. (2002). The hidden dimension of blue-collar sensemaking about workplace communication. *Journal of Business Communication, 39*, 288-213.

More, E. A., & Irwin, H. T. (2000). Management communication for the new millennium. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 142-151.

Morgan, J. M., Reynolds, C. M., Nelson, T. J., Johanningmeier, A. R., Griffin, M., & Andrade, (2004). Tales from the fields: Sources of employee identification in agribusiness. *Management Communication Quarterly, 17*, 360-395.

Mueller, B. H., & Lee, J. (2002). Leader-member exchange and organizational communication satisfaction in multiple contexts. *Journal of Business Communication, 39*, 220-244.

Mumby, D. K. (1998). Organizing men: Power, discourse, and the social construction of masculinity(s) in the workplace. *Communication Theory, 7*, 164-183.

Mumby, D. K., & Stohl, C. (1996). Disciplining organizational communication studies. *Management Communication Quarterly, 10*, 50-72.

Myers, K. K. (2005). A burning desire: Assimilation into a fire department. *Management Communication Quarterly, 18,* 344-384.

Myers, K. K., & McPhee, R. D. (2006). Influences on member assimilation in workgroups in high-reliability organizations: A multilevel analysis. *Human Communication Research, 32*, 440-468.

Myers, K. K., & Oetzel, J. G. (2003). Exploring the dimensions of organizational assimilation: Creating and validating a measure. *Communication Quarterly, 51*, 438-457.

Myers, S. A., & Johnson, A. D. (2004). Perceived solidarity, self-disclosure, and trust in organizational peer relationships. *Communication Research Reports, 21*, 75-83.

Myers, S. A., & Kassing, J. W. (1998). The relationship between perceived supervisory communication behaviors and subordinate organizational identification. *Communication Research Reports, 15*, 71-81.

Nadesan, M. H. (2001). Post-fordism, political economy, and critical organizational communications studies. *Management Communication Quarterly, 15,* 259-267.

Nelson-Marsh, N., Broadfoot, K. J., & Munshi, D. (2008). COMMUNEcating in the spaces in-between: Creating new understandings of organizing and communicative practice around the globe. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*, 313-321.

Neuliep, J., Hintz, S., & McCrosky, J. (2005). The influence of ethnocentrism in organizational contexts: Perceptions of interviewee and managerial attractiveness, credibility, and effectiveness. *Communication Quarterly, 53*, 41-56.

Oetzel, J., Meares, M., Myers, K. K., & Estefana, L. (2003). Interpersonal conflict in organization: Explaining conflict styles via face-negotiating theory. *Communication Research Reports, 20*, 106-115.

Oliver, C. (1990). Determinants of interorganizational relationships: Integration and future directions. *Academy of Management Review, 15*, 241-265.

Olufowote, J. O., Miller, V. D., & Wilson, S. R. (2005). The interactive effects of role change goals and relational exchanges on employee upward influence tactics. *Management Communication Quarterly, 18,* 385-403.

Opt, S. (1998). Confirming and disconfirming American myth: Stories within the suggestion box. *Communication Quarterly, 46*, 75-87.

Palazzolo, E. T. (2005). Organizing for information retrieval in transactive memory systems. *Communication Research, 32*, 726-761.

Parker, P. S. (2001). African American women executives' leadership communication within dominant-culture organizations: (Re)conceptualizing notions of collaboration and instrumentality. *Management Communication Quarterly, 15*, 42-82.

Parker, P. S. (2002). Negotiating identity in raced and gendered workplace interactions: The use of strategic communication by African American women senior executives within dominant culture organizations. *Communication Quarterly, 50*, 251-268.

Perriton, L. (2009). "We don't want complaining women!" A critical analysis of the business case for diversity. *Management Communication Quarterly, 23*, 218-243.

Pratt, M. G., & Foreman, P. (2000). Classifying managerial responses to multiple organizational identities. *Academy of Management Review, 25*, 18-42.

Putnam, L. L., & Casali, A. M. (2009). A Brazilian story on the development of organizational communication, introduction. [Editorial Material]. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*, 642-647.

Putnam, L. L., Phillips, N., & Chapman, P. (1996). Metaphors of communication and organization. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of Organization Studies* (pp. 375-408). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Raile, A. N. W., Kim, R. K., Choi, J., Serota, K. B., Park, H. S., & Lee, D. W. (2008). Connections at work: How friendship networks relate to job satisfaction. *Communication Research Reports, 25*, 168-178.

Rains, S. A. (2005). Leveling the organizational playing field—virtually: A meta-analysis of experimental research assessing the impact of group support systems use on member influence behaviors. *Communication Research, 32*, 193-234.

Redding, W. C. (1985). Stumbling towards identity: The emergence of organizational communication as a field of study. In R. D. McPhee & P. K. Tompkins (Eds.), *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions* (pp. 15-54). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Redding, W. C., & Tompkins, P. K. (1988). Organizational communication: Past and present tenses. In G. M. Goldhaber & G. A. Barnett (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 5-33). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Rizzo, B. J., Booth-Butterfield, M., & Bekelja Wanzer, M. (1999). Individual differences in managers' use of humor: Subordinate perceptions of managers' humor. *Communication Research Reports, 16*, 360-369.

Rothaermel, F. T., & Sugiyama, S. (2001). Virtual internet communities and commercial success: Individual and community-level theory grounded in the atypical case of TimeZone.com. *Journal of Management, 27*, 297-312.

Rowland, R. C. (2004). On organizational apologia: A reconceptualization. *Communication Theory, 14*, 191-211.

Ruud, G. (2000). The symphony: organizational discourse and the symbolic tensions between artistic and business ideologies. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 28*, 117-143.

Sager, K. L. (2008). An exploratory study of the relationships between theory X/Y assumptions and superior communicator style. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*, 288-312.

Scheibel, D. (1999). "If your roommate dies, you get a 4.0": Reclaiming rumor with Burke and organizational culture. *Western Journal of Communication, 63*, 168-184.

Schneider, B. (2001). Constructing knowledge in an organization: The role of interview notes. *Management Communication Quarterly, 15*, 227-255.

Scott, C. R. (2001). Establishing and maintaining customer loyalty and employee identification in the new economy: A communicative response. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 629-636.

Scott, C. R. (2007). Communication and social identity theory: Existing and potential connections in organizational identification research. *Communication Studies, 58*, 123-138.

Scott, C. R., Corman, S. R., & Cheney, G. (1998). Development of a structural model. *Communication Theory, 8*, 298-336.

Scott, C. R., & Timmerman, C. E. (2005). Relating computer, communication, and computer-mediated communication apprehensions to new communication technology use in the workplace. *Communication Research, 32*, 683-725.

Scott, C. W. (2008). Organizational discourse and the appraisal of occupational hazards: Interpretive repertories, heedful interrelating and identity at work. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36,* 298-317.

Scott, S. G., & Lane, V. R. (2000). A stakeholder approach to organizational identity. *Academy of Management Review, 17*, 486-509.

Sheer, V. C., & Chen, L. (2004). Improving media richness theory: A study of interaction goals, message valence, and task complexity in manager-subordinate communication. *Management Communication Quarterly, 18*, 76-93.

Shuler, S., & Davenport, B. (2000). Seeking emotional labor. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 50-89.

Sias, P. M. (2004). Disengaging from workplace relationships: A research note. *Human Communication Research, 30*, 589-602.

Sias, P. M. (2005). Workplace relationship quality and employee information experiences. *Communication Studies, 56*, 375-395.

Sillince, J. A. A. (2006). Resources and organizational identities: The role of rhetoric in the creation of competitive advantage. *Management Communication Quarterly, 20*, 186-212.

Sillince, J. A. A. (2007). Organizational context and the discursive construction of organizing. *Management Communication Quarterly, 20*, 363-394.

Smith, F. L., & Keyton, J. (2001). Organizational storytelling: Metaphors for relational power and identity struggles. *Management Communication Quarterly, 15*, 149-182.

Smith, R. C. (1993). *Images of organizational communication: Root-metaphors of organization-communication relation.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Washington, D. C.

Smith, R. C., & Turner, P. K. (1995). A social constructionist reconfiguration of metaphor analysis: An application of "SCMA" to organizational socialization theorizing. *Communication Monographs, 62*, 152-181.

Snyder, J. L., & Cornetto, K. M. (2009). Employee perceptions of e-mail monitoring from a boundary management perspective. *Communication Studies, 60*, 476-492.

Stephens, K. K. (2007). The successive use of information and communication technologies at work. *Communication Theory, 17*, 486-509.

Stephens, K. K., & Davis, J. (2009). The social influences on electronic multitasking in organizational meetings. *Management Communication Quarterly, 23*, 63-83.

Stephens, K. K., Sornes, J. O., Rice, R. E., Browning, L. D., & Saetre, A. S. (2008). Discrete, sequential, and follow-up use of information and communication technology by experienced ICT users. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*, 197-231.

Stohl, C., & Cheney, G. (2001). Participatory processes/paradoxical practices. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14,* 349-407.

Svennevig, J. (2008). Exploring leadership conversations. [Editorial Material]. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21,* 529-536.

Taylor, M., & Doerfel, M. L. (2003). Building interorganizational relationships that build nations. *Human Communication Research, 29*, 153-181.

Teboul, J. C. B., & Cole, T. (2005). Relationship development and workplace integration: An evolutionary perspective. *Communication Theory, 15*, 389-413.

Teven, J. J. (2007). Effects of supervisor social influence, nonverbal immediacy, and biological sex on subordinates' perceptions of job satisfaction, liking, and

supervisor credibility. *Communication Quarterly, 55*, 155-177.

Thackaberry, J. A. (2004). "Discursive opening" and closing in organizational self-study: Culture as trap and tool in wildland firefighting safety. *Management Communication Quarterly, 17*, 319-359.

Timmerman, C. E. (2003). Media selection during the implementation of planned organizational change: A predictive framework based on implementation approach and phase. *Management Communication Quarterly, 16*, 301-340.

Timmerman, P. D., & Harrison, W. (2005). The discretionary use of electronic media. *Journal of Business Communication, 42,* 379-389.

Tourish, D. (2008). Challenging the transformational agenda—Leadership theory in transition? [Editorial Material]. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 522-528.

Tourish, D., Paulsen, N., Hobman, E., & Bordia, P. (2004). The downsides of downsizing: Communication processes and information needs in the aftermath of a workforce reduction strategy. *Management Communication Quarterly, 17*, 485-516.

Tracy, K. (2007). The discourse of crisis in public meetings: Case study of a school district's multimillion dollar error. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 35*, 418-441.

Tracy, S., & Trethewey, A. (2005). Fracturing the real-self ⟷ fake-self dichotomy: Moving toward the "crystallized" organizational discourses and identities. *Communication Theory, 15*, 168-195.

Tracy, S. J. (2000). Becoming a character for commerce. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14,* 90-128.

Tracy, S. J., Lutgen-Sandvik, P., & Alberts, J. K. (2006). Nightmares, demons, and slaves: Exploring the painful metaphors of workplace bullying. *Management Communication Quarterly, 20*, 148-185.

Tracy, S. J., & Scott, C. (2006). Sexuality, masculinity, and taint management among firefighters and correctional officers: Getting down and dirty with "America's heroes" and the "scum of law enforcement." *Management Communication Quarterly, 20*, 6-38.

Trethewey, A. (2001). Reproducing and resisting the master narrative of decline: Midlife professional women's experiences of aging. *Management Communication Quarterly, 15*, 183-226.

Trethewey, A., & Corman, S. (2001). Anticipating K-commerce: E-commerce, knowledge management, and organizational communication. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 619-628.

Tullar, W. L., & Kaiser, P. R. (2000). The effect of process training and outcomes in virtual groups. *Journal of Business Communication, 37*, 408-426.

Turner, P. K. (1999). What if you don't?: A response to Kramer and Miller. *Communication Monographs, 66*, 382- 389.

Turner, P. K., & Krizek, R. L. (2006). A meaning-centered approach to customer satisfaction. *Management Communication Quarterly, 20*, 115-147.

Tyler, J. M., & McCullough, J. D. (2009). Violating prescriptive stereotypes on job resumes: A self-presentational perspective. *Management Communication Quarterly, 23*, 272-287.

Ulmer, R. R. (2001). Effective crisis management through established stakeholder relationships: Malden Mills as a case study. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 590-615.

Van den Hoof, B., Groot, J., & de Jonge, S. (2005). Situational influences on the use of communication technologies. *Journal of Business Communication, 42*, 4-27.

Vielhaber, M. E., & Waltman, J. L. (2008). Changing uses of technology: Crisis communication response in a faculty strike. *Journal of Business Communication, 45*, 308-330.

Waldeck, J. H., Siebold, D. R., & Flanagin, A. J. (2004). Organizational assimilation and communication technology use. *Communication Monographs, 71*, 161-183.

Weaver, C. K. (2001). Dressing for battle in the new global economy: Putting power, identity, and discourse into public relations theory. *Management Communication Quarterly, 15*, 279-288.

Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Weick, K. E., & Daft, R. L. (1983). The effectiveness of interpretation systems. In K. S. Cameron & D. A. Whetten (Eds.), *Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models* (pp. 71-93). New York: Academic Press.

Whittle, A., Mueller, F., & Mangan, A. (2008). In search of subtlety: Discursive devices and rhetorical competence. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*, 99-122.

Wiesenfeld, B. M., Raghuram, S., & Garud, R. (1999). Communication patterns as determinants of organizational identification in a virtual organization. *Organization Science, 10*, 777-790.

Wiley, S. B. C. (2004). Rethinking nationally in the context of globalization. *Communication Theory, 14,* 78-96.

Zaidman, N. (2001). Cultural codes and language strategies in business communication. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 408-441.

Zhu, Y., May, S. K., & Rosenfeld, L. B. (2004). Information adequacy and job satisfaction during merger and acquisition. *Management Communication Quarterly, 18*, 241-270.

Ziegler, J. A. (2007). The story behind an organizational list: A genealogy of wildland firefighters' 10 standard fire orders. *Communication Monographs, 74*, 415-442.

Zoller, H. M. (2003). Working out: Managerialism in workplace health promotion. *Management Communication Quarterly, 17,* 171-205.

Zoller, H. M. (2004). Dialogue as global issue management: Legitimizing corporate influence in the transatlantic business dialogue. *Management Communication Quarterly, 18*, 204-240.

Zorn, T. E., Page, D. J., & Cheney, G. (2000). Nuts about change: Multiple perspectives on change-oriented communication in a public sector organization. *Management Communication Quarterly, 13*, 515-566.

Book Reviews

Atton, Chris and **F. James Hamilton**. *Alternative Journalism.* London, Thousand Oaks, CA, New Delhi, Singapore: Sage Publications, 2008. Pp. 179. ISBN 978-1-4129-4702-2 (hbk.) $89.95; 978-1-4129-4703- 9 (pb.) $42.95.

For more than a decade British scholar Chris Atton has been publishing alternative media titles, from his first *Alternative Literature* in 1996, to *Alternative Media* in 2002, and *An Alternative Internet* in 2004. His last book, this time co-written with James Hamilton, another very active scholar in this area of research, deals instead with *Alternative Journalism.*

Despite the limitations of dealing with a subject that might have a potentially very large scope, the book accomplishes the mission of giving students and scholars a very good resource that can inspire also further research and discussion in the classroom. The publication will appeal to students of journalism and new media, as well as those researchers working in the area of critical media studies, political economy of the media, and alternative media practice. Together with a number of key texts that have been published in increasing numbers in the last decade on community, citizen, and radical media, *Alternative Journalism* will be the complement to areas such as web, radio, and TV practices that have been covered before.

This is the first book-length study to bring together organically the investigation and analysis for forms of journalism that have been challenging mainstream news media and the commercial organization of its production. It is divided in three parts.

The first part traces the historical roots of alternative journalism from the early radical-popular press in early 19th century England, then analyzing the rise of bourgeois journalism and its consolidation, before turning the attention to oppositional journalism in the early 20th century in the U.S., and the forms developed outside Western contexts as the samizdat, showing how, as a consequence of the changes in dominant practices, "the alternative that challenges it has changed as well" (p. 21).

The second chapter focuses on the political economy of alternative media by discussing the pressures that are shaping its practice, arguing that alternative journalism "is better seen as opposing but also enabled by the conditions in which it exists" (p. 22). The dilemmas that characterize its practice are, Atton and Hamilton state, patronage, commercial support, personal journalism, and collective and movement support. They warn though that its political economy can not be traced "through a set of static categories, but through an exceedingly complex field of limits and pressures that operate in a wide variety of often contradictory ways" (p. 40).

A socio-demographic survey of who actually are "alternative journalists" provides the object of analysis of the third chapter, which explores their backgrounds, motivations, and skills. However, as the authors warn, there are a limited number of research findings that can be relied upon and therefore this might only help to get the "fragments from which we can piece together a picture" (p. 43). What emerges then is the wide range of backgrounds and experiences that characterizes these journalists depending, for example, on the size of the target audiences, and their own take on professionalism and equality principles. At times, the authors say, alternative journalism will reproduce "prevailing conditions in the wider society" (p. 59), including its disparities and imbalances.

The second, and central, part of the book starts with the debate on the multiplicity of policies, forms, and challenges of this kind of journalism. A challenge that remains constant is surely the risk of absorption and incorporation that is present also in current initiatives that have been adopted from a number of news media outlets. Media corporations want to appear more open to public input and often invite citizens to send their own contributions, aiming to boost user participation in order to enhance their democratic credentials. The other three options adopted in relation to the "Dominant" are then described as the ones trying to challenge, reform, or subvert it.

Chapter 5 gives an overview of contemporary practices of alternative journalism ranging from partic-

ipatory online news reporting, fanzines (as an alternative cultural journalism), and blogs, then analyzes the concepts of objectivity, active witnessing and representation, sourcing and credibility, and reliability. Overall, the wide variety of approaches shows "new ways of thinking about and producing journalism, focuses on what kind of knowledge are produced, and suggests how readers and writers may come together to make sense of them" (p. 96).

A global cross-media overview of alternative journalism, including a selection of case studies is given in Chapter 6, starting with the *Indymedia Network* and the South Korean-based *OhMyNews*, which has succeeded in emerging "as a distinct rival to mainstream news organizations" (p. 102) in the East Asian country. Accounts of alternative press media in the former Yugoslavia, Taiwan, and Malaysia are then followed by the discussion of alternative radio journalism cases in Colombia and the United Kingdom (the community radio station *Resonance FM*) and the web-based global network *OneWorld Radio*. Street papers and alternative television complete the survey of the alternative media landscape.

In the final part, Atton and Hamilton look at how theories of journalism, media, and society can make sense of the large variety of projects previously discussed in the book. Starting with critical media studies, the authors then discuss Downing's theories of alternative media for radical political communication, Rodriguez' conceptualization of citizen media, and Couldry's approach to the struggle for media power. After a brief overview of alternative journalism theories, and the concept of "native reporting," Atton and Hamilton develop a sociology of alternative journalism by employing Bourdieu's theory of cultural production, linking alternative journalism and field theory, and exploring it in relation to professional ideologies and practices to show how "alternative journalism practices present ways of re-imagining journalism" (p. 135).

In Chapter 8 the authors question the role of the Internet as a site for alternative journalism and ask "to what extent such practices are sustainable in a media-centric world" (p. 136), examining the areas of organization, popularization and challenge, and user-created content and participation. Enhanced broadband capacity, especially in the more developed countries, has contributed to the rise of the use video and audio materials, and documentaries that are critiques of how the mainstream media work, as the *Echo Chamber Project* and *Outfoxed* in the U.S. Interestingly, Atton and Hamilton

also point out how alternative journalism is not only aspiring to be a tool for information delivery, but also used for "'the development of skills and . . . experimentation with forms, technologies, and uses" (p. 146), contributing to increase media literacy skills, and possibly becoming "the surest way of escaping the ghetto of marginalization and isolation" (ibid.).

The book is concluded by a very useful critical bibliography of alternative journalism, a chapter that will be surely an excellent resource for students and scholars alike to develop further work in this area.

Bibliographical references and a subject index are included.

—Salvatore Scifo
European Union Institute
Marmara University, Istanbul

Auletta, Ken, *Googled: The End of the World as We Know It*. New York: The Penguin Press, 2009. Pp. 336. ISBN 978-1-5942-0235-3 (hbk.) $27.96. (Also available in Adobe reader and ePub eBook formats for the same price.)

Recently I returned to the small Michigan town where I spent my childhood in order to attend a high school reunion. My classmates were excited about my adult life—TV work, Harvard and MIT studies, travel globally with an International Media Commission. One fellow shouted as I was leaving, "How can I learn more about your activities?" I replied, without even thinking, "Google me!"

I had, like many others, turned the noun "Google" into a verb.

Most agree with Hal Varian at Google that the Internet has made information *available*, but it's Google's search engine that has made all this information *accessible*.

Google's algorithms and global computer storage have also empowered a corporate giant. It handles more than 3 billion searches daily. Google's advertising revenues—more than $20 billion a year—account for 40% of all the advertising dollars spent online. Google News aggregates 25,000 news sites daily. And as it continues to digitize libraries with its Google Books project, the company appears headed to be the sole gateway to almost all the world's books.

How did all this happen? It has been chronicled several times in books but Ken Auletta is uniquely positioned to analyze all of it here in the context of new and old media. His previous books on the networks and

on Microsoft's legal battles, as well as his regular column in *The New Yorker* magazine, have given him the understanding and analytical skills to trace the Google story perceptively.

First, to grasp the breadth of the Google empire: it does searches; it developed its own operating system (Chrome OS); it has unveiled a mobile phone (Nexus One); it owns YouTube; it is moving into cloud computing; it has an operating system for tablet PCs (Android); it is offering answer highlighting and rich snippets (to enrich its search). And there's Google Earth and Maps and Images and Finance and Arts and Sports and Health and the above-mentioned Google Books.

This book is a rich and readable chronological history of Google with too much material to review here. I have selected two aspects of the story I suspect will be of special interest to COMMUNICATION RESEARCH TRENDS readers—Google's impact on "old" media and its efforts to digitize all the books in the world for easy access (and its own profit.)

Here are some new media/old media clashes (often with Google in the middle):

• Old media advertising revenues and agencies are declining dramatically as Google and other online sites offer advertising. Google's PageRank positions its ads on the basis of traffic and its auctions for ads are run online, with no ad reps, no negotiations, no relationships. Google Analytics allows advertisers to track clicks and sales and effectiveness.

• Newspaper circulation and ad revenues are dropping precipitously while Google News aggregates news stories with links back to the original source. Thus all these stories are free for Google while journalism struggles to maintain quality as jobs disappear.

• Traditional professional storytellers on TV have been seriously challenged by "user-generated" content in social networks; more and more people are viewing media on computers or mobile devices, while TV networks slip.

Some of the most interesting data analysis in Auletta's book relates to the convergence and synergy as new and old media confront and challenge each other. Google's personnel are mainly engineers and its founders believe it's virtuous to share. This embraces the concept by Eric Steven Raymond in his paper "The Cathedral and the Bazaar." "Instead of a solitary engineering wizard crafting software as if it were a cathedral, releasing it when perfected . . . this new model

was more like 'a great babbling bazaar' igniting the creativity of engineers and users." The two founders have been described as "Montessori kids" taught to think for themselves. All Google employees are urged to use 20% of their time to work on projects of their own choice; a huge percentage of new Google projects are developed in this "free" time.

And, now, the emergence of Google Books [www.books.google.com]. In 2005 Google began digitizing millions of books, in cooperation with major research libraries. It has now become clear that, with E-books and Tablets, we simply don't know just how many ways we will be reading books in the future. There's no doubt digitization will provide access *to* books; it will also allow getting more *out* of books. All this is of great interest (globally) to researchers, librarians, authors, publishers, educators, and readers-at-large. Google has recently announced a new format for downloads (ePub), allowing text to conform to smaller screens.

But engineers need to look up from their computer algorithms to see that this raises many questions:

• What about copyright? How will authors' incomes be assured?

• How can a reader's privacy be safeguarded?

• If Google alone becomes the portal, what about monopoly concerns?

• If books are ranked by request numbers only, how can we rank quality?

• In this kind of mass production, how can bibliographic concerns be met?

As authors and publishers challenged Google in court, a settlement was reached. But now this settlement is being challenged and may be litigated for years to come.

Auletta notes that hubris exists within the Google culture. But he concludes:

> Nowhere in the three billion daily searches it conducts, . . . or the more than 20 million books it plans to digitize, will we find another company that has swept so swiftly across the media horizon. (p. 336)

The book includes bibliographical references and an index.

—Frances Forde Plude
Notre Dame College of Ohio

Bongiovanni, Ambrogio. *Il dialogo interreligioso: Orientamenti per la formazione* [*Interreligious dialogue: Orientations for formation*]. Presentation by

Alberto Trevisiol, IMC. Bologna: Editrice Missionaria Italiana (EMI), 2008. Pp. 384. ISBN 978-88-307-1777-0 (pb). €16.

Dr. Bongiovanni is a lecturer at both the Pontifical Gregorian University and the Pontifical Urbanian University in Rome and is the founder and director of the St. Francis Xavier Movement, a lay ecclesiastical movement that was founded in Italy in the 1980s and was present in India (where St. Francis Xavier is buried in Goa) from 1990. The author has researched widely in India. Since 2001 he has served as a member of the Committee for Charitable Intervention for the Third World of the Italian Catholic Bishops' Council.

The author puts forward the notion that there is today a need for a reflection on formation in interreligious dialogue. He believes that this dialogue needs training and cannot be left to either improvisation or to being an academic discipline that considers religions as a doctrinal complex that must be examined and discussed and which obscures practice (p. 11). He also wants to move away from the possibility of forming people solely through giving them a systematic idea of various religions, perhaps in the context of other disciplines like theology, philosophy, or religious sciences, without giving the specific formation that is needed. For a useful interreligious dialogue, he suggests (p. 13), there is a need to change attitudes and languages without losing the nature of the message or the scope of its function.

The book is in three parts. The first is a general introduction to the topic in relation to today's society and the need to rethink education on faith and the necessity of encounter between philosophy and theology. He then suggests preliminary considerations of emerging theological positions that assist in the rethinking of training or formation.

The second part considers dialogical communication, which he describes as a dynamic communication of love. Here, he discusses the purification of the language, the significance of relations, the word and the other, and communication of religious experience. He asks also what the "I" and the "You" can exchange, what they communicate, and intersubjective communication. Bongiovanni then considers theological sources and contexts.

The third part considers orientations for training in dialogue, returning to the term "dialogue" and possible formative routes that could direct interreligious dialogue. He then discusses the scenario that pluralism of faiths presents and looks towards a theology of dialogue and an attempt to construct a "culture of dialogue," asking which methods and elements might assist formation in this area. The final result of this work is, he says, an attempt to get to work in the field of training in some categories and reflections on interreligious dialogue. Bongiovanni says that he does not intend to hide the fact that the major preoccupation is still a spiritual one (p. 346) since formation and education presuppose a conviction and hope that they can have a real and positive impact on our daily life, that they will prepare us for encounter with the other and will cause a variety of transformative processes. Dialogue, he adds, happens between people and not between systems (although I suppose Niklas Luhmann would dispute this) (p. 347). This notion of formation is developed in a polarity between the understanding of "the other" and a new understanding and appropriation of one's own tradition from a new light.

There is an extensive bibliography (pp. 351-375), which would be useful to anyone interested in this area (and we all should be, in an increasingly multi-faith world).

—Maria Way
University of Westminster, UK

Burgess, John and **Joshua Green**. *YouTube: Online Video and Participatory Culture.* Cambridge, MA: Polity Press, 2009. Pp. viii, 172. ISBN 978-0-7456-4478-3 (hbk.) $64.95; 978-0-7456-4479-0 (pb.) $19.95.

John Burgess and Joshua Green concentrate on conveying what YouTube is, an online visual global popular force; how it has changed the landscape of video sharing, influencing virtual communities, promoting mainstream popular culture; and how it has enhanced participatory culture. Burgess and Green, with the assistance of contributors Henry Jenkins and John Hartley, look at the beginnings of YouTube, along with key debates regarding its Internet presence and its impact on new media. The authors succeed in their goal of discussing the medium's challenges regarding initiating participatory culture: issues of the commercial world's participation; the challenge of promoting inclusiveness, sometimes in the face of controversy and legal concerns regarding video content; and the challenge of learning exactly what users are gravitating to, regarding subject matter.

Chapter 1 looks at the origins of YouTube and its structure when it debuted in 2005. The chapter covers the historic purchase of the site by Google, as well as the site's ability to recommend popular videos on a list, provide an email link for video sharing, offer a space for comments on videos, and display an embedded video player. The chapter emphasizes YouTube as a ready-made digital platform for content that has already been produced elsewhere, thus stressing its ability to promote other businesses. The emphasis of the enhancement of participatory culture via the popularity of video sharing is also discussed in the chapter, as is the emphasis of the viability of YouTube as a subject for research. The chapter then notes Patricia Lange's 2007 ethnography of the YouTube community that helps further shed light on key mixes of YouTube users: those who concentrate on YouTube as a promotional tool and those who use the site mainly for social networking and creating continued ties with their own virtual communities. The chapter ends with the overall emphasis of the authors' goal to gain a clear understanding of YouTube as what they term a mediated cultural system.

Chapter 2 addresses the relationship between YouTube and the mainstream media. This chapter focuses on the authors' goal to disprove how many branches of mainstream media have perceptions about new media that are not correct. Here, the authors couple the continuing development of YouTube as an effective structure in new media that serves its users who create material for it, and traditional mainstream media that use YouTube for their promotional and business needs. The authors cite the cultural studies writings of Stuart Hall. They do so as a way of indicating that outside forces not necessarily associated with new media have sought to cite YouTube's inclusion of videos showing youth engaged in criminal or dangerous activities as a way of attempting to create a "moral panic" instead of noting the diversity of content, a key uniting and bridge-building benefit of a new media entity such as YouTube. The chapter emphasizes YouTube's continued use in "scrapbooking" through documentation of family life like the times of filming home movies, as well as the use of the medium as a continuation of being an example of an information communication technology (ICT). The chapter also covers key challenging periods in YouTube's short history such as Viacom's 2007 lawsuit against the site, for example. The chapter also addresses the sometimes uneasy relationship with mainstream media over the legal interpretation of producing new material out of already-existing content.

Chapter 3 serves as the keystone of the book's structure in that it details the authors' study of YouTube's users. Here, the reader sees the fascinating trends regarding just what the users are actually doing with YouTube, and the frequency in which they are choosing to utilize the site. A key point of interest is the structuring of the sample by coding the videos according to their popularity. This choice makes sense, in that the website is structured in such a way that the most popular videos are always noted on a daily basis. The study shows that YouTube is unique in satisfying virtual communities by satisfying participatory culture in that the overwhelming majority of popular videos are user-created. At the same time, another fascinating part of the study reveals that almost half of the popular videos are taken from traditional sources, then uploaded to the website, and edited another time, many times changing the content's original meaning. Thus, the study reveals that user-created examples such as video blogs or "vlogs" of people sharing opinions and interests are immensely popular. At the same time, the presence of material from mainstream media, re-edited to suit the desires or entertainment wants of a virtual community is also popular, a finding that further sheds light on the use of YouTube as a unique interpretive community as well as a unique participatory culture.

Chapter 4 concentrates on the use of YouTube as a social networking website. The authors stress that the primary goal of YouTube users is to view the video content on the site more than create it or engage in online social networking. The authors show that the website is significant when it comes to this phenomenon, even though it was not originally designed for this purpose. The authors show that the Most Viewed and Most Subscribed categories on the website indicate what groups many viewers are gravitating to and why. The authors indicate that although traditional media was represented in these social networking congregations, the majority of these groups were a part of YouTube "stars": individuals whose presence on the site through their creating of original material on the site resulted in like-minded viewers becoming regular viewers and subscribers. In the second half of the chapter, the authors concentrate on looking at and further understanding how YouTube users engage in cultural production and participation. The key point they emphasize is that although YouTube was not designed to really facilitate social networking, members of virtual communities have still used it for these purposes like they would use a site such as Flickr, for example.

One key example of this point stems from the fact that YouTube does not have a live chat function. The authors show examples of those whom they call "lead users," people who are innovative mainly in their creativity, and have been the ones to innovate communicative patterns like the virtual "shout-out" to other key YouTube users known by their respective virtual and interpretive communities.

Chapter 5 delves into what the authors term YouTube's cultural politics. Here, the authors again emphasize YouTube's uneasy relationship regarding cultural production, regarding what they call the convergence between market and non-market modes. What continues to be fascinating about this chapter's point is the fact that these modes coexist in this digital space. Both modes actually do so to the point where there seems to be more frequent evidence of both spheres of influence working together to influence more users. The authors state that although the creators of YouTube built the website for commercial gain, cultural production, in the form of progressive cultural communities, used and still use the website to express their community's belief systems and practices. A key example that the authors discuss is the 2008 United States Presidential election, where the users engaged in cultural citizenship through the exercising of different political ideologies. The authors emphasize Joke Hermes' definition of cultural citizenship and its emphasis on identity construction and representation of these communities as well as ideology. Further, the authors stress the globalization factor—when in 2007 YouTube localized its operations by providing access to several countries. The increased presence of YouTube videos from South American and European countries, as well as Hong Kong and New Zealand were cited as key examples of cultural diversity and global representation on the website. Equally fascinating is the use of YouTube as a cultural archive. Here, the authors point out that many viewers use the site as a way of finding and revisiting meaningful media they viewed many years ago, such as episodes from classic television shows. Again, this phenomenon is indicative of YouTube's value as a participatory culture through its uniting of virtual communities with shared interests, regarding the value of a treasured past mediated moment.

Chapter 6 focuses on YouTube's uncertain future. In this chapter, the authors ponder whether YouTube can continue to enhance participatory culture through success as a platform for cultural diversity and continued expression of creativity among virtual and interpretive communities, while still being a viable structure that entices the profit-enhancing desires of corporations. A key point the authors emphasize here is the fact that YouTube has recently redesigned its website to promote its social networking capabilities. When a registered user logs back onto the site, YouTube now has a list of suggested videos geared toward the users' primary interests, and those of the virtual community in which they belong. Thus, the enhancement of cultural participation from a website originally not built for that purpose is a key point here. Also, the chapter returns to address the concern that YouTube has been used to document behavior deemed controversial or inappropriate. Here, the theme of uncertainty regarding the website returns to this point: the struggle to identify what is and what is not acceptable or beneficial for the website, while respecting and promoting creativity and free expression.

The book ends on an equally powerful note with important essays by Jenkins and Hartley. Jenkins reminds the reader that the independent "garage cinema" and the "do-it-yourself newsroom" were important foundational predecessors to YouTube, and therefore, were influential to the overwhelmingly popular user-created portion of YouTube. Hartley educates the reader regarding his creation of the Youth Internet Radio Network, a study that focuses on the digital literacy of young people through their congregating to a researcher-created video website that was a predecessor to YouTube.

In conclusion, *YouTube: Online Video and Participatory Culture* provides a thorough and educational insight into the video sharing website's beginnings, evolution, and hypothesized future, primarily as a constantly-changing format to encourage a now-present global participatory culture; now more than when it was originally conceived.

—Patrick Stearns
Morgan State University

Eide, Elisabeth, **Risto Kunelius**, and **Angela Phillips** (Eds.). *Transnational Media Events: The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations*. Göteborg: Göteborg University and NORDICOM, 2009. Pp. 290. ISBN 978-91-89471-64-1 (pb.) SEK 280, €30.

One of the major stories relating to religious belief that has appeared in our media during recent years was that which resulted from the 2005 publication of the now infamous "Mohammed Cartoons" in

the Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten*. This new book from NORDICOM looks at the story from an academic viewpoint through a variety of articles, written by scholars from many countries and using different methodologies. This was truly a global media event—at least in its consequences—and the book reflects this.

It is noted here that a media spectacle attracts research projects and that they share the guilt of others in becoming part of such scholarly activity. Here, they say, the "Islamic World" is seen in juxtaposition, or perhaps even opposition, to the "West," but the effects of the publication of these cartoons were global with coverage from Argentina to China (p. 12). The editors suggest here that the chosen chapters throw light onto important developments and trends in world values and politics, developments and trends in a transnationally mediated world. The authors believe that this particular event, transnational in form, opened up space in which key debates—secular versus religious, modern versus traditional, modern versus late modern, and the actual publication and aftermath of the cartoons—could be examined. For the authors, such binary oppositions provide too easy a form through which to consider the events. When the academic community so often sees religion and those with religious faith, perhaps particularly religious in the sense that they are clerics, as being out of step with modernity, such binary opposites would appear to me to be invalid when so many of the world's people profess a religious faith. Even in the UK, considered one of the less religious countries in Europe, over 70% of the population considered themselves to be "white Christians" at the 2001 census, not to mention the almost 2 million Muslims (now more), the million or so Hindus, and those Christians who are not white; all of these people live in the modern world and thus in modernity, and I am sure that few of them feel truly out of step with the modern.

Here, the editors suggest that the division between "the religious" and "modernity" may lie in the way we view news, news which is still mainly national and so has a tendency to show only that news which has resonance in our own country (p. 12). In the West, Islam is possibly also seen as "Eastern" and exotic—the Other—despite the fact that Christianity (like all the major religions) also comes from the "East." The newspaper that printed the cartoons said that their original intent was to encourage debate on a topic that was being ignored in Denmark. However, their decision, whether or not we believe their initial statements, was considered to be anti-Muslim and the diplomatic community lodged complaints about the treatment of Muslims in Denmark (p. 13). The ongoing story provoked questions about Muslims in Western countries and questions on how these cartoons had come to be published—which led onto questions about the ways in which Jews were portrayed in some Muslim countries and, from Pakistan, onto questions about why David Irving, the Holocaust denier, had been jailed in Austria but those who had perpetrated the drawing and publication of these cartoons were still walking free. Neither side was helped in their discourse by Iranian President Ahmadinejad's announcing a competition for Holocaust cartoons. In this book, the various authors and the editors try to make sense of the event itself and the discourse(s) that surrounded that event.

Leaving aside the more general population, I would suggest that there is a real problem within the academic community itself. While that community often discusses (as a good thing) the notion of freedom of speech, in a case of this type we often seem ready to take issue either with the perpetrators or with those who complain about the cartoons. Freedom of speech should mean just that—we should be free to speak about anything about which we wish to speak (however, unpalatable this may be). I personally despise extremist parties, like the British National Party (formerly the National Front) in the UK, but they do represent the viewpoint of a proportion of the population of my country and, since we live in a democracy, I feel that they should be free to express their views, just as I should be free to openly oppose them. As an extension of this, I can disagree on religious grounds. My own faith, Roman Catholic Christianity, is often seen in the West as being retrograde and out of step due to its stance on, for instance, contraception or abortion—yet it is rarely pointed out in the media that many Muslims, Jews, Hindus, and other Christian groups share these views. This book does not set out to ask whether this event and its ramifications were actually about "freedom of speech," but wishes to consider the actions and words of those who were actors in the event, e.g., the media. Many chapters situate themselves in broader political debates.

Of the book's three sections, the first demonstrates how the event unfurled from the initial publication to the global spread of the controversy. Amin Alhassan then makes an analytical reading of the cartoons and demonstrates their differences and ambiguities. The book's second section looks at the mediated event through professional journalistic concepts, such as media spin, free speech, communication rights and

the global/local dynamics of journalism. Karin Becker considers the border between art and journalism and Risto Kunelius asks how this event adds to our knowledge of the global media event and whether there can be such a thing as a "global public sphere." The eminent academic, John Durham Peters, writes the book's final chapter. While Durham Peters was not a member of the project's original research group, he writes here on the tensions between freedom of speech and the theorization of religion, noting that free speech is naturally recursive. When free speech is advocated, this in itself becomes a speech act, which is often offensive. The suppression of free speech can equally be a speech act and often offensive (p. 275), which possibly could be construed as back up for my earlier comment on free speech. His is an erudite and balanced commentary, and one of his conclusions is that there should be no surprise if we still have a "riot of heresies in the 21st century" (p. 287). While the intellectual traditions of the Abrahamic religions offer guidance on thought on the public sphere and free speech, and reading about such traditions may trouble us, Liberalism, even that which has some religious faith behind it, for Durham Peters, attacks the authority that tries to fix meaning. He ends by writing, "Liberalism is best understood not as the termination of all religious debate, but as the enabler of its on-going vitality" (p. 287).

Yet another timely and interesting book from the NORDICOM series, this would be useful to those who teach religious studies, philosophy, transcultural media, and globalization. It is eminently readable.

—Maria Way
University of Westminster, UK

El-Nawawy, Mohammed and **Sahar Khamis**. *ISLAM Dot Com: Contemporary Islamic Discourses in Cyberspace*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Pp. 263. ISBN 978-0-230-60035-5 (hbk.) $90.00.

The most often asked questions about the role of Islam in the political communication literature focus on "Who speaks for Islam?" and "What does the Muslim religion mean to those living outside of the Islamic world?" In a comprehensive study packed into a monograph-length book, el-Nawawy and Khamis fill the gap in the scholarly literature that analyzes online communities and their role in defining religious identity as it pertains to the Islamic world. The co-authors' main objective in the book addresses how individuals and groups "exercise voice and social agency to negotiate

relationships and public discourse" (p. 19). This book makes a modest claim, that it is a scholarly "snapshot" (p. 19) of a rapidly evolving mediated public square constructing political and religious identity, and uses textual analysis of Muslim discourse on three of the most frequently visited interactive Islamic websites—islamonline.net, islamway.com, and amrkhaled.net. The first site is in Arabic and English, the other two are multi-lingual, available in Arabic, English, German, French, Turkish, Spanish, and other languages. This multi-linguality in an oral culture is central to the enduring importance of this innovative study in the field of new media and religion, one which seeks to explain whether the Internet is a centripetal or centrifugal social force, uniting a fragmented diasporic population or, through a virtual democratic blogosphere, creating new divisions by permitting all forms of discussions, including those that are uncivil and more emotional than rational.

The co-authors demonstrate the importance of this cyber discourse by a discussion of the rich theoretical foreground in communication theory that makes a strong case for the importance of the ordinary conversational exchanges on the three website discussion boards, explaining how the Internet and virtual public sphere are both reflexive and constructive. In the first three chapters, the co-authors define the public sphere using communication theory, then unpack religion and the virtual public sphere as it pertains to Islam, and, in a third and separate chapter, debate whether or not the *umma* is properly considered a public sphere, and how that determines the shifting of conceptions of religious authority and who is eligible to teach. Chapters 4 and 5 examine textual evidence from Islamic websites actively engaged in collective and divergent identity construction in cyberspace, and the sixth chapter concludes the examination, weighing whether these sites are platforms for consensus or contention.

This innovative, highly readable volume grounded in communication and social science theory explores the multiple ways in which the Islamic religious identity is being shaped by cyberspace, as the co-authors cross the interdisciplinary and international borders of their subject, and discuss the multi-faceted identities on the three most frequently visited websites, where the imagined community reinvents itself over the issues of the day. Non-Muslim or lay readers are brought through three initial theoretical chapters that provide context for framing whether or not the websites facilitate a "rational and critical public sphere in

the Muslim *umma*," (p. 18) as derived from the six criteria derived from Habermasian theories of the public sphere and communication action, Benedict Anderson's ideal of the imagined community, and their compatibility with the key Islamic concepts of *shura,* (consultations) *ijtihad,* (independent interpretation) and *ijma* (consensus). These concepts are fully explained in the first three chapters, as they apply to communicative action, rational-critical debate, and consensus, and are applied to the discourse on the three website discussion boards (p. 7).

In two central evidentiary chapters exploring collective and divergent identities respectively, the co-authors provide textual evidence excerpted from the Internet discourse. In the realm of the collective and in the realm of the divergent, the co-authors describe "heated debates between the Muslim *umma* and those who do not belong to it" (p. 165) such as: Sunni versus Shi'ite discourses about marriage between members of the two sects, marrying a non-Muslim, a debate between a Catholic and a Muslim about the concept of truth in the Bible and the Quran, Danish cartoons and the lack of respect for the Prophet, gender and political discourses including intercultural marriage, the Israeli-Palestinian territorial wars, violence in Lebanon, and even the rising suicide rate in the U.S. Army. The exploration of the collective identity formation reveals how the "nature of the *umma*" both can "fit under or diverge from, the notion of the public sphere, as envisioned by Habermas," a public sphere "capable of reinventing and restructuring itself . . . by oscillating between the poles of tradition and modernity, moral unity and political fragmentation, localism and globalization, uniformity and diversity, as well as modernity and radicalism" (p. 111).

This book is the tenth volume in a series chaired by Professor Philip Seib of the University of Southern California on international political communication. Dr. Mohammed el-Nawawy has written and conducted research extensively about Al-Jazeera, and holds the Knight-Crane endowed chair in the school of communications at Queens University in Charlotte, North Carolina. His co-author, Sahar Khamis is Assistant Professor in the department of Communications at the University of Maryland. Both are Arab-Americans and both teach courses in communication specializing in Middle Eastern mass media.

—Claire H. Badaracco
Marquette University

Ganssle, Gregory E. *A Reasonable God: Engaging the New Face of Atheism*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009. Pp. 165. ISBN 9781602582415 (pb.) $24.95.

For anyone teaching media and religion, communication, or popular culture and religion, this slim volume examining the leading public intellectuals who argue for atheism is a valuable resource, accessible for all levels of study, from beginning to advanced. The author looks at the arguments of four best-selling writers, to whom the term New Atheist is applied because of the popularity of their contemporary books—Sam Harris (*The End of Faith*), Daniel Dennett (*Breaking the Spell*), Richard Dawkins, (*The God Delusion*), and Christopher Hitchens (*god is not Great*). The examination is lucidly explained and organized, highly accessible, lifting up the major lines of argument without glossing—yet, oddly, praising those who seek a Reasonable God for both their passion and lack of neutrality.

The author is quick to point out that though popular culture has dubbed these men the "new" atheists, their argument is not new, nor does it, he concludes, pose a threat to those who believe in God. Yet for those interested in the study of believers in God, this is a worthy exposition about the rationale of those who wish to privilege Science and Reason over Miracles and Mystery, and leaves open for speculation the ways in which these arguments intersect with modernity, post-modernity, and popular culture in the age of religious fundamentalists and terrorists; no provision is made for feminist interpretations of patriarchy, but perhaps that is another subject entirely, though the lack of any female atheists is noteworthy.

The book is organized around eight short, well-researched, scholarly, and well-documented chapters: first, that religious truth claims are contrary to science, particularly in the realm of the inexplicable, the mysterious, or miraculous; second, the tension between faith and evidence: that they are contrary in both interpretation and in existence. The third chapter is contrapuntal—exploring the major arguments *for* God's existence in light of what the New Atheists have made of those reasons. The fourth chapter examines the most popular and controversial of these arguments, that is, intelligent design, and the fifth, the Darwinian explanations for religion and what the four writers make of those arguments.

The sixth chapter examines three arguments in the public culture against the existence of God not taken up

by these writers: that religious pluralism undermines the rationality of belief in one God; the critique of first cause—who made the maker of all things?; and the problem of evil. The seventh chapter undermines the arguments put forth in the sixth: the author contends that none of these usual arguments are as persuasive as the "fittingness" argument, that the world in its present state fits better with an atheistic rather than a theistic view. The conclusion of the book aims to relax any believers threatened by the popularity of the new atheists. Why these writers' best-selling books have traction in the current world of extremists and fundamentalists, he leave up to the reader to think about.

—Claire H Badaracco
Marquette University

Jamal, Amal. *The Arab Public Sphere in Israel: Media Space and Cultural Resistance*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009. Pp. 208. ISBN 978-0-253-35386-3 (hbk.) $65.00; 978-0-253-22141-4 (pb.) $24.95.

The challenge of this theoretically and empirically well-rounded book is to explain state-minority relations through media use. The author offers as an illustration of broader political-cultural and communication theory the contemporary example of how Arabs in Israel consume local Arab media productions in Arabic for Arab audiences, including newspapers, radio, and television. Using this example, the author illustrates how minority groups exhibit a double-consciousness by resisting state policies of control and identity formation without renouncing the state, yet crossing their confinement; how they connect to their broader cultural groups through mass media. He argues very well the case for the importance of his research at this time in political history, citing a comparable coping mechanism between minority and majority populations such as Hungarians in Romania, Kurds in Turkey, Maori in New Zealand, Russians in the Baltics, and Turkish populations in Holland. This book advances the argument about the important role of mass media consumption in the identity formation of minorities within hegemonic states.

The author's research method and scope are impressive, tying together the empirical data from survey research with theoretical threads. The first three chapters draw the reader into the historical, political, and theoretical framework within which the context for the survey research makes it case. The complexities of location and displacement, native linguistics and political identities are extremely interesting and dispassionately described based on the author's deep knowledge of a broad cultural history of the complicated political communication patterns that have caused and sustained conflict over territory, identity, and homeland for generations.

Two large sample surveys provide the field data: one sample includes 594 participants randomly sampled by telephone interviews of 60 to 90 minutes each during the winter of 2004-2005. The second sampled opinion among 229 elites, consisting of personal interviews of 229 politicians, artists, authors, bankers, educators, civil activists, and university professors. This research provides the empirical base for three chapters central to the argument of the seven-chapter book. The third and fourth chapters are historical, providing the context for the rise of Arabic media and Israeli media policies toward the Arab minority, and explain the mediated adaptation to the political realities of the region between 1967–1985. In the fifth chapter, the author examines some the findings from the survey research, particularly in newspaper reading among Arab publics. In the sixth chapter, the author uses the data to describe attitudes towards Hebrew mass media, emphasizing the important role of public trust in audience behavior. He observes that in the last decade, in order to compete with alternative radio broadcasting from Arab countries as well as European stations also broadcasting in Arabic and some local radio, Israeli radio has introduced some changes in programming that cater to the younger generations and promoted Arabs within the station. The seventh chapter examines electronic media among Arabs based on several important factors and demonstrating the dual consciousness among the minority population in a hegemonic state, particularly among the indigenous Arab minority. Table 7.1 (p. 115) ranks the top 10 television channels in popularity among Arabs, who tend to want to consume political news from Arab channels (see Table 7.4, p 119), but who also do watch "a considerable amount of Israeli television in Hebrew" (p. 114). Additional tables, 7.2, 7.3, report comparable data for elites (and there are interesting discrepancies, and daily television consumption of only slightly more than 2 hours). The state of dual consumption patterns among Arabs in Israel is demonstrated in another data set about the perceptions among Arabs of the impact of satellite television: elites ranked "strongly" a sense of strengthening of connections to Arab culture, and a slightly less emphatic "agree" among non-elites (p. 124).

The author, Senior Lecturer and Chair of the Department of Political Science at Tel Aviv University, concludes that the book for the first time clarifies the mass media as a central player in the formation of state-minority relations, including "surveillance, marginalization, and control" (p. 127), and through this highly readable historical and empirical study, has advanced the definition of the nature of the public sphere in Israel.

—Claire H Badaracco
Marquette University

Kierulf, Anine and **Helge Rønning** (Eds.) *Freedom of Speech Abridged? Cultural, Legal, and Philosophical Challenges.* Gothenburg, Sweden: Nordicom, University of Gothenburg, 2009. Pp. 155. ISBN 978-91-89471-76-4 (pb.) €25, SEK 240

Once again, Nordicom publishes a timely book that deals with one of the problematics that exercises many, both in and outside academic, today. "Free Speech" is a wonderful concept, but in liberal countries, just as in more illiberal ones, there is a feeling that free speech does indeed have to be limited for a variety of reasons.

This book is made up of 11 essays contributed by professionals in various fields, all of whom work in the Nordic countries. Their approaches are different, but add to the debate on freedom of expression. These essays are divided among three different groups: philosophical essays, legal ones, and those which deal with global/cultural notions, so necessary in an age where increased globalization of media products is the norm.. The content of the essays varies from Ulf Petäjä's essay "What is the Value of Freedom of Speech?" (pp. 23-34) and Catherine Holst and Anders Molander's "Freedom of Expression and Freedom of Discourse: Examining a Justificatory Strategy" (pp. 35-49), both of which look at the concept of free speech, to actual case studies like Thomas Bull's (pp. 79-92), which deals with the Swedish situation, or Arne Ruth's (pp. 105-114), which looks at the furore around Salman Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses* from a perspective 20 years after the event. The book's intention is to consider articles from a variety of countries and to analyze them, but also to draw attention to facets of free speech that are more general and which may inspire reflection in the reader. Case studies, the editors note, can be "helpful starting points for understanding how differing cultural backgrounds influence how we think and talk about free speech" (p. 8).

Risto Kunelius' article, the final one in the book, is called: "Lessons of Being Drawn In: On Global Free Speech, Communication Theory, and the Mohammed Cartoons." Few cartoons can have caused the reams of newsprint that the printing of these particular ones did, or the backlash which resulted from them. In some ways, however, much as we believe or disbelieve the editors of *Jyllands-Posten's* statement that they were just treating Muslims in the same way as other Danes, one of the good results was that the event brought to the fore discourse on just what people thought free speech, or freedom of expression, was and/or should be. Kunelius notes that these cartoons illuminated the "several ways the new conditions in which free speech theory is translated from a seemingly universal and a-historical abstract set of ideas into actual rhetoric and action" (p. 139). The story became transnational and transcultural quite quickly and, for Kunelius this controversy underlined the role of the media itself (as a distinct actor), which meant that those media had to rationalize their actions and justify themselves. He further notes that while there were transnational solidarities (p. 140), there was also evidence that the mechanisms of national domestication were still very much alive. He suggests that the cartoons provided an opportunity to discuss notions of multiculturalism and religion, but that some countries kept the coverage of the story strictly to the "foreign news" sections of newspapers and broadcasting, e.g., the USA and Argentina. In other countries, different discourses were drawn in to explain or discuss the event and the reactions: West vs. East; history of empire, self-censorship, and blasphemy, for instance (p. 141). Notions of free speech, Kunelius opines, are subject to domestic conditions, but it is not easy to keep such reporting to the merely national level and it quickly moves to a transnational level. Freedom of speech, he adds, has great appeal in the West as a frame with abstract and universal appeal, but needs a local carrier item, historical references, familiar personalities, disagreements, or local actors, for instance.

Later in his chapter, Kunelius considers this event in terms of Bakhtin's notion of "Carnevalism" and also in relation to professional journalism's role in an era of mediatization. He suggests that there is a need for journalists to produce a "performative" distinction from politicians; that there is a need for media distinctiveness (in this case the publication was an act of distinction by the *Jyllands-Posten*'s editors) and he puts forward possible reasons why this is necessary in a modern media market. Thirdly, he suggests that the distinct

professional agency of the media opens up through paradox. He then moves on to discuss the discourse around the cartoons in terms of the public sphere and of what he terms the infrastructure of a "global public sphere," which he adds may not exist (p. 147). He completes the article by questioning fundamentalism and communication theory. This event, he proposes, brought to light two basic fundamentalist forms: that a sacred taboo was broken in printing these cartoons and also that a sacred Western tenet, free speech, was broken, a tenet which comes from the West's notions of a secular religion.

Kunelius hopes that the events and the discourse that has surrounded them will enable us to answer a number of questions when, as will inevitably happen in a globalized world, another such event occurs. He hopes that in this event communication research will provide the possibility of resisting fundamentalism (in both its forms, one supposes) and at the same time defending communication (p. 149).

Once again, Nordicom has published a book with high level, well written chapters that deal with a timely and interesting topic. Each chapter has end notes or references, but the book has neither a bibliography nor an index.

—Maria Way
University of Westminster, UK

McManus, John. *Detecting bull: How to identify and bias and junk journalism in print, broadcast, and on the wild web*. (CD book). Pp. 272. Sunnyvale, CA: The Unvarnished Press, 2009. ISBN 978-0-9840785-0-9 (CD). $23.93. Available from http://www.detecting-bull.com/online_buy_page2.htm.

Aristotle never used the term "BS," but he might agree with John McManus' assertion that some journalism is simply that—Bald Sophistry. McManus' *Detecting Bull* is a book on compact disc that lays out basic propositions on the form and function of modern journalism in order to equip readers with tools to be more informed citizens—that is, to identify bald sophistry. He writes that journalism ought to "help as many people as possible make sense of issues and events that affect their lives" (Ch. 9, p. 2). The author, who is director of the San Jose State University-based Grade the News, carefully engages the reader in how journalism currently works in order to prepare them to identify BS.

Each chapter lays out several propositions about a classic issue in journalism such as bias, objectivity, or commercial influence. The issue in Chapter 1 is the rapidly changing nature of our information system. McManus argues that there are simply fewer well-trained journalists as a result of a shifting business model in the industry. Public trust in journalism is failing largely due to the perception (and reality) that journalism is motivated by profit. Spin and propaganda have undercut traditional journalism by supplying popular but unreliable information. McManus invokes Stephen Colbert in Chapter 2 to frame the battle between and truth and "truthiness"; fragments of the truth are disguised more than ever so truth doesn't seem to simply win out in public debate. This chapter builds the case for critical thinking about news sources. One major proposition is that the media should discover truth; truth then leads to trust, and "trust is the glue that holds society together" (p. 3). A discussion of philosophical positions on truth culminates in a final proposition that posits that journalists can draw from agreement (pragmatic) truths, or those truths based on the classic model of who, what, when, where, and how. McManus continues laying the foundation of his view of human information processing in Chapter 4 by posing propositions on human beings' ability to see the world clearly. Essentially, these propositions are based on perception. Among numerous examples, he cites a Princeton/Dartmouth football game experiment of 1951 to show how viewers of the same event see very different things; objectivity is essentially impossible.

In Chapter 5 the author discusses the influence of institutions on journalism. While some journalism still adheres to classic, agreed upon principles, much of contemporary journalism is motivated by profits. Commercial interests exert enormous influence, and one cannot understand the news unless one understands the commercial pressures behind it. Among the propositions is the claim that the most threatening bias is not an alleged liberal or conservative bias, but a commercial bias. As one example, McManus includes a memo on Brittney Spears from AP Los Angeles Assistant Bureau Chief Frank S. Baker that shows how some news seems simply to defer to publicists to shape the news. Baker wrote that virtually anything Spears did was "a big deal" and that the AP should watch whatever anybody else wrote in order to confirm it (p. 5).

McManus encourages us to reconsider objectivity in Chapter 6. He suggests replacing *objective* with *empirical*, reflected in his propositions: news is inherently biased and objectivity is not only undesirable, but is impossible. McManus draws from Bill Kovach and Tom Rosensteil to define empiricism as a "practical or

functional form of truth" (p. 6). He identifies three positive biases in which media engage—picking out the news, packaging it, and simplifying it. These processes prevent information overload, but we must be aware of the value systems behind these choices, for news *represents* reality, it does not *reflect* it. He references an interview by CNN's Campbell Brown with Sarah Palin to illustrate tough questioning, and Scooter Libby's revealing of Valerie Plame Wilson as a CIA agent to illustrate the questionable credibility of unnamed sources.

Chapter 7 is on how to detect bias in news and opinion articles. McManus lays out a series of questions that provide one of his best detection tools. The questions promote critical thinking such as the nature of one's own biases, but he also asks readers to question the source, target audiences, groups affected, evidence used, etc. McManus uses well-crafted video news stories of a lay-about police commissioner in Southfield, Michigan, and double billing for prison inmates in New Orleans. He draws from reports by Keith Olbermann and Bill O'Reilly to help illustrate two purposes in journalism: reporting information and providing an opinion on the information. A set of bias-detector core questions provides an interactive tool for distinguishing author statements from source statements, with adjustments for genre, symbol-system, and media. A video of the "Gates of Hell," a sensationalized story of alleged gang initiation in an abandoned power station in Westchester County, New York, exhibits the use of weasel words that sensationalize the story. These extended examples show both the text of the story with accompanying video, and then commentary from McManus to show how to detect problems with both source statements and author statements.

Chapter 8 focuses on mapping patterns of bias. McManus defines bias as "a pattern of favoritism, negativity, or absence of coverage about someone or something that is not justified by the facts" (p. 2). Though not mentioned specifically, this chapter seems to draw from agenda setting theory in its definitions of favorableness, placement, and size or length of story. Some of the tools for detecting bull include a favorableness grid and a bias map that allows readers to plot all three variables. He also presents two analyses on the 2004 elections, finding that news sources in northern California gave far less coverage than a 30-member coalition of public interest groups had recommended. The findings suggest a bias against substantive coverage as opposed to bias toward a party or candidate. An analysis by Grade the News of photo and headline space in local newspapers given to candidates in the 2003 California gubernatorial recall election concluded that Arnold Schwarzenegger received more space than Gray Davis, Cruz Bustamante, and other candidates. Chapter 9 departs from bias to describe "how to evaluate the quality of news," operating from the premise that even if bias is absent, stories are not necessarily good. Some of the standards for quality include consequences of the story, diversity of sources, and basic standards of fairness. These standards are laid out on a news scorecard that viewers can use to evaluate stories. He includes a video example of a story on protests surrounding the debate to ban Marine recruiters from the city of Berkeley, California with a completed scorecard as example.

Author Eric Wiener recently said on NPR that given a few hours with a book, he would "promise to inform and entertain" readers, often during "stolen moments on the subway or after the kids are asleep." In contrast, e-books, he says, give readers an opportunity to float away to something else on line that might be more interesting; e-books seem to be just another player on a noisy electronic stage. Though not exactly an e-book, the electronic format (CD) of McManus's *Detecting Bull* is sometimes both confining and distracting; even with a laptop, readers don't always want to remain saddled with a machine to read a book. However, there are numerous benefits of releasing this book on CD. Embedded video clips of local news stories exhibit both good and bad investigation techniques and include several full stories from local newscasts. These simply can't be done in print, and they make a great teaching tool. Interactive scorecards in several formats with detailed instructions provide students with tools to analyze news stories. The digital format also allows for some convenient electronic gadgetry. For example, roll over an image such as a cartoon of Calvin and Hobbes and it enlarges; roll over a pen icon near a source, and the entire citation pops up. Highlighted words take you to web sites for further explanation, (such as the Pew Research Center or the Society of Professional Journalists' code of ethics). Each chapter ends with exercises and discussion questions.

—Pete Bicak
Rockhurst University

Reference

Weiner, E. (2010, January). In an era of immediacy, why fear the e-book? *National Public Radio*. Retrieved January 29 from http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=122822760

Oddey, Alison and **Christine White**. (Eds.) *Modes of Spectating*. Bristol, UK and Chicago, IL: Intellect, 2009. Pp. 266. ISBN 978-1-84150-239-7 (pb.) £27.50, $40.00.

Once upon a time "spectators" were people who attended football matches or something similar—we looked at or watched or listened to or read our media. This book considers the new ways in which we can become spectators, ways which result from the new media which are offered us. We have moved, the authors say, from seeing what happened previously (through films, highlights on tv, etc.) through sounds and narratives experienced on film to the instant replay (p. 7), which they suggest has led to the "immediate historicizing of the present moment"; we can even repackage historical events. Spectating, they say, lets us journey in an experience where we meet the unexpected, "chance upon and incur the improvisational, know and feel, and become acquainted with what is given" (ibid.). Oddey posits that as spectators we can participate in "participant services" of an auction, a reception, lunch, cocktail party, or dinner dance. The authors come from a number of different countries and backgrounds and this gives the book a considerable depth.

The book presents chapters which question:
- What are spectators doing?
- How do we understand the way spectating performance modes have changed?
- What is the nature of spectating multi-media projects?
- What is the choreography of the spectators as an artistic control?
- What do spectators of live performance want?
- What level of disturbance is necessary for entertainments in the 21st century?

Their aim in this book is to disrupt our ideas of spectating and to challenge notions of either the passive or active spectator. Questions about reading and non-reading, spectatorship in gaming and liveness are discussed, some in relationship to gaming. Do these new spectatorship modes help us to understand better the benefits of imagination and creativity? For McBurney, technologies are just another tool with which to play with imagination and creativity, but the older section of the population may find this difficult (and, I would add, in some cases frightening).

In the opening chapter the editors define what they mean by the terms they use: audience, spectator, inter-watching, for instance, and list what they call the "modes of spectating" (p. 13)—which seem to me to be technological platforms, which they call the "receiver device" (ibid.). There is an introduction and there are four separate sections: Interactive media and youth culture; Imaginative escape; Identity and the self-conscious spectator, and, finally, the Site of spectating. There is a good selected bibliography, biographies of the authors, and an index.

The book usefully adds to the literature on media events; new technologies and audiences, with some of the chapters coming from new and interesting viewpoints.

—Maria Way
University of Westminster, UK

Postiglione, Marianne, RSM, and **Thomas P. Sheahen** (Eds). *Faith-Science-Culture Converging or Diverging Realities: A 40 Year Retrospective. Proceedings of the ITEST 40th Anniversary Conference September, 2008.* St. Louis, MO: ITEST Faith/Science Press, 2009. Pp. viii, 230. ISBN 1-885583-17-6 (pb.) More information can be found on www.faithscience.org. No price is listed for this book.

Few subjects have generated as much heat in recent years as what many people see as a conflict between science and faith. Perhaps one of the reasons is that science is seen as having absolute answers, while faith cannot be measured or rationalized in the same way. ITEST's work has attempted to address this problem. This new volume looks back over the 40 years of ITEST, highlighting the advances made in the life sciences during this time and asks whether the growth and developments in science and technology, which have contributed in many cases to benefits in people's lives, have hindered the growth of the human spirit. Postiglione and Sheahen ask whether we have become subservient to "technological imperatives" or are obedient to the creative breath (p. vi). They ask whether there has been convergence or divergence between faith/theology and science/technology. The book is made up of a number of papers, versions of which were given at the conference, and edited versions of the discussions which followed, words from participants who had examined the papers, and questions from a Christian viewpoint investigating the relationship(s) participants believe are evident in the interrelationships of faith, science, and culture.

The book begins with a tribute to the late Fr. Robert Brungs, S.J., ITEST's founder written by Sr. Virginia Kampwerth. She notes that ITEST have moved

their activities from ones that were solely in the university milieu to making their work available in Catholic grade schools in the USA in modules that bring the points of conjunction of science and religion into their ethos. Kampwerth quotes Fr. Brungs as saying:

> Creation is the thread that binds us to God and God to us . . . We can't start too early to teach children that God loves them and to let them know that God's creation is the only tool at God's disposal to interrelate with us. (p. v)

Elsewhere, Kampwerth notes Fr. Brungs' absolute faith in God as the Way, the Truth, and the Life (p. iv). That he could bring that faith into developing the ITEST project is a tribute to him and to his colleagues.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, given the conference's topic, John F. Haught of Georgetown University notes that in February 2009 there would be celebrations of the 200th birthday of Charles Darwin and the 150th anniversary of the publication of *The Origin of Species.* He noted also that in the 40 years of ITEST there had been increasing attention to Darwin. He notes that Darwin was used as the intellectual foundation of the "new atheism" which Richard Dawkins, Chrisopher Hitchens, and others have put forward (p. 2). Haught's position is that the secularists have an incoherence in their logic and through their own belief systems deny some of those fundamental characteristics that make us human. He suggests that these secularists use their own minds to deny human minds' reality. He notes (p. 13) that it is "not his intention to discourage evolutionary and other scientific accounts of mind." He also suggests that, whatever he says, the "evolutionary naturalists" (ibid) will "not give up their belief that the fundamental causes of intelligence are themselves completely unintelligent." He puts forward a proposal for a satisfying answer to this impasse.

The second paper, on Catholic health care ministry and contemporary cuture, comes from Dr. Edmund D. Pellegrino. Both, Pellegrino notes, want to use the powers of modern biotechnology wisely and well and so often work within the same sets of ethical restraints (p. 20). Later he notes that the Church's mission of evangelization takes many forms, one of the most prominent being the vocation of healing and helping the sick. Pellegrino describes what he sees as a dichotomy in contemporary bioethics where the emphasis that Christian medical ethics puts on the dignity of the human being is not being taught in medical schools/hospitals for what are described as utilitarian reasons. He suggests that the Christian alternative to scientism and secularism is valid and that Christians should be drawn to attention.

Sr. Carla Mae Streeter, OP, from the Aquinas Institute of Theology, presents *"Gaudium et Spes*: Joy and Hope, The Church in the Modern World 43 Years Later." She considers the situation in the Church and the world that led up to the publication of *Gaudium et Spes* and the ways in which the world has since changed. She looks at the critical importance of science in implementing the vision of this document. She notes (p. 51) that there is no doubt that there is an intimate relationship between science and questions of meaning, posed by philosophy and theology: questions of human meaning, purpose, and suffering, which need to include hard data provided by the physical, social, and psychological sciences when pursuing the answers to these questions. She points out, quoting an anonymous writer, "There will not be a renewal of Christianity until a manual of science cannot be written without a reference to the Incarnation."

Robert L. Morris, an ITEST member for 20 years and a chemical engineer of some standing, responds to and comments on the papers. He notes (p. 58) that his attitude to some of the questions being raised in the papers may differ because, unlike Dr. Pellegrino (a medical doctor) or the clergy who were present, his work makes it unlikely that he will have such a personal and close relationship to the life of somebody in his laboratories as they would. This, he suggests, is one of the biggest differences between the scientist/theologian and the physicians and theologians. It is one thing to develop ideas or technologies theoretically and entirely another to put them into action with real people on a daily basis.

Much of the remainder of the book consists of edited transcripts of the discussions that followed during the conference and these too are valuable aids to those who are thinking about the questions with which ITEST and this conference and book deal.

The final, short chapter is a summing up by a student at the Aquinas Institute of Theology, Donna Zuroweste (pp. 212-213). This final chapter is followed by indices and by a list of the speakers and other participants at the conference with their contact details.

—Maria Way
University of Westminster, UK

Vandendorpe, Christian. *From Papyrus to Hypertext: Toward the Universal Digital Library* (Phyllis Aronoff & Howard Scott, trans.). Urbana and Chicago:

University of Illinois Press, 2009. Pp. xii, 191. ISBN 978-0-252-03435-0 (hbk.) $65.00; 978-0-252-07625-1 (pb.) $25.00.

Vandendorp's reflections on reading, the web, and hypertext originally appeared in 1999 *as Du papyrus à l'hypertexte* (Éditions du Boréal); with the online world moving so quickly, this translated edition updates the original, confirming some predictions, acknowledging later developments, and keeping the general structure of individual short essays. Though arranged as chapters, each unit of the work stands alone; Vandendorpe prefers the model of Pascal's Pensées to the continuous narrative he deems more suited to a novel. In this he follows his own descriptions of the kinds of writing suited for different kinds of reading. And that reinforces the overall goal for the work, described in this way: "simply to put in perspective the changes taking place in reading, changes that are often ignored because their effects are essentially invisible, but whose consequences for cultural behavior in general will nonetheless be significant" (p. 165).

The question of reading and its various forms provides a theme for the book. Reading, of course, occurs in many forms: Can one read a newspaper in the same way one reads a book? Can reading a billboard really count as "reading"? What about those claims to "read" a film or an image? For Vandendorpe, the question provides a point of entry into contemporary society:

> The entire book is obviously dominated by the question of reading, which is discussed from various perspectives of meaning and effect, context, readability, cognitive filters, and learned reflexes. How the author conceives of reading in the end determines the format of the text and the degree of control given to the reader or kept by the author. In this respect, the computer has the power to radically change the situation established over millennia of written culture. (p. 3)

To embark on such an exploration demands a good bit of knowledge and Vandendorpe leads his reader through a history of reading, a consideration of the role of the written sign, the development of standards of readability, and the slow invention of the book with its "linearity and tabularity" (p. 22)—the mechanisms for finding things in a continuous text.

But to do this well, one must also consider utterance, meaning and effect, orality, the role of the reader, and the stance of the writer. All the parts eventually fit together, but this book makes demands on the reader. Rather than laying the pieces out, Vandendorpe offers more of a do-it-yourself kit, inviting the reader to pick and choose from the essays/chapters. One could read the book straight through (my choice), but one could also treat the chapters as hyperlinked modules, something Vandendorpe encourages by indicating how one essay ties to others throughout the book.

In addition to many of the sources familiar to an English-speaking world (Auerbach, Bolter, Eisenstein, Goody, Lanham, McLuhan, Negroponte, Ong, Richards, and so on), the book draws on European (especially French), and South American writers who consider the nature of reading, meaning, and books.

Many of the chapters look ahead to an uncertain future. Trying to avoid the prophet's mantle, Vandendorpe does show a commitment to the web and tries to indicate how it might change reading practices: everything from the role of the publisher to the emergence of wikis to the choices offered to the reader. The future of reading may well include different kinds of interactivity and different kinds of arrangement of text on page/screen. Unfortunately, despite his historical summaries of how civilization got the kinds of books it has, Vandendorpe seems to sidestep the time dimension of developing new reading techniques. The book took centuries to emerge in its present form; should we not expect a similarly slow period of development in reading online? So, too, with people. While he does make reference to "tomorrow's readers" (p. 165), Vandendorpe does not credit their potential role in re-inventing reading, as most media ecologists would. The (communication) environment shapes those within it (a point he makes), but (the point he misses) those using various communication tools also shape that environment through their interactions with it.

From Papyrus to Hypertext both delights and frustrates (perhaps a definition of a good book!). One finds precious nuggets of information in every chapter—good ideas, striking illustrations, "I-didn't-know-that" material about books and reading. But then, Vandendorpe rushes on to the next chapter; one fairly begs for more. Yes, references can serve that purpose, but a book on the future of reading and the Internet could help its readers along.

The book does have all the "tabularity" that Vandendorpe endorses: a good table of contents, endnote citations, 10 pages of references, and an index.

—Paul A. Soukup, S.J.
Santa Clara University