

# COMMUNICATION RESEARCH TRENDS



Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture

---

Volume 35 (2016) No. 2

IN THIS  
ISSUE

## Hispanics-and-Latinos and the U.S. Media: New Issues for Future Research

Santiago Arias and Lea Hellmueller  
Texas Tech University

A QUARTERLY REVIEW OF COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

---

ISSN: 0144-4646

## Table of Contents

Editor's Introduction:	
Identity and Image in the Media . . . . .	3
Hispanics-and-Latinos and the U.S. Media:	
New Issues for Future Research . . . . .	4
1. Introduction . . . . .	4
2. The Growth of the Hispanic Population and Spanish-Language Media in the United States . .	6
3. The Origins of the Term "Hispanic" as a Media-Driven Concept . . . . .	8
A. The historical and conceptual difference between the terms "Hispanic" and "Latino" . .	8
4. Media Framing of Hispanics: The Love-Hate Relationship . . . . .	11
A. News media framing on general attitudes . . .	12
5. Anti-Immigration News Media Narrative: Attitudes toward Hispanics . . . . .	13
6. Conclusion . . . . .	15
References . . . . .	17
Additional Reading . . . . .	20
Book Reviews . . . . .	21
Briefly Noted . . . . .	40

Communication Research Trends  
Volume 35 (2016) Number 2  
<http://cscsc.scu.edu>

Published four times a year by the Centre for the Study of  
Communication and Culture (CSCC), sponsored by the  
California Province of the Society of Jesus.  
Copyright 2016. ISSN 0144-4646

Editor: Emile McAnany  
Managing Editor: Paul A. Soukup, S.J.

Subscription:  
Annual subscription (Vol. 35) US\$55

Payment by check, MasterCard, Visa or US\$ preferred.  
For payments by MasterCard or Visa, send full account  
number, expiration date, name on account, and signature.

Checks and/or International Money Orders (drawn on  
USA banks; for non-USA banks, add \$10 for handling)  
should be made payable to Communication Research  
Trends and sent to the managing editor

Paul A. Soukup, S.J.  
Communication Department  
Santa Clara University  
500 El Camino Real  
Santa Clara, CA 95053 USA

Transfer by wire: Contact the managing editor. Add \$10  
for handling.

Address all correspondence to the managing editor at the  
address shown above.

Tel: +1-408-554-5498  
Fax: +1-408-554-4913  
email: [psoukup@scu.edu](mailto:psoukup@scu.edu)

The Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture  
(CSCC) is an international service of the Society of Jesus  
established in 1977 and currently managed by the  
California Province of the Society of Jesus, P.O. Box 519,  
Los Gatos, CA 95031-0519.

# Identity and Image in the Media

## Editor's Introduction

Careful observers of communication like Walter Lippmann in his 1922 book, *Public Opinion*, have long noted that communication products (newspapers for Lippmann; radio, film, television, and, later on, the digital world) shape people's understanding of the world. Since most of us can have direct experience of only a small part of the world, we depend upon what others tell us. Others who command large audiences such as those generated by the news and entertainment industries can have an impact beyond their individual reach. Lippmann's observation may have functioned as an "aha" moment for many; it coincided with early communication research and at least indirectly led scholars to examine the issue more closely. Harold Lasswell's classic 1927 study, *Propaganda Technique in World War I*, took up the theme, focused on how governments aimed to shape public opinion, both in their own nations and in those of their enemies, often through mass media outlets. Advertising agencies had more or less reached the same conclusion from their applied work of getting products before the public, even if they did not have a good theory to explain their results or even target particular audiences.

The early generations of communication researchers concerned with mass media found persuasion fascinating, whether that persuasion served the marketing interests of advertisers or fostered the political ambitions of office seekers or helped governments achieve their ends in war and peace. The understanding of persuasion—of affecting not only what Lippmann termed "the pictures in our heads" but also people's likelihood to believe and act—grounded decades of communication research. Anecdotal evidence of the impact of communication led to careful studies, as history shows: the Payne Fund Studies (on the effects of films on children and teens); the follow-up studies to Orson Welles's Mercury Theatre of the Air "War of the Worlds" broadcast; or the studies of personal influence by Elihu Katz and Paul Lazarsfeld. This interest in the workings of persuasion continues, in one form or another, to influence communication studies with topics ranging from the impact of violence in the media to the consumption habits of individual shoppers. All of them, often implicitly, depend on some kind or another

of the "pictures in our heads" as the basis for persuasion—change the picture, change the response.

In the 1970s communication research began to examine another aspect of the impact of "the pictures in our heads": a negative one. George Gerbner coined the term "symbolic annihilation" to refer to the underrepresentation or absence of representation of groups in the mass media. Those who did not appear in "the pictures" did not exist for the people who depended on the pictures. During a period of increasing racial tension in the United States, he pointed out that most U.S. television (the mass medium with the strongest reach) did not feature people of color very much. Gaye Tuchmann, Arlene Kaplan Daniels, and James Benét's edited volume, *Hearth and Home*, applied that argument to women: The mass media's skewed representation of women led to a larger cultural distortion. Television executives paid attention to the research and encouraged a wider range of individuals in programs.

As Santiago Arias and Lea Hellmueller demonstrate in this issue of COMMUNICATION RESEARCH TRENDS, the same situation applied to Hispanics-and-Latinos, though other factors complicated the situation, for example the lack of even a vocabulary to describe this growing part of the population in the United States. Their essays traces the debates about terminology and describes the complementary roles played by the U.S. Census Bureau and the mass media in settling on terminology. But even with this crucial step accomplished, the news and entertainment industries seemed content to leave this population at the margins, addressing their concerns only in Spanish-language media or restricting news coverage on national networks to single issues such as immigration, often through a distorted lens.

\* \* \*

Santiago Arias is a graduate student in the College of Media and Communication at Texas Tech University. Lea Hellmueller serves as an assistant professor of Journalism and Electronic Media in the same program. Her "research agenda focuses on journalism's professional roles and performances in a digital and transnational news environment."

# Hispanics-and-Latinos and the U.S. Media: New Issues for Future Research

*Santiago Arias and Lea Hellmueller*

vladimir.s.arias@ttu.edu    lea.hellmueller@ttu.edu

## 1. Introduction

In discussions of the Hispanic-and-Latino population, researchers face a dilemma, discussed in more detail in Section 3 below, regarding terminology. We note now only that this essay will join both terms as “Hispanics-and-Latinos” in order to include all members of this panethnicity. Further, the authors have also considered that the use of ‘Latinos’ here (instead of Latinos/as) corresponds to the awareness of Spanish language discrete rules in terms of plural nouns specifically rather than any gender bias.

Recent years have shown that Hispanics-and-Latinos play an important role in the United States; they can influence and transform the political landscape, for example, as in the presidential elections of George W. Bush and Barak Obama. While no one would argue that the Hispanic-and-Latino vote secured Bush and Obama wins, political research has shown that Latinos, “like any other group, have an influence that is not absolute but really strong” (Barreto, Segura, Collingwood, Manzano, & Valenzuela, 2014). Both candidates strengthened their election majorities through obtaining the Hispanic-and-Latino vote (Barreto & Segura, 2014; Affigne, 2014).

In 2016, the Hispanic population represents nearly 17% of the total U.S. population, becoming the largest minority. There are more than 53 million of Hispanics-and-Latinos in the U.S. (Barreto & Segura, 2014a; Affigne, 2014); over 93% under the age of 18 hold U.S. citizenship, while more than 73,000 of these young people turn 18 every month (Barreto & Segura, 2014a), an increase of 33% in only 10 years (Barreto, Segura & Pantoja, 2014). The current Hispanic-and-Latino population spreads evenly between foreign-born and U.S.-born individuals, but the foreign-born population now shows a faster growth than the native-born population (Barreto, Segura & Pantoja, 2014); indeed, 40% of Hispanics-and-Latinos are foreign

born, and 34% under the age of eighteen. Thus, the U.S. Census Bureau (2012) projected that it expects the Hispanic/Latino population to exceed 128 million by 2060, becoming then one third of the total U.S. population.

Because of the rate of this population’s growth since 1960, this largest minority has steadily attracted attention from government and business markets. These groups paid substantial attention to the minority in terms of sales and votes (Mora, 2014); in the case of sales, for example, in 1992 salsa displaced ketchup as the United States’ most frequently purchased condiment (Barreto & Segura, 2014a). The Hispanic-and-Latino population has reached the stage of having a tremendous impact on politics because of its growth. Since the time of the last two presidential elections, this population has enough influence to decide who will win and who will lose (Mora, 2014). As a matter of fact, in 2008, 75% of the Hispanic-and-Latino vote went to Mr. Obama, making him the next president (Affigne, 2014; Barreto, Segura, Collingwood, Manzano, & Valenzuela, 2014). During the ongoing 2016 presidential race campaigns have again placed their focus on securing the Hispanic-and-Latino vote. As noted in the U.S Census Bureau projections, the Hispanic-and-Latino demographic trend and its impact on politics will only continue.

Simultaneously to the growth of the Hispanic population in the United States, Spanish-language media have also expanded in numbers. Indeed, since the 1960s Spanish-language television in the United States has shown a steady growth beginning by “using a broadcasting technology that mainstream stations rejected, Ultra High Frequency, to become a multiplatform industry encompassing networks valued in the tens of billions of dollars in the 2010s” (Wilkinson, 2015, p. 1). Equally impressive, in July

2013 and July 2014 the Spanish-language television network Univision received the highest rating among all U.S. TV networks in prime time for adults 18–49 years old (Wilkinson, 2015). But, in addition to the growth of Spanish-language media in U.S. and the rating numbers, researchers must also consider the main frameworks that media organizations apply to cover and report on issues relevant to this growing population and the historical relationship between the Hispanic/Latino population in the U.S. and the media (Mora, 2014). This forms an essential aspect in understanding the development of the minority's panethnicity in the country. For a country receiving more than 50 million non-citizens each year as temporary visitors and admitting approximately one million immigrants to live as lawful residents yearly (Fullerton, 2014), with most immigrants coming from, first, Mexico, then in lesser numbers from Central and Latin American countries, the news media have increasingly focused on issues related to immigration as the major topic with which to target individuals coming from those countries (Stewart, Pitts, & Osborne, 2011; Valentino, Brader, & Jardina, 2013; Hartman, Newman, & Bell, 2014). Even though Hispanic-and-Latino groups care about the same issues as the majority of the U.S. population—such as education, health, economy, or jobs—Hispanic-and-Latino political scholarship still shows that immigration sits at the top of the political agenda of this population (see Barreto, Segura, Bergman, Damore, & Pantoja, 2014). As a result, the news media's attention has focused on immigration issues, but narrowly with particular attention on the Hispanic-and-Latino populations.

This essay aims to provide an integrative analysis of news media and the Hispanic-and-Latino community, in which it will discuss scholarly research relevant to Hispanic-and-Latino media in the following categories: (1) contextual factors and statistics of the growth of the Hispanic population in the United States; (2) the birth of the term “Hispanic” in comparison to the term of “Latino” as a demographic label and self-ethnic identity labeling; (3) the pivotal role of media in popularizing the term “Hispanics” between 1975 and 1994, and then news media framing on Hispanics between 1994 to 2015; and (4) attitudes toward Hispanics primed by news media that impact local immigration policies.

The assessment of the proposed topics seeks to provide practical insights for future research on issues

related to Hispanics/Latinos and media coverage of their issues in the U.S. The final, concluding section summarizes the most important findings on which we propose new directions of research on Hispanics and U.S. media.

Before examining the growth of the Hispanic population in the United States, we offer some explanations on the social and political differences between Hispanics and Latinos in order to better understand how both researchers and the general public often use the two terms interchangeably. Social and political differences between Hispanics and Latinos, derived from their country of origin, certainly exist. For example, Hispanics do not consider the Spanish language as a pivotal part of their identity whereas Latinos do; Hispanics share political ideas about U.S. immigration policies whereas Latinos more likely favor more inclusive and open immigration policies, with the difference between Hispanics and Latinos seemingly tethered to the country of origin, a fact that shapes their further political behavior (Barreto & Segura, 2014b; Lavariega-Monforti, 2014; Branton, Franco, & Wrinkle, 2014). Political research substantially indicates that place of birth sways the way in which attitudes and engagement in the American political system emerge (Barreto & Segura, 2014b; Lavariega-Monforti, 2014; Liu & Gastil, 2014). Foreign-born citizens more likely hold beliefs and expectations rooted in their home-country experience; Central America and Latin American countries and their political system see no contradiction between self-reliance (generally related to a preference for limited role of government) and a greater role of government. Those born in the United States consider themselves more as Hispanics, and those foreign-born think of themselves as Latinos mostly, but both groups build the same panethnicity (Calderón, 1992). Even though foreign-born citizens will more likely hold beliefs and expectations rooted in their home-country experience, Hispanics-and-Latinos share similar values and political beliefs such as preference for a greater role of the government, less military international intervention, free access to health care, and a very limited involvement of religion in politics. Examining the 2004 exit polls, for example, only 18% of Hispanics-and-Latinos said that moral values sit at the top of the main political concerns; as a matter of fact, 82% responded that economy, the war on terror, the war in Iraq, education, and health care

were the top concerns (see Barreto & Segura, 2014b). Not surprisingly, The Obama political campaign explicitly included the role of government, less military intervention, and health care as main points. Indeed, most of the political research on the minority suggests that the tipping point of Obama's campaign was his position on the Iraq war because many undocumented Latino immigrants chose military enrollment to pursue American citizenship, and Hillary Clinton did not have a strong position in this topic; indeed, she voted to authorize U.S. force in Iraq in 2003 (see Barreto, Segura, Manzano, Sanchez, & Valenzuela, 2014). Not surprisingly, Obama won 75% of the Latino vote (see Barreto & Segura, 2014a), securing the presidential nomination and, actually, winning the overall ballot. Therefore,

understanding this population has important social and political consequences in the United States.

However, researchers have found the use of the terms "Hispanic" and "Latino" by U.S. media somewhat unpredictable for the most part (Valdeón, 2013). This matters a great deal because the overall narrative discourse in news media serves Hispanics-and-Latinos as a way to identify within a certain culture that shapes their further cultural assimilation and political participation in the country thereafter (Branton, Franco, & Wrinkle, 2014; Liu & Gastil, 2014). Considering the tremendous political impact this population potentially has in shaping the present political landscape in the country, it is worth examining the construction of political knowledge and political behavior of the members of this grouping, whom the news media content increasingly shapes.

## **2. The Growth of the Hispanic Population and Spanish-Language Media in the United States**

The presence of individuals with "Hispanic" cultural bonds in the southwest region of the United States began in the 16th century. The minority slowly increased during the 17th and the 18th centuries (Skop, Gratton, & Gutmann, 2008; Affigne, 2014), but, this trend was about to change in the next century. The end of the Mexican-American war, with the peace treaty between both countries signed in 1848, marked an important changing point for both countries. The treaty called for the U.S. to pay \$15 million to Mexico and to pay off the claims of American citizens to Mexico of \$3.25 million, giving to the United States the Rio Grande as a boundary for Texas and ownership of California and a large area comprising nearly half of New Mexico, most of Arizona, Nevada, Utah, and parts of Wyoming and Colorado. Meanwhile, denizens of those annexed areas had the choice of either relocating themselves within the new territory of Mexico or receiving American citizenship with full civil rights—nearly 90% chose to become U.S. citizens (Barreto & Segura, 2014a; Affigne, 2014). In the period after the signing of treaty, settlers and inhabitants had the need for building a community in the new racially hostile annexed regions, and mass media have played a pivotal role for this goal (Rodriguez, 1999; Guzmán, 2008). Thus, the relationship between the Hispanic-and-Latino population in the U.S. and the media forms an

essential part in understanding the development of the minority's panethnicity in the country (Mora, 2014). In fact, this specific historical event instigated the beginnings of Spanish-language media in U.S. (Rodríguez, 2008a, 2008b).

Thus, this section seeks to provide an analysis of the historical construction of the Hispanic-and-Latino panethnicity in the United States in which the media play a major role.

Surprisingly, the same original Hispanic-and-Latino population now increasingly populates some areas of the regions annexed by the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo (Barreto & Segura, 2014a). This demographic shift started to happen in 1960 with a demographic kindle point in decade of the '80s. Hispanics-and-Latinos formed the fastest growing population in the last 50 years in the United States. In 1960 the Hispanic population only counted for 3.5 million people, constituting less than 4% of the U.S. population, but 20 years later, in 1980, the Hispanic-and-Latino population soared to 14.6 million people and started to dramatically augment. Indeed, since the 1980s, this population grew "more than seven times faster than the population of the nation as a whole, increasing by half, whereas the white (non-Hispanic) population increased by only 6% between 1980 and 1990. In the 1990s, the Hispanic population increased

58%” (Rodríguez, 2008b, p. 7). This demographic trend did not stop there. Indeed, between 2000 and 2010, the Hispanic-and-Latino population increased 44% (Barreto & Segura, 2014a). The Hispanic-and-Latino minority became the largest minority in the U.S. in 2010, reaching 16.7% of the total population with a total of 50.5 million counted by the census (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). Furthermore, in California, the Hispanic-and-Latino community represents the largest population in the state; Texas will make the same shift sometime before 2020 (Barreto & Segura, 2014a). Some scholars even believe that Hispanics-and-Latinos will represent one third of the total population by 2030 (Acevedo-Garcia, Bates, Rodríguez, Sáenz, & Menjívar, 2008).

This population has not only had an increasingly social and political impact on the country reflected in the last two presidential elections, but also became an important audience for the nascent Spanish-language media. Between decades of the 1960s and 1980s, Spanish-language television networks began to target the size and the scope of the Hispanic audience by increasing the production of documentaries, variety shows, and news programming (Mora, 2014). During the 1960s, the term “Hispanic” was first used by American media institutions who employed the term to cover issues related to Mexican- American and Puerto Rican communities (Mora, 2014). During the 1970s, the U.S. Census Bureau took note of the population in order to create the demographic label for statistical purposes, and, during this government official identification period, while media hired Hispanic-and-Latino activists, those activists hired media executives to manage their nascent political identity.

Several media-related developments occurred in 1980s: The Spanish-language newscast “SIN Noticiero” went on air in 1981 (Mora, 2014); the population grew almost 60%. Spanish-language media helped to build the notion of an Hispanic identity through entertainment programs and news programming beginning in 1980 with Univision and later with Telemundo (Mora, 2014; Wilkinson, 2015). Univision resulted from the Hallmark Cards Inc. and First Chicago Venture Capital takeover of the Spanish International Communications Corporation (SICC) and Spanish International Network (SIN) in 1987 after the two became interested in the Spanish-language television market from the 1980 census that established this population as an astonishingly fast-growing market (Mora, 2014). Indeed, the Spanish International

Communications Corporation (SICC) and Spanish International Network (SIN)—before their acquisition 1987—helped the U.S. Census Bureau to develop research strategies and methodologies to gather information about Hispanics-and-Latinos in the country. In 1978 SIN and SICC, providing a low cost-access to Mexican programming, decided to expand nationally because of the Hispanic-and-Latino population growth projection based on information that the two corporations had gathered since the 1960s for market purposes. Nielsen and Arbitron, the most important U.S. media research firms also began to conceptualize and understand the Hispanic-and-Latino audience in this time period. The 1980 U.S. census result recognized for the first time the “Hispanic” Market and “Hispanic” buying power in the United States, a fact reflected in the expansion of SIN and SICC. However, in a challenge to the SIN and SICC operations, the Spanish Radio Broadcasters of America (SRBA) made a formal complaint to the FCC in 1980, alleging that SICC violated the FCC’s foreign control policy, which prohibits non-citizens (“aliens”), or representatives of aliens, or corporations in which aliens control more than 20% of the stock holding broadcast licenses. Then, also in 1980, a shareholder legally complained about the losses for SICC that were not balanced by gains made by SIN, suggesting that SICC operated in the economic interest of SIN. In response, in 1987, the FCC claimed that the SIN-SICC relationship was problematic enough to not renew SICC’s applications, and suggested “a corporate restructuring process” as a “less dramatic remedial solution” (Mora, 2014). Hence, Hallmark Inc. and First Chicago Venture Capital purchased most of the SICC station licenses and coined the new corporation Univision Communications Corporation, changing the concept of the programing, from being a Spanish-language network in America to be an American network in Spanish. The new company adapted U.S. formats for television shows to the Hispanic-and-Latino audiences’ needs (Mora, 2014). Between 1960 and 1980, then, Hispanic media helped to build the notion of Hispanics-and-Latinos. In fact, Hispanics solely; during those decades, the controversy about “Hispanic” or “Latino” had not yet gained political and cultural salience. Without the media collaboration and focus on the popularization of the term through the production of culturally relevant television shows, newscasts, and so on for this population at that time, the identification process would not have succeeded as it did.

Meanwhile, research shows that on English-language news media networks, during the 1990s, negative attitudes started to arise against Hispanics-and-Latinos. This began after voters approved California Proposition 187 in 1994. This California state ballot proposition, later found unconstitutional, required law enforcement agents to report any prohibited unauthorized immigrants from accessing government services. This proposition, backed by the Republican governor Pete Wilson, eventually cost Republicans the Hispanic-and-Latino vote and resulted in a shift back to the “Democrat line” in the upcoming elections at the same moment in which this population dramatically grew in California (Barreto, Segura, Bergman, Damore, & Pantoja, 2014). Simultaneous to the rising birth rate of this population during the period from 2000 to 2010, when Hispanics-and-Latinos became the largest minority in the state of California, a negative framing, par-

ticularly in political discourse, grew stronger rather than being assuaged. Indeed, this minority, in particular, experiences a great deal of prejudice and discrimination such as limited employment opportunities, maltreatment in the criminal justice system, and victimization through violent hate crimes against Latinos, which have risen at a rate of 40% from 2003 to 2007 (Trujillo, 2012). News media content has focused more on these issues rather than positive aspects related to the Hispanic-and-Latino population. This has helped build a semantic meaning of the Hispanic- and-Latino identity as a metonym for illegal immigration (Stewart, Pitts, & Osborne, 2011).

The following section discusses the genesis of the term “Hispanic” in 1975, which tracks the pivotal role of “Hispanic” media to bolster the group’s social identity, a role not embraced by English-language news media until the mid-1990s.

### 3. The Origins of the Term “Hispanic” as a Media-Driven Concept

Few official sources used the term “Hispanic” before 1975 as a demographic label to refer to Spanish-speaking individuals living in the United States (Hayes-Bautista & Chapa, 1987); and apart from some attempts made by Hispanic and American media between the 1940s and 1960s to refer to Puerto Ricans and Mexicans (Mora, 2014), the term seldom appeared in U.S. public opinion. Mora (2014) highlights the difficulty in clearly determining how the label “Hispanic” first occurred as a demographic label and even whether the term refers to the Spanish language population, people with Spanish ancestry, or both. Alcott (2005) notes that the term has generated controversy for the last 35 years. The U.S. Census Bureau did officially apply the demographic label “Hispanic” for the group in 1975; but the success of the term for both purposes (U.S. Census Bureau official use and self-ethnic identification of the minority) seems a response primarily to prompting by U.S. media (Trevino, 1987; Flores-Hughes, 2006; Mora, 2014).

Before the 1970s the Hispanic/Latino community suffered hundred of years of political and social invisibility in the United States; the minority seemed not to exist for English-language mainstream media, government work, and academic research. For example,

Affigne (2014) found that before 1970 no political research related to the minority; moreover, as a matter of fact, no single book published in the U.S. analyzed the political behavior, policy interests, or political leadership of Hispanics. However, a key question remains: Why did government and media choose the term “Hispanic” over the term “Latino”? And a related question appears along these same lines: Is there any difference in the identification of both terms? Both inquiries generally underlie or become implicitly assumed in relevant scholarly work, but such questions bring to our attention the fact that the term “Hispanic” derived from a media concept; and furthermore this calls attention to the fact that media coverage forms a powerful social force for self-identification development and social recognition.

#### *A. The historical and conceptual difference between the terms “Hispanic” and “Latino”*

The historical commencement of the official use of the ‘Hispanic’ term happened in 1975. Flores-Hughes’s (2006) seminal work examines the institutionalized side of the origin of the “Hispanic” category as a shared attempt between the U.S. government and Hispanic activists, which did not result from a

mere arbitrary action. She explains that the Office of Education, a branch of the former Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), conducted a research study to identify education issues affecting Hispanics and Native Americans at that time. Then, after its completion, in order to develop racial/ethnic definitions for Hispanics and Native Americans, Office of Education officials welcomed those Hispanics who participated in the study as advisors to create the “Ad Hoc Committee on Racial and Ethnic Definitions.” As an active member of this process, she reports that “we [the Ad Hoc Committee] discussed use of several terms including ‘Spanish-speaking,’ ‘Spanish-surnamed,’ ‘Latin American,’ ‘Latino,’ and ‘Hispanic.’ But in the end we were deciding between the terms ‘Latino’ and ‘Hispanic.’” (p. 82). The group did consider the term “Latino” as a potential demographic label; Flores-Hughes (2006) explained that the Ad Hoc Committee considered the use of “Latino” in 1975 to refer to all individuals who come from all countries who share “Latin” languages as the lingua mater, but they found it confusing for general use: “‘Latino’ might be confused with ‘Latin’; it could conceivably be interpreted to include persons whose descendants are from Italy and other southern European nations” (p. 82). However, other scholars such as Hayes-Bautista and Chapa (1987) consider the term “Latino” more appropriate as a population descriptor.

Hayes-Bautista and Chapa (1987) provide essential work to understand the historical and political justification for the use of the “Latino” term as opposed to “Hispanic,” which the U.S. Census Bureau operationalized as a combination of nationality and culture. They note that the Hispanic activists who favored the use of “Latino” over “Hispanic” did not initiate this debate; indeed, the Spanish-American Heritage Association claimed in 1980 that “an Hispanic person is a Caucasian of Spanish ancestry; the Mexican American and Puerto Rican are not Caucasians of Spanish ancestry, and therefore are not Hispanic” (p. 64). This action resulted in the 1980 census modification of the demographic label “Hispanic” by “Spanish/Hispanic” as the term of reference with the inclusion of country of origin (Ramirez, 2004). Hayes-Bautista and Chapa questioned “*what makes a Latino/a to belong to this cultural ethnic group; is it Spanish language, a surname, a mythical ancestor from Spain, or is it the fact of origin in a country of Latin America?*” (p. 61, italics

added). The answer came from a unique political bond that all Hispanic immigrants share in the United States: the enactment of the Monroe Doctrine in 1825, which declares a U.S. foreign interventionism policy in Latin and Central American countries that has shaped the historical economic and political situations that pushed people to migrate from other American Spanish-speaking countries to live in U.S. This policy was a direct response from John Quincy Adams, the sixth president of United States (1825–1829) against the French government, which first coined the term “Latin” (Braudel, 1994) to naturalize Napoleon III’s objective to build up a new empire with the nascent independent Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking countries in the American continent; the notion of a “Latin” essence linking France with Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking American countries had great appeal as a way to naturalize such a project. This Monroe doctrine basically warned the French empire and other European countries about any re-colonizing attempt against Western Hemisphere countries that obtained their independence (mostly from the Spanish empire). The doctrine resulted in separating the New World and the Old World in terms of spheres of influence (see Hayes-Bautista & Chapa, 1987). Therefore, from this perspective, the only common bond among Hispanics lies in an origin from an affected “Latin” American country as defined by this foreign interventionism policy.

Furthermore, in regards to the controversy on the use of either “Latino” or “Hispanic,” Flores-Hughes (2006) recount:

Good people can continue to disagree about the term “Hispanic” versus the term “Latino.” But the record is now straight. For governmental purposes, the practice is to use “Hispanic.” There are many who say they do not like the term “Hispanic” because it reminds them of the Spanish empire that annihilated the Aztec civilization in Mexico. Others assert that our Ad Hoc Committee did not include a term that acknowledged our indigenous heritage. . . . I did not see any useful purpose in belaboring the atrocities the Spanish empire committed against the Aztecs 500 years ago. After all, there are many, now identified as “Hispanics,” who carry Spanish blood, and for that we should be proud. It is useless to stereotype all Spaniards as bad and evil when that is not the case. Also, our indigenous heritage is a proud one, but because there are a multitude of tribes of origin, selecting

a term that reflects all of them was not a practical option. We knew from the start that whatever term on which we decided would not please 100% of the targeted population. (p. 84)

Finally, in 1975, the Census Bureau and the activists reached an agreement to coin the term “Hispanic” as a label for all U.S. denizens who share any Spaniard connections: “The relatively new term ‘Hispanic’ was more encompassing of all people of Spanish lineage, would serve to more respectfully identify a U.S. ethnic group, and would facilitate a new era of inclusion for all people of Hispanic origin” (Flores-Hughes, 2006, p. 82). Immediately, activists and government officials asked the media for help to popularize the term, which would have not happened without media intervention (Flores-Hughes, 2006; Mora, 2014).

Mora (2014) offers an extensive account about Hispanic identity construction in the United States as a mutual collaboration among the U.S. government, activists, and media organizations, focusing more on the pioneering activist organizations that helped to institutionalize the notion of the nascent panethnicity. Specifically, Mora (2014) examines how the media played a critical role in promoting the demographic identification for Hispanic denizens. Chapter 4 provides an account about the Spanish-language television networks’ hiring strategies to report or produce content for Hispanics: At the same time that the media outlets hired “Hispanic” activists as their main experts on public affairs relevant to the minority, the Hispanic activist groups hired hiring media executives for image advising.

Even though, Flores-Hughes (2006) and Mora (2014) highlight the successful participatory commencement of the term Hispanic and the crucial role of media to popularize the term, both argue that the Hispanic term is a media driven concept. It is important to note that media and political elites first used the term “Hispanic” (with the Spanish-language media marketers publicly coining the term “Hispanic Market,” Mora, 2014). Only later did the government decide to adopt the term. Therefore, the demographic label “Hispanic” also became a social identity categorization. However, the label arose from external forces such as the U.S. Census Bureau and other government agencies, politicians at the federal level, and the use of the term by media rather than any cohesion of the group themselves (Calderón, 1992; Lavariega-Monforti, 2014). Furthermore, the term “Latino”

also appeared during the decade of the seventies to symbolize the commonalities in issues and collective actions among all Spanish-speaking individuals such as Puerto Ricans and Chicanos, which at the time sought national coalitions looking for social and political recognition. However, that term never implied a separate ethnic identity from Hispanic (Calderón, 1992).

During the 1960s and 1980s, the media performed a pivotal role in popularizing the term in a positive way. However, since 1994, Hispanics-and-Latinos in the United States have faced negative stereotypes in the media for the most part (see Mindiola, Niemann, & Rodriguez, 2009; Chomsky, 2007, 2014; Dixon, 2015). News media content has overemphasized lower socio-cultural backgrounds such as low income, different language spoken, unintelligent immigrants (Grosfoguel, 2004), or criminal behaviors (Chiricos & Eschholz, 2002).

Even though Hispanics-and-Latinos represent 17% of the total population in the United States, an anti-immigration narrative promoted by U.S. media targets the minority (for a review, see Valentino, Brader, & Jardina, 2013). Other researchers label this narrative, the *Latino Threat Narrative* (for a review, see Stewart, Pitts, & Osborne, 2011).

In sum, while the image of Hispanics in the U.S. seems to have improved significantly over the past years (Weaver, 2005), it also seems that the negative stereotyping remains (see Valdeón, 2013; Dixon, 2015). Therefore, we must understand not only the fixed linguistic meaning or the official government use of the term, but, even more importantly, the social meanings derived from the media which report about Hispanics-and-Latinos because those social meanings may prime general attitudes toward the minority (Valentino, Brader, & Jardina, 2013). Those social meanings also serve to lead the minority members to identify within a certain conceptualization (Dovidio, Gaertner, Pearson, & Riek, 2005) and shape their further cultural assimilation in the country, their political behavior, and the nation’s general immigration policies (Sides & Citrin, 2007). The next section, then, examines the meanings provided by media while reporting relevant issues for the minority to the overall U.S. population.

## 4. Media Framing of Hispanics: The Love-Hate Relationship

News media content has become the most important source of political acculturation for immigrant populations and predicts further political participation thereafter (Liu & Gastil, 2014). The same holds true for Hispanics-and-Latinos: news media discourses mediate their political knowledge (Affigne, Hu-Dehart & Orr, 2014). This section focuses on research about news media framing of Hispanics-and-Latinos as well as of the issues related to the immigration between 1994 and 2015 in order to analyze the possible conceptualizations of Hispanics-and-Latinos in media discourses.

Most content analysis research on news media assessing the rhetoric around immigration takes the year 1994 as the starting point for the news media's increasing focus on issues related to the Hispanic-and-Latino populations. This year coincides with California Proposition 187, when the rhetoric around this proposition became racially charged (Barreto, Segura, Bergman, Damore, & Pantoja, 2014); with a message consisting of "save our state," Proposition 187 supporters seemed to have the intention to blame Latinos and immigrants for California's economic and social hardships (Stewart, Pitts, & Osborne, 2011; Brader, Valentino, & Suhay, 2008). This situation provoked Hispanics-and-Latinos to get together to protest against this law, a situation that increasingly attracted news media attention and public debate about the Hispanic-and-Latino populations while reporting about immigration.

Therefore, scholarly research on this topic coincides with the year 1994 as the starting point of increasing news media coverage on immigration and Hispanics-and-Latinos (e.g., Stewart, Pitts, & Osborne, 2011; Valentino, Brader, & Jardina, 2013; Hartman, Newman, & Bell, 2014). In that year, 1994, private news media channels mostly started to negatively stereotype this population, a stereotype that took root in cable television programs. For example, Waldman, Ventura, Savillo, Lin, and Lewis (2008) point out that most of news media discourses on cable networks rest on two myths. First, this discourse consists of promoting the idea that crime and undocumented immigrants, and the costs of illegal immigration in social services and taxes directly result from the increase of Hispanics-and-Latinos in

the United States. The second discourse focuses on the notion of a conspiracy to take back the Southwest of the United States for Mexico. Waldman and his colleagues analyzed three cable commentators: Lou Dobbs, Bill O'Reilly, and Glenn Beck. Their results conclude 70% of the 2007 episodes of *Lou Dobbs Tonight* contained discussion of illegal immigration. The *O'Reilly Factor* included 56% of the 2007 episodes discussing illegal immigration; Glenn Beck included discussion illegal immigration in 28% of his 2007 programs. These programs gave anti-immigration activists a national outreach. By contrast, studies conducted at Harvard and Michigan showed that undocumented and foreign-born immigrants were far less likely to commit acts of deviance, crime, drunk driving, or any kind of action that may jeopardize U.S. denizens' well-being. Indeed, the incarceration rate of foreign-born denizens is five times less the rate of native born citizens. Narrowed to the Hispanic-and-Latino population, foreign-born Latinos were less likely to be incarcerated than native-born Latinos, showing the same pattern. Furthermore, Waldman and colleagues (2008) indicated that the combined state and federal prisoner population of non-citizens was only 5.9%. Even though the public image of Hispanics-and-Latinos showed a substantial improvement between 1990 and 2000 (Weaver, 2005), and California courts rejected Proposition 187, negative stereotypes targeting Hispanics-and-Latinos still exist.

Chiricos and Escholz (2002) examined race and news media content. This research investigated how news media content primes the local public's fear of crime. Specifically, this study compared the proportions of African-Americans, Hispanics-and-Latinos, and Whites on crime news in Orlando, Florida. Thus, it compared the racial and ethnic composition of suspects reported by television news to the racial and ethnic composition of Orlando; the study also examined the characteristics of those arrested and the characteristics of the local population. The findings suggested fear of crime forms part of a new "modern racism"; that is, that local television news may contribute to the social construction of threat in relation to both minorities; television over-represents African

Americans and Hispanics in crime news in relation to their share of the general population.

Lining up with this modern racism, Stewart, Pitts, and Osborne (2011) conducted a content analysis to understand newspapers' reporting on immigration and Hispanics; that reporting produces a conflated notion about the minority as a metonym of "illegal immigrant." From a lexical content analysis of newspapers articles between 1994 and 2006, in which "illegal immigrant" appeared, and a critical discourse analysis of two 2007 local news events involving illegal immigrants, the results found a "Latino threat narrative" which conceptualizes Hispanics-and-Latinos as deviant subgroups such as "illegal aliens," "drug users," "school drop-outs," etc. Recently, Dixon (2015) conducted an analysis of television news in Los Angeles, and he found that these news reports depicted Latinos as perpetrators but under-represented them as victims and officers. On the other hand, the news reports significantly over-represented Whites as victims and officers, even when official statistics indicate different patterns of crime. Other studies concluded that the news media is still priming racism (Valentino, Brader, & Jardina, 2013). Overall, the news media still under-represent the Hispanic-and-Latino minority; for example, "while Latinos make up more than 17% of the U.S. population, the report found that only 7% of guests on English-language Sunday shows were Hispanic" (Torres & Lopez, 2015, ¶1). Affigne (2014) noticed an ethnic undersampling in the American National election Studies (ANES). In 1970, when Hispanics represented 4.7% of the U.S. population, there was no Hispanic sampling in the ANES survey year; in 1980, the minority represented 6.4 %, but the ANES survey only included 3%; 28 years later, in 2008, the Hispanic-and-Latino population formed 15.4% of the U.S. total population, but the percentage in the ANES sample was 9% (Affigne, 2014). In addition to the under-representation, the news media appears overly critical of this population; indeed, "attitudes toward Latinos in particular account for nearly all of the impact of ethnocentrism since 1994" (Valentino, Brader, & Jardina, 2013, p. 149). The analysis of how the news media in the country frames Hispanics-and-Latinos matters because that framing influences attitudes toward Hispanics-and-Latinos (and any other ethnic groups as well) and because the frame may affect further enactment of immigration policies.

#### *A. News media framing on general attitudes*

News media content may frame positively or negatively a specific ethnic group. In turn, those narratives also shape individuals' attitudes toward minorities; indeed, Brader, Valentino, and Suhay (2008), in a quantitative analysis of the news media discourse about immigration in the United States, found that the general white population in the country thinks about illegal immigration as related to Hispanics-and- Latinos. The study aimed to examine whether and how elite discourse shapes mass opinion and immigration policy. The findings suggested that reactions to news about the costs of immigration depend upon the origin of the immigrants; basically, the white population reported more negative attitudes toward Latino immigrants than to European immigrants.

In order to see the effect of attitudes derived from news media content, Valentino, Brader and Jardina (2013) combined several studies: They conducted content analyses on news coverage, compiled survey data from 1992 to 2008, conducted a survey experiment, and collected official statistics. Again, the findings suggest that news media dramatically increased mention of Hispanics-and-Latinos in the period since 1994, the year when California Proposition 187 gained significant national attention. Secondly, ethnocentrism outranks economic concerns in explanations of whites' immigration policy opinions and attitudes toward Latinos. Thus, news media content on immigration as well as demographic patterns influence policy opinion about this population.

Since 1994 the news media's attention on Hispanic-and-Latino immigration coincides with actual rates of immigration from Latin America and local demographic characteristics in parallel to the level of local ethnocentrism (Valentino, Brader, & Jardina, 2013). As a result, serving audiences' needs based on demographic characteristics without an awareness of the levels of ethnocentrism makes news media outlets promote racism against the minority. At the same time, news media provide national and local political information to immigrants that become the source for the immigrants' interpersonal and associational political knowledge (Liu & Gastil, 2014). Thus, individuals' exposure to news media has important consequences not only for developing their political knowledge, but also for influencing their self-conceptualization that in turn shapes further political participation.

## 5. Anti-Immigration News Media Narrative: Attitudes toward Hispanics

News media content featuring Hispanics-and-Latinos not only affects general public perception but also provokes discrimination (Mastro, Behm Morawitz, & Kopacz, 2008) against Hispanics-and-Latinos such as unfair immigration policies or negatives attitudes and judgments against the minority. The importance of analyzing news media messages lies in the delineation of public opinion about a specific topic derived from the content of those messages. Simultaneously, the social relevance of measuring public opinion appears in the political arena, in the sense that it serves as an important indicator of the possible acceptance or rejection of public policies that officials will propose. Hence, “media images become part of the ongoing negotiation of identity by supporting and enhancing important aspects of self-image” (Mastro, Behm Morawitz, & Kopacz, 2008, p. 4).

On one hand, the anti-immigrant rhetoric represented in some news media content has an impact at the political level such as in the enactment of immigration policies; for example, Citrin, Green, Muste, and Wong (1997) examined the effects of economic factors on public opinion toward immigration policy, using the 1992 and 1994 National Election Study surveys. Their findings showed that personal economic circumstances play a small role in opinion formation, but beliefs about the state of the national economy and generalized feelings about immigrants (i.e., Hispanics and Asians) served as significant determinants of attitudes. Ten years later, Sides and Citrin (2007) surveyed individuals in 20 European countries (the 2002–2003 European Social Survey). This study measured individuals’ attitudes toward immigration; the results confirmed again that symbolic attitudes (such as cultural unity or ethnocentrism) better predict immigration policies tethered to specific local demographics.

On the other hand, in regards to the influence of news media content on intergroup relationships, Mastro, Behm Morawitz, and Kopacz (2008) examined the relationship between aversive racism and social identity theory to assess the influence of exposure to television depictions of Hispanics-and-Latinos on White viewers’ judgments. Aversive racism refers to evaluations of racial/ethnic minorities characterized

by a conflict between Whites’ endorsements of egalitarian values without their acknowledgment of having negative attitudes toward racial/ethnic out-groups. This study exposed participants to a simulated television script showing an ambiguous, stereotypic, or counter-stereotypic representation of either a White or Latino television character. The researchers asked subjects to complete a survey after reading the script, examining the picture of the character, and noting the name of the character. Results suggest that viewers make judgments consistently on the basis of one’s racial identification as the moderating factor. Starting with these findings, Pérez (2010) conducted a study in which he used the implicit association test (IAT) to detect automatic attitudes specifically for the U.S. immigration policy context; “the evidence here suggests that immigration policy judgments are directly colored by one’s implicit view of one immigrant group: Latino immigrants” (p. 536). Findings such as these strengthen the contention that the analysis of news media discourse on immigration may prime racism and negative attitudes among a population; basically subtle negative group cues in the media can activate racial attitudes that boost their impact on political judgments. For example, as a matter of fact, negatives stereotypes around African-American individuals decreased since 1994, while negatives stereotypes about Hispanics-and-Latinos increased dramatically (Valentino, Brader, & Jardina, 2013); hence, “which group attitudes will be most powerful at any moment depends in part on the media” (p. 156).

News media anti-immigrant content may also impact intergroup relationships. As a way of illustrating this point, Short and Magaña (2002) found that White U.S. participants would more likely make negative evaluations of a Latino person. In this study, they asked participants to evaluate either a Mexican or English Canadian immigrant who had several parking tickets; the judgments toward the Mexican immigrant were more negative than those made toward the English Canadian immigrant. The study also noted that when the researchers removed the information about the ethnicity of the immigrant, participants judged the cases in a fairly similar manner, with no significant differences.

Furthermore, recent studies found the same pattern; for example, Dovidio, Glusek, John, Ditlman, and Lagunes (2010) conducted four empirical studies to document discrimination against Latinos, explore the potential dimensions that underlie bias against Latinos, and examine the effect of a particular social identity cue—accentedness—on perceptions of acceptance and belongingness of Hispanics-and-Latinos and members of other groups. The results suggest that Whites recognize African-Americans as American as Whites, whereas they associate Hispanics-and-Latinos with illegal status in the United States; this leads to different types of bias toward Hispanic-and-Latino Americans, such as greater restriction of civil liberties and stronger motivation for national exclusion than toward Black Americans. In another study, Abad-Merino, Newheiser, Dovidio, Tabernero, and Gonzalez (2013) found the same pattern on women; they conducted an experiment in which female participants had to indicate their willingness to help another woman who could not afford education, health care, or take extra classes to catch up with school. The experimental design manipulated the ethnicity of the female, and again the results indicate a higher prejudice against Hispanics-and-Latinas.

As reported earlier, news media play a pivotal role on forming attitudes toward Hispanics-and-Latinos in the U.S., as well as shaping political knowledge and participation of Hispanics-and-Latinos because these media locate the minority within a specific social and political conceptualization. Liu and Gastil (2014) conducted a study of immigrant communities' political socialization in the U.S., using the socioeconomic status model with a focus on the role of communication socialization agents such as news media consumption, the size of personal networks, organizational affiliations, and community interaction, and "among them, news media use contributed to immigrants' political knowledge and participation the most, and this effect consistently held across three major different ethnic groups" (p. 255). News media consumption forms one of the most important sources to shape Hispanic-and-Latino political knowledge and participation; these media become their acculturation basis. The negative attitudes toward this population and its association with "illegality" have a (somewhat biased) source in news media anti-immigrant rhetoric (Rodríguez, 2008a; Trujillo, 2012).

Social categorization forms the basis for human perception and cognition, and it is based on the principle that people need to understand others in their envi-

ronment. In other words, social categorization consists of the abstraction of meanings from the perception of the environment (Dovidio, Gaertner, Pearson, & Riek, 2005). People categorize any object into groups. The actual differences between members of the same category remain minimally perceived, but people generally ignore this process while forming impressions of that object. Hence, a social category differs in some aspects from members of other categories, and then these differences tend to become exaggerated and overgeneralized, creating stereotypes.

The main problem arises when news media colored to anti-immigrant narratives frames social categorization: "Ask yourself what would happen to your own personality if you heard it said over and over again that you were lazy, a simple child of nature, expected to steal, and had inferior blood? . . . One's reputation, whether false or true, cannot be hammered, hammered, hammered, into one's head without doing something to one's character" (Allport, 1979, p. 142, cited in Dovidio, et al., 2005). Therefore, news media framing on Hispanics-and-Latinos has important consequences on individuals' psychological well-being; the social categorization process emphasizes similarities and differences within and between groups to make more salient one attribute by exaggerating it to justify the membership or exclusion of a given group. On this basis, research should question the aspects that news media make more or less salient about Hispanic-and-Latinos that end up creating a picture of their image in Americans' heads (Vu, T., Guo, & McCombs, 2014).

In sum, social categorization produces in-group favoritism and out-group derogation (Brewer, 1999); in other words, "social categorization fundamentally involves a distinction between the group containing the self (the 'in-group') and other groups (the 'out-groups')—between the 'we's' and the 'they's'" (Dovidio, et al., 2005, p. 234). In another study, Dovidio and different colleagues (Dovidio, et al., 2010) indicate that Americans do not tend to see the Hispanics-and-Latinos as "Americans," clearly indicating who they consider the "we's" and the "they's" here in U.S. In addition, Dixon (2015) shows that the anti-immigrant content in news media has persisted for years and has not substantially changed; this rhetoric against immigrants seems present mostly in the news media.

Cultural assimilation marks the traditional ideal for any society. However, immigrants subject to discrimination and racism have limited sources to acquire

the cultural elements for further adaptation. Thus they depend on the media as their most important source. Dalisay (2012) analyzed immigrants' pre- and post-immigration uses of English and native language media, asking how such uses are associated with three indicators of acculturation—current English proficiency, preference to use English in social interactions, and American political knowledge. Dalisay used Princeton University's New Immigrant Survey, a survey comprised of 8,573 face-to-face interviews with a response rate of about 70%, with the interviews conducted in the respondents' preferred languages. The geographi-

## 6. Conclusion

Overall, we consider the coverage of Hispanics-and-Latinos in U.S. news media in this essay because news media content largely influences individuals' political knowledge (Lippmann, 1922; Cohen, 1963; McCombs & Shaw, 1972; Schrum, 1995; Shoemaker & Reese, 1996; Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, Signorelli, & Shanahan, 2002; Liu & Gastil, 2014) and attitudes toward Hispanics-and-Latinos in particular (Valentino, Brader, & Jardina, 2013). Specifically in this context, many researchers have found that political knowledge among Hispanics-and-Latinos mediates the cultural adaptation processes and voting behavior in the U.S. (Affigne, Hu-Dehart, & Orr, 2014). The news media coverage remains one of the most important sources for individuals to develop politically relevant attitudes and behaviors for the onset of political participation (Liu & Gastil, 2014). "Immigrant political socialization can be viewed as a parallel process along the continuum of cross cultural adaptation or acculturation" (Liu & Gastil, 2014, p. 241), thus political socialization makes up a specific form of acculturation through news media consumption mostly because the communication environment they experience has a profound impact on immigrants' participatory attitudes (Liu & Gastil, 2014).

The U.S. Census Bureau chose the term "Hispanic" as the demographic label for all individuals living in the United States who share any "Hispanic" cultural background or relationship. With the best political intentions, the Census Bureau saw the main purpose of this epithet to agglutinate all Spanish-speaking people in the best possible way; indeed, the choice of the term involved close participation among

cal sampling frame included the top 85 metropolitan statistical areas and all of the top 38 counties in the United States. The findings indicate that immigrants become acculturated to a host society through an increased use of the host media while their use of native media steadily decreases; simultaneously, results also showed an oversimplification in assuming that native language media hinders the acculturation process. An in-depth analysis of the acculturation through Spanish-language media in the United States will definitely interest future research studies on those issues.

Hispanic-and-Latino activists, government, and media. However, the media have had a wider outreach and a stronger influence than the other two actors; indeed, scholars acknowledge that the successful historical acceptance of the term "Hispanic" took place because of the help of media coverage (Mora, 2014). This historical fact marks the "Hispanic" and "Latino" terms as media driven concepts, a fact reflected in its semantic unpredictability in the news media (Valdeón, 2013). Secondly, news media content has increasingly targeted Hispanics-and-Latinos with negative stereotypes on the basis of an anti-immigrant framework that affects people's perception about the minority, and even the minority's self-perception that it does not contribute completely to American society as whole.

Besides the negative stereotypes and media underrepresentation of Hispanic-and-Latino population, the minority nowadays defines the American political landscape. Even though "survey data on electoral participation and mobilization [show] that Latino citizens are less likely to receive turnout messages and other mobilization messages from both parties and candidates" (Barreto, Segura, Manzano, & Pantoja, 2014, p. 59), the minority has a tremendous impact of American politics. The elections in 2012 showed that Hispanics-and-Latinos are not a homogeneous and predictable ethnic group; while Clinton led the overall race for 2008 presidential elections, Obama's position on immigration reforms and the war in Iraq attracted the Latino vote, winning the elections in one day (Barreto & Segura, 2014a). Branton, Franco, and Wrinkle (2014) found that levels of political knowledge shapes policy preferences among Hispanics-and-

Latinos; if we consider that one of the main sources for political knowledge is news media content, then we need to be very concerned about it: Do news media outlets reflect on the anti-immigrant or Latino threat narratives as direct consequences for political polarization that serve to bring in noxious political candidates that benefit from this discord? How can a detached news media cover the presidential race knowing about the social responsibility of integrating Hispanics into the political discourse?

If in the past the Hispanic-and-Latino vote importantly influenced election results, determining who would win or lose, then political parties need to take care about who they choose as the potential presidential candidates, and think about the content promoted on news media because that content will mediate not only political knowledge, but more importantly, political participation of the one of the most important population voting blocks in the country. Reflecting on news media content should not only help to frame research, but serve to introduce an important and crucial question regarding how English-language media networks conceive and enact their journalistic role and how they cover Hispanic issues in comparison to Spanish-language media outlets in the U.S. Considering the profound changes that media and journalism presently experience, it becomes interesting for future studies to investigate those cultural and technological changes and the effect they have on the Hispanic population in the United States. Since we cannot consider journalistic role performance and journalistic cultures as universal standards but something that adapts to cultural contexts, another important avenue opens up for research to investigate how journalistic professionalism plays out in those different journalistic cultures: the Hispanic media outlets compared to the English-language outlets in the United States. While they both operate in the same political system, the performance of the watchdog role, for example, never had as central a place in South American media systems. In fact, in political systems characterized by strong political parallelism and in systems in which media owners belong to major political parties, journalism has taken on different forms than in the United States. What happens if such journalistic cultures now operate under a different political system (i.e., the United States)? What role do reporters at *Univision* and *Telemundo* embrace and with what type of journalistic professionalism do they identify? All those questions open up new research opportunities for scholars interested in

cross-cultural and international empirical research on Hispanics, identity, and journalistic cultures. What identity of Hispanics do Spanish-language media portray compared to English-language media in the United States? And, what role does language play in the contextualization of the social and cultural issues of Hispanics? How are the two terms, Hispanics and Latinos, contextualized in Spanish-language and English-language TV networks? What context do they have on digital online platforms? And, do Hispanics-and-Latinos perceive information differently based on the contextualization of the term? If so, in what ways?

In addition, content analyses have provided findings on the negative stereotypes that have appeared regarding the minority, but we need more research on developing content analyses that include visual analysis as well as textual analysis. This matters because news stories consist of images and words. The development of visual codebooks for content analysis of news media content on immigration and Hispanics-and-Latinos is paramount, and should offer new insights for future research.

The present essay attempts to contribute the idea that queries about identity and political participation follow from news media content. The first section provided the historical evidence to understand that the Hispanic-and-Latino community, recognized by U.S. government only since 1975, also gained a national identity from the media, which provided the basis not only for popularizing terms but also for building identities and social meanings which have an impact at the individual, social, and political levels.

The social polarization across ethnic groups in the United States resulted news media content—if that content embedded anti-immigrant rhetoric that harmed Hispanics-and-Latinos' self-esteem. This type of polarization sooner or later will emerge in potentially politically violent contests in the country (see Iyengar, Sood, & Lelkes, 2012), such as the contemporary one we are witnessing in current primary election campaigns. What kind of political atmosphere and social climate does this type of news content generate? Some scholars project that, approximately close to the year 2030, the Hispanic-and-Latino population will represent one third of the total population of the United States. That is, one out of three individuals will face a landscape of cultural racism that a violent political polarization reflects.

The third section aimed to show how news media content later becomes political knowledge that further

materializes in specific discrimination behaviors among different groups of the population at the individual level, but also reified at the structural level such as in immigration policies that reflect aversive racism. In sum, Hispanic-and-Latino research needs to integrate history, framing, social categorization, and political socialization theories to highlight the role of news media content as one of the major source of immigrants' political knowledge and participation. Indeed, social identity is important for establishing interpersonal relationships among diverse ethnicities and for personal well-being (Dovidio, Gaertner, Pearson, & Riek, 2005). If news media content provides one of the main frameworks for individuals to evaluate reality, the anti-immigrant rhetoric on the basis of Latino threat narrative present in some U.S. news media outlets offers a paramount area to examine. In other words, social identity shapes how individuals think about others; and news media content mediates that social identity and at the same time influences political knowledge (Sides & Citrin, 2007; Valentino, Brader, & Jardina, 2013; Dixon, 2015). This impacts individuals' responses to others (Dovidio, et. al., 2005). As a result of news media content, people form specific attitudes, which then materialize in immigration policies. Thus, researchers and news consumers should not take anti-immigrant news media content as simply innocuous sensationalist messages. Racial identification and media content affect both viewers' evaluations of target racial/ethnic out-group members as well as in-group esteem (Mastro, Behm Morawitz, & Kopacz, 2008).

While this essay can only provide a snapshot of the research on Hispanic-and-Latino topics and concerns over the last years, we hope that its discussion and the ideas for future work underline the importance of examining the media coverage and assimilation processes of the largest minority in the United States.

## References

- Abad-Merino, S., Newheiser, A. K., Dovidio, J. F., Taberero, C., & González, I. (2013). The dynamics of intergroup helping: The case of subtle bias against Latinos. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 19*(4), 445.
- Acevedo-Garcia, D., Bates, L., Rodríguez, H., Sáenz, R., & Menjivar, C. (Eds.) (2008). *Latinas/os in the United States: Changing the face of América*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media
- Affigne, T. (2014). The Latino voice in political analysis, 1970–2014: From exclusion to empowerment. In T. Affigne, E. Hu-DeHart, & M. Orr (Eds.), *Latino politics en ciencia política* (pp. 9–47). New York: NYU Press.
- Affigne, T., Hu-DeHart, E., & Orr, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Latino politics en ciencia política*. New York: NYU Press.
- Alcoff, L. M. (2005). Latino vs. Hispanic The politics of ethnic names. *Philosophy & Social Criticism, 31*(4), 395–407.
- Allport, G. W. (1979). *The nature of prejudice*. New York: Basic Books. (Originally published 1954 by Addison-Wesley)
- Barreto, M., & Segura, G. (2014a). *Latino America: How America's most dynamic population is poised to transform the politics of the nation*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- Barreto, M., & Segura, G. (2014b). Ronald Reagan was wrong: Latino ideology and beliefs about government. In M. Barreto & G. Segura (Eds.), *Latino America: How America's most dynamic population is poised to transform the politics of the nation* (pp. 33–51). New York: PublicAffairs.
- Barreto, M., Segura, G., Bergman, E., Damore, D., & Pantoja, A. (2014). The Prop. 187 effect: The politics of immigration and lessons from California. In M. Barreto & G. Segura (Eds.), *Latino America: How America's most dynamic population is poised to transform the politics of the nation* (pp. 173–188). New York: PublicAffairs.
- Barreto, M., Segura, G., Collingwood, L., Gross, J., & Pedraza, F. (2014). The “decisive bloc” in 2012. In M. Barreto & G. M. Segura (Eds.), *Latino America: How America's most dynamic population is poised to transform the politics of the nation* (pp. 145–170). New York, NY: PublicAffairs.
- Barreto, M., Segura, G., Collingwood, L., Manzano, S., & Valenzuela, A. (2014). November 2008: The Latino vote in Obama's general election landslide. In M. Barreto & G. Segura (Eds.), *Latino America: How America's most dynamic population is poised to transform the politics of the nation* (pp. 93–125). New York: PublicAffairs.
- Barreto, M., Segura, G., Manzano, S., & Pantoja, A. (2014). Now see us, now you don't: The implications of political participation lagging population growth. In M. Barreto & G. Segura (Eds.), *Latino America: How America's most dynamic population is poised to transform the politics of the nation* (pp. 53–76). New York: PublicAffairs.
- Barreto, M., Segura, G., Manzano, S., Sanchez, G., & Valenzuela, A. (2014). The 2008 Democratic primary. In M. Barreto & G. Segura (Eds.), *Latino America: How America's most dynamic population is poised to*

- transform the politics of the nation (pp. 79–92). New York: PublicAffairs.
- Barreto, M., Segura, G., & Pantoja, A. (2014). Unity and diversity. In M. Barreto & G. Segura (Eds.), *Latino America: How America's most dynamic population is poised to transform the politics of the nation* (pp. 13–32). New York: PublicAffairs.
- Brader, T., Valentino, N. A., & Suhay, E. (2008). What triggers public opposition to immigration? Anxiety, group cues, and immigration threat. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52, 959–978.
- Branton, R., Franco, A., & Wrinkle, R. (2014). ¿Quién Apoya Que? The influence of acculturation and political knowledge on Latino policy attitudes. In T. Affigne, E. Hu-DeHart, & M. Orr (Eds.), *Latino politics en ciencia politica* (pp. 115–131). New York: NYU Press.
- Braudel, F. (1994). *A history of civilizations* (R. Mayne, Trans.). New York: Penguin. (Originally published as Braudel, F. (1987). *Grammaire de civilisations* (2 vols.). Paris: Les editions Arthaud)
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate? *Journal of social issues*, 55(3), 429–444.
- Calderón, J. (1992). “Hispanic” and “Latino”: The viability of categories for panethnic unity. *Latin American Perspectives*, 19(4), 37–44.
- Chiricos, T., & Eschholz, S. (2002). The racial and ethnic typification of crime and the criminal typification of race and ethnicity in local television news. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 39(4), 400–420.
- Chomsky, A. (2007). *They take our jobs!: And 20 other myths about immigration*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Chomsky, A. (2014). *Undocumented: How immigration became illegal*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Citrin, J., Green, D. P., Muste, C., & Wong, C. (1997). Public opinion toward immigration reform: The role of economic motivations. *Journal of politics*, 59, 858–881.
- Cohen, B. (1963). *The press and foreign policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Dalisy, F. (2012). Media use and acculturation of new immigrants in the United States. *Communication Research Reports*, 29(2), 148–160.
- Dixon, T. L. (2015). Good guys are still always in white? Positive change and continued misrepresentation of race and crime on local television news. *Communication Research*, 42, 1–18. doi: 10.1177/0093650215579223
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Pearson, A. R., & Riek, B. M. (2005). Social identities and social context: Social attitudes and personal well-being. *Advances in Group Processes*, 22, 231–260.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gluszek, A., John, M. S., Dittmann, R., & Lagunes, P. (2010). Understanding bias toward Latinos: Discrimination, dimensions of difference, and experience of exclusion. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66(1), 59–78.
- Flores-Hughes, G. (2006). The origin of the term “Hispanic.” *Harvard Journal of Hispanic Policy*, 18, 81–84.
- Fullerton, M. (2014). An overview of labour migration policies in the United States. In S. Carrera, E. Guild, & K. Eisele (Eds.), *Rethinking the attractiveness of EU labour immigration policies: Comparative perspectives on the EU, the US, Canada, and beyond* (pp. 77–89). Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies.
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., Signorelli, N., & Shanahan, J. (2002). Growing up with television: Cultivation processes. In J. Bryant & D. Zillman (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 43–68). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2004). Race and ethnicity or racialized ethnicities?: Identities within global coloniality. *Ethnicities*, 4(3), 315–336
- Guzmán, I. M. (2008). Mapping the dynamic terrain of U.S. Latina/o media research. In D. Acevedo-Garcia, L. Bates, H. Rodríguez, R. Sáenz, & C. Menjivar (Eds.), *Latinas/os in the United States: Changing the face of América* (pp. 199–209). New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Hartman, T. K., Newman, B. J., & Bell, C. S. (2014). Decoding prejudice toward Hispanics: Group cues and public reactions to threatening immigrant behavior. *Political Behavior*, 36(1), 143–163.
- Hayes-Bautista, D. E., & Chapa, J. (1987). Latino terminology: Conceptual bases for standardized terminology. *American Journal of Public Health*, 77(1), 61–68.
- Iyengar, S., Sood, G., & Lelkes, Y. (2012). Affect, not ideology a social identity perspective on polarization. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 76(3), 405–431.
- Lavariega-Monforti, J. (2014). Identity revisited: Latinos (as) and Panethnicity. In T. Affigne, E. Hu-DeHart, & M. Orr (Eds.), *Latino politics en ciencia politica* (pp. 51–73). New York: NYU Press.
- Lippmann, W. (1922). *Public opinion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company
- Liu, W., & Gastil, J. (2014). Pathways of immigrant political socialization: Examining the role of news media, social connections, and community interaction. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 43(3), 238–263.
- Mastro, D. E., Behm Morawitz, E., & Kopacz, M. A. (2008). Exposure to television portrayals of Latinos: The implications of aversive racism and social identity theory. *Human Communication Research*, 34(1), 1–27.
- McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public opinion quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.

- Mindiola Jr., T., Niemann, Y. F., & Rodriguez, N. (2009). *Black-brown relations and stereotypes*. University of Texas Press.
- Mora, G. C. (2014). *Making Hispanics: How activists, bureaucrats, and media constructed a new American*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pérez, E. O. (2010). Explicit evidence on the import of implicit attitudes: The IAT and immigration policy judgments. *Political Behavior, 32*, 517–545.
- Ramirez, R. R. (2004). *We the people: Hispanics in the United States* (U.S. Bureau 2000 Special Report). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Rodriguez, A. (1999). *Making Latino news: Race, language, and class*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rodriguez, A. P. (2008a). As the Latino/a world turns: The literary and cultural production of transnational latinidades. In D. Acevedo-Garcia, L. Bates, H. Rodriguez, R. Sáenz, & C. Menjivar (Eds.), *Latinas/os in the United States: Changing the face of América* (pp. 210–224). New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Rodriguez, N. (2008b). Theoretical and methodological issues of Latina/o research. In D. Acevedo-Garcia, L. Bates, H. Rodriguez, R. Sáenz, & C. Menjivar (Eds.), *Latinas/os in the United States: Changing the Face of América* (pp. 3–15). New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Shoemaker, P. J., & Reese, S. D. (1996). *Mediating the message: Theories of influences on mass media content* (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Short, R., & Magaña, L. (2002). Political rhetoric, immigration attitudes, and contemporary prejudice: A Mexican American dilemma. *The Journal of social psychology, 142*(6), 701–712.
- Shrum, L. J. (1995). Assessing the social influence of television: A social cognition perspective on cultivation effects. *Communication Research, 22*(4), 402–429.
- Sides, J., & Citrin, J. (2007). European opinion about immigration: The role of identities, interests and information. *British Journal of Political Science, 37*(3), 477–504.
- Skop, E., Gratton, B., & Gutmann, M. P. (2008). Latinas/os (in) on the border. In D. Acevedo-Garcia, L. Bates, H. Rodriguez, R. Sáenz, & C. Menjivar (Eds.), *Latinas/os in the United States: Changing the Face of América* (pp. 243–262). New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Stewart, C. O., Pitts, M. J., & Osborne, H. (2011). Mediated intergroup conflict: The discursive construction of “illegal immigrants” in a regional US newspaper. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 30*(1), 8–27.
- Torres, J., & Lopez, C. (2015). REPORT: Single issue syndrome: How Sunday shows undermine Hispanic inclusion. *Media Matters for America*. Retrieved May 20, 2016 from <http://mediamatters.org/research/2015/03/04/report-single-issue-syndrome-how-sunday-shows-u/202569>.
- Trevino, F. M. (1987). Standardized terminology for Hispanic populations. *American Journal of Public Health, 77*(1), 69–72.
- Trujillo, M. D. (2012). The interplay between prejudice against Latinos and policy: A social psychological perspective. *Harvard Journal of Hispanic Policy, 24*, 11–19.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (1971). United States Census Report 1970. Retrieved May 17, 2016, from <http://www2.census.gov/prod2/statcomp/documents/1971-02.pdf>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (1983). United States Census Report 1980. Retrieved May 23, 2016, from [https://www.census.gov/history/www/through\\_the\\_decades/overview/1980.html](https://www.census.gov/history/www/through_the_decades/overview/1980.html)
- U.S. Census Bureau. (1990). United States Census Report 1990. Retrieved May 17, 2016, from <http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen1990.html>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). United States Census Report 2000. Retrieved May 17, 2016, from <http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). National Population Projections. Retrieved May 20, 2016 from <http://www.census.gov/population/projections/data/national/2012.html>.
- U.S. Office of Management and Budget. (1997). Revisions to the standards for the classification of federal data on race and ethnicity; Notice. Retrieved May 17, 2016, from [https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg\\_1997standards/](https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg_1997standards/)
- Valdeón, R. A. (2013). Hispanic or Latino: The use of politicized terms for the Hispanic minority in U.S. official documents and quality news outlets. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 13*(4), 433–449.
- Valentino, N. A., Brader, T., & Jardina, A. E. (2013). Immigration opposition among U.S. Whites: General ethnocentrism or media priming of attitudes about Latinos? *Political Psychology, 34*(2), 149–166.
- Vu, H. T., Guo, L., & McCombs, M. E. (2014). Exploring “the world outside and the pictures in our heads”: A network agenda-setting study. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 91*(4), 669–686.
- Waldman, P., Ventura, E., Savillo, R., Lin, S., & Lewis, G. (2008). Fear and loathing in prime time: Immigration myths and cable news. Report. *Media Matters Action Network*. Retrieved May 17, 2016 from <http://www.ilw.com/articles/2008,0709-waldman.shtm>
- Weaver, C. N. (2005). The changing image of Hispanic Americans. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 27*(3), 337–354.
- Wilkinson, K. T. (2015). *Spanish-language television in the United States: Fifty years of development*. New York: Routledge.

## Additional reading

- Alba, V. (1969). *The Latin Americans*. New York: Praeger.
- Avalos, M., & Affigne, T. (2014). Latino politics and power in the twenty-first century: Insights from political analysis. In T. Affigne, E. Hu-DeHart, & M. Orr (Eds.), *Latino politics en ciencia politica* (pp. 231–254). New York: NYU Press.
- Barreto, M., Segura, G., Bergman, E., & Damore, D. (2014). Immigration politics and the 2014 election. In M. Barreto & G. Segura (Eds.), *Latino America: How America's most dynamic population is poised to transform the politics of the nation* (pp. 189–205). New York: PublicAffairs.
- Boske, C., & McCormack, S. (2011). Building an understanding of the role of media literacy for Latino/a high school students. *The High School Journal*, 94(4), 167–186.
- Bucy, E. P., & Newhagen, J. E. (1999). The micro and macrodrama of politics on television: Effects of media format on candidate evaluations. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 43(2), 193–210.
- Burns, P., & Gimpel, J. G. (2000). Economic insecurity, prejudicial stereotypes, and public opinion on immigration policy. *Political Science Quarterly*, 115(2), 201–225.
- Chávez, C. A. (2015). “News with an accent”: Hispanic television and the re-negotiation of U.S. Latino speech. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 12(3), 252–270.
- Chavez, L. R. (2001). *Covering immigration: Popular images and the politics of the nation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chavez, L. R. (2008). *The Latino threat: Constructing immigrants, citizens, and the nation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Davisson, A. (2009). ‘I’m in!’: Hillary Clinton’s 2008 democratic primary campaign on YouTube. *Journal of Visual Literacy*, 28(1), 70–91.
- Dockterman, D. (2011). Country of origin profiles. Pew Hispanic Center report. Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2011/05/26/country-of-origin-profiles/>. Accessed February 18 2016.
- Filindra, A., & Pearson Merkwowitz, S. (2013). Together in good times and bad? How economic triggers condition the effects of intergroup threat. *Social Science Quarterly*, 94(5), 1328–1345.
- Geron, K., & Michelson, M. R. (2008). Latino partisanship, political activity and vote choice. In D. Acevedo-Garcia, L. Bates, H. Rodríguez, R. Sáenz, & C. Menjivar (Eds.), *Latinas/os in the United States: Changing the face of América* (pp. 325–339). New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Gershon, S. A., & Pantoja, A. D. (2008). Political orientations and Latino immigrant incorporation. In D. Acevedo-Garcia, L. Bates, H. Rodríguez, R. Sáenz, & C. Menjivar (Eds.), *Latinas/os in the United States: Changing the face of América* (pp. 340–351). New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Guzmán, B., & McConnell, E. D. (2002). The Hispanic population: 1990–2000 growth and change. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 21(1-2), 109–128.
- Huntington, S. P. (2004). *Who are we? The challenges to America's national identity*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Huntington, S. P. (2004). The Hispanic challenge. *Foreign Policy*, March/April
- Hess, R. D., & Torney-Purta, J. (1967). *The development of political attitude in children*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Hood III, M. V., & Morris, I. L. (1997). ¿Amigo o enemigo?: Context, attitudes, and Anglo public opinion toward immigration. *Social Science Quarterly*, 78(2), 309–323.
- Huddy, L. (2001). From social to political identity: A critical examination of social identity theory. *Political Psychology*, 22(1), 127–156.
- Hyman, H. H. (1959/1969). *Political socialization: A study in the psychology of political behavior*. New York: Free Press.
- Iyengar, S., Jackman, S., Messing, S., Valentino, N., Aalberg, T., Duch, R., Hahn, K. S., Soroka, S., Harell, A., & Kobayashi, T. (2013). Do attitudes about immigrants predict willingness to admit individual immigrants? A cross-national test of the person-positivity bias. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 77(special issue), 2–29. doi: 10.1093/poq/nft024
- Iyengar, S., & Westwood, S. J. (2015). Fear and loathing across party lines: New evidence on group polarization. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59(3), 690–707.
- Langton, K. P. (1969). *Political socialization*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Mastro, D. E., & Greenberg, B. S. (2000). The portrayal of racial minorities on prime time television. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 44(4), 690–703.
- Mendelberg, T. (2001). *The race card: Campaign strategy, implicit messages, and the norm of equality*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Newman, B. J., Hartman, T. K., & Taber, C. S. (2012). Foreign language exposure, cultural threat, and opposition to immigration. *Political Psychology*, 33(5), 635–657.
- Newman, B. J., Hartman, T. K., & Taber, C. S. (2014). Social dominance and the cultural politics of immigration. *Political Psychology*, 35(2), 165–186.
- Nishikawa, K. A., Yower, T. L., Clawson, R. A., & Waltenberg, E. (2009). Interviewing the interviewers: Journalistic norms and racial diversity in the newsroom. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 20(3), 242–259.

- Ochoa, G. L. (2008). Entre nosotras/os: Theorizing, researching, and constructing cross-Latina/o relations in the United States. In D. Acevedo-García, L. Bates, H. Rodríguez, R. Sáenz, & C. Menjívar (Eds.), *Latinas/os in the United States: Changing the Face of América* (pp. 263–276). New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Rodriguez, I. (2007). Telling stories of Latino population growth in the United States: Narratives of inter-ethnic conflict in the mainstream, Latino and African-American press. *Journalism*, 8(5), 573–590.
- Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown tide rising: Metaphors of Latinos in contemporary American public discourse*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Sapiro, V. (2004). Not your parents' political socialization: Introduction for a new generation. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7, 1–23.
- Silber-Mohamed, H. (2014). The boundaries of Americanness: Perceived barriers among Latino subgroups. In T. Affigne, E. Hu-DeHart, & M. Orr (Eds.), *Latino politics en ciencia política* (pp. 132–157). New York: NYU Press.
- Sinclair, J. (2004). From Latin Americans to Latinos: Spanish-language television in the United States and its audiences. *Fronteiras-estudos midiáticos*, 6(1), 7–20.
- Stokes-Brown, A. K. (2014). Racial identities and Latino public opinion: Racial self-image and policy preferences among Latinos. T. Affigne, E. Hu-DeHart, & M. Orr (Eds.), *Latino politics en ciencia política* (pp. 184–205). New York: NYU Press.
- Tienda, M., & Ortiz, V. (1986). "Hispanicity" and the 1980 Census. *Social Science Quarterly*, 67(1), 3–20.
- Valentino, N. A., Hutchings, V. L., & White, I. K. (2002). Cues that matter: How political ads prime racial attitudes during campaigns. *American Political Science Review*, 96, 75–90.
- Valentino, N. A., Traugott, M. W., & Hutchings, V. L. (2002). Group cues and ideological constraint: A replication of political advertising effects studies in the lab and in the field. *Political Communication*, 19(1), 29–48.
- Vaquera, E., & Kao, G. (2006). The implications of choosing "no race" on the salience of Hispanic identity: How racial and ethnic backgrounds intersect among Hispanic adolescents. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 47(3), 375–396.
- Vargas, L. (2008). Ambiguous loss and the media practices of transnational Latina teens: A qualitative study. *Popular Communication*, 6(1), 37–52.
- Villarreal, R., & Peterson, R.A. (2008). Hispanic ethnicity and media behavior. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 48(2), 179–190.
- Wilkinson, K. T. (2002). Collective situational ethnicity and Latino subgroups' struggle for influence in U.S.

Spanish language television 1. *Communication Quarterly*, 50(3-4), 422–443.

## Book Reviews

**Bastiansen, Henrik G. and Rolf Werenskjold.** (Eds.). *The Nordic Media and the Cold War*. Göteborg, Sweden: NORDICOM, 2015. Pp. 366. ISBN 978-91-87957-15-4 (paper) 280,00 kr; €32.

NORDICOM has again provided a book that many researchers would not have known they needed until they encountered the book itself. *The Nordic Media and the Cold War* adds to a growing collection of research about news media (typically) and war coverage; however, this book differs from the others in its focus on one particular area, its attention to a less commonly studied time period, and its inclusion of multiple media. Much of the discussion of war in media coverage deals with the hot wars of the last century and the role that the news played in either covering the war or in serving as sites of war propaganda. This book, by focusing on the Cold War—the period following World War II until the dissolution of the Soviet Union—invites the reader to look at the role that the media played in the Nordic countries, a focus that provides a kind of a special case or even a microcosm for what has been going on in other countries. As the editors write in their introduction "These countries constituted an important geopolitical area between East and West during the Cold War: They lay at the intersection of the USA, Canada, and Britain in the West and the Soviet Union and communist Eastern Europe in the east and south of the region" (pp. 9–10).

The role of the different media in the Nordic countries reflects not only the geographical situation of the Nordic countries and government-press relations but also the sometimes difficult-to-manage relationship between the Nordic countries and the different power blocs. The editors give a sense of the complexity of the situation: "Each of the four Nordic countries chose their own solution to national security after the Second World War in 1945: Finland developed a close relationship with the Soviet Union, regulated in a separate friendship agreement of 1948; Sweden pleaded neutral foreign policy and placed itself outside the two power blocs in East and West, while Denmark and Norway chose to enter the North Atlantic defense alliance NATO in 1949. These three solutions, later defined as the Nordic balance, came to be an almost permanent

situation in the region throughout the period 1945–1991” (p. 10). This situation provides the basis and context for the various media activities of the Nordic countries. The media systems in the four countries reflect a range from state-affiliated broadcasters to newspapers affiliated with ruling and opposition parties to independent media producers.

The editors divide the contributions to the book into three parts, roughly corresponding to time periods of the Cold War. The first, which they entitle “Soviet influence?” looks primarily at 1948 to 1968, the earlier part of the Cold War. The second part “Space, Sports, and Spies” examines the 1970s (through key media themes); and the last section “Towards the End” focuses on the 1980s. The contributors to the book (drawn from throughout the Nordic region) participated in a larger ongoing enterprise to study this particular period and the Cold War. The researchers had gathered in conferences over the last five years, presenting papers and debating the issues. The book results from these collaborations. As noted, each section of the book groups chapters that offer different perspectives, often from one country or another, on the particular time periods. In several instances two scholars examine the same event, but from the ways in which it appeared in media coverage of different countries.

The editors, Henrik Bastiansen and Rolf Werenskjold, introduce the volume with a detailed description of the context for both the historical period and the research approach. Since many readers outside of the Nordic countries would not know the regional history (and younger readers may not know the Cold War), this context proves invaluable.

In the first section addressing possible Soviet influences, Morten Jentoft (“Radio Moscow—Propaganda from the East—in Norwegian”) provides a history of the efforts and the impact of radio Moscow. He notes that while the broadcasts of the BBC were quite well-known in Norway throughout the Second World War (and throughout the world in later communication research), scholars have directed less attention to the broadcasts of Radio Moscow in Norwegian. While those broadcasts helped during the war in supporting the resistance against the German Nazi invaders, they continued throughout the Cold War, but with less influence on the population. Jentoft points to the interest in those broadcasts by the Norwegian intelligence services, monitoring Russian policy and its influence on the Norwegian population. The chapter includes coverage of issues such as the downing of the

American U2 spy plane as well as the way in which Radio Moscow addressed other concerns, particularly as the Soviet Union faced challenges, whether in Czechoslovakia or later during the dissolution of the Soviet Union.

Raimo Salokangas (“The Shadow of the Bear: Finnish Broadcasting, National Interest, and Self-censorship during the Cold War”) considers situation of the Finnish state broadcaster and the positions it took during the Cold War. Dividing the Cold War into several time frames, Salokangas notes that the Finnish broadcasters trod very careful paths. Trying not to insert themselves into foreign policy issues (particularly the more controversial ones) they followed a policy, in his words, of “the colder the war, the more careful the company” (p. 67). This policy referred to both the news coverage and the official government responses. Lotta Lounasmeri (“A Careful Balancing Act: Finnish Culture of Self-censorship in the Cold War”) also looks at the Finnish situation but through newspaper coverage. She argues that the press had an obligation to follow the government’s line of neutrality partly, as she says, for good neighborly relations. This resulted in a self-censorship of the press in which the Finnish press placed their first priority on the national interest rather than any particular idealistic or democratic goals. The exception in Finland came from men’s magazines. Laura Saarenmaa (“Political Nonconformity in Finnish Men’s Magazines during the Cold War”) examines these magazines and the ways in which they were overtly anti-Communist. They did not hesitate to espouse political views in addition to their erotic content. She notes that “in the 1960s and 1970s men’s magazines served as forums for wartime recollection, carefully avoided in the main mainstream media in the the Cold War period” (p. 101). In this they extended their outsider status beyond the publication of erotic material to political opinion.

A very different attitude in the Nordic press had to do with the Wallenberg case. Hans Fredrik Dahl (“The Wallenberg Case as a Cold War Issue”) reports on this case of a Swedish diplomat who, in the process of rescuing Jews in Hungary, disappeared in 1945 at the end of the war after being arrested by the Soviets. This unsolved mystery continued to surface within the Nordic media as a point of contention with the Soviet bloc. Dahl recounts both what is known of the Wallenberg case and the ways in which it later played a role in the Cold War and the media coverage

of that time. Not all of the Nordic press opposed the Soviet Union. Birgitte Kjos Fonn (“East-West Conflict, West-West Divide? Western Self-Awareness in a Cold War Dissenter Newspaper”) examines the East-West conflict in terms of a dissenting newspaper during the Cold War. The paper provided a voice for the new left movement in Norway, associated with the opposition political parties. She notes that while these papers may have been affiliated with the left, they were perhaps less pro-Russian than they were anti-West or at least anti-western values as shown in the elites of the West. She examines in detail the newspaper, *Orientering*.

The second section of the book addresses events and media coverage during the latter part of the 1960s and the 1970s. The first big issue dealt with the space race. Patrik Åker (“The Space Race in the Swedish Press during the Cold War Era: A Celebration of Transparent Western Television”) examines how the Swedish press addressed the space race, noting that “the space race was from the beginning treated as a media and communication project as much as a science and technology project. Outer space was the perfect area to make this project global; it concerned all mankind and was not accessible without media technologies” (p. 147). Åker points out that the Swedish press was quick to identify the difference between the relative secrecy of the Soviet space program and the openness of the space program of the United States where the U.S. NASA group did not hide even its mistakes and failings where the Soviet group tended only to report on positive outcomes. This very fact served as a powerful propaganda tool for the West.

The Cold War also played out in sports, including the coverage of sporting events. After the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, the ice hockey championship of 1969, which featured competition between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, received a great deal of coverage in the Swedish and Norwegian press. Peter Dahlén and Tobias Stark (“Political Resistance on Ice: The 1969 Ice Hockey World Championship in the Swedish and Norwegian Press”) compare the coverage in the Swedish and Norwegian newspapers. They quickly identify how the sports coverage mirrored the political problems of the era in the struggle between East and West. They note the “multiple meanings” of the Cold War and the events of the Cold War which would overflow into every aspect of society.

In an attempt to provide a larger context for the media responses to the Cold War, Marie Cronqvist

(“Cold War Sweden and the Media. A Historiographical Overview and a Glance Ahead”) offers an historiographical overview of Swedish Cold War studies. She pays “specific attention to how this field of research has dealt with the media as historical sources.” She wants to recognize and “problematize Cold War historiography from the point of view of media history” (p. 181). The media history did indeed fall within various cultural narratives in Sweden during the Cold War. One would be surprised to find any news source that could exist completely independent of the larger cultural dialogue and cultural narrative. A specific example of this kind of way in which news reporting became embedded in the cultural narrative comes from one Norwegian case study. Paul Bjerke (“‘The Most Disgraceful of All Crimes’: Critical Journalism during the Cold War? A Norwegian Spy Case Study”) examines a spy case that roiled Norway during this period and cast doubts on both the Soviet Union and the Norwegian police services. The spy, arrested in 1977, had functioned as an agent perhaps since the end of the Second World War. The news coverage revealed that the government had evidence of the spy’s activity for at least 10 years but that the Secret Service arrested the wrong person, who was later cleared. The particular outcome of this case led to public scrutiny of the various police agencies but also of the press themselves and how the authorities had made use of the press.

The last part of this collection deals with the more recent events of the Cold War through the 1980s. Sports coverage again takes the lead. Oddbjørn Melle (“Norway’s Olympic Cold War, 1980: A Neighboring Country’s Response to the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan”) studies the Norwegian coverage of the U.S. call to boycott the 1980 Olympics in Moscow after the Russian invasion of Afghanistan. Melle examines the coverage of the Summer Olympics in Norway and the choices of the different countries whether to boycott those Olympics. Norway bordered on the Soviet Union and its particular press coverage in response to the boycott reflected the larger context both of the Cold War and of national politics. About the same time, public opinion throughout the Nordic area was riled by the issue of placing American missiles in Europe. This became a serious issue for Danish security policy; the Danish media debated the issue extensively. Palle Roslyng-Jensen (“Media Securitization and Public Opinion: Denmark and the Euro-Missile Issue

1979–1983”) examines the evidence based on opinion surveys and the growth of public opinion as reported in the press. Terje Rasmussen (“Politics, Press, and the Euro-missiles: The Take-off of the Euro-missile Conflict in Norway”) provides a similar look at the issue of the missiles in Europe from the basis of the press in Norway. He writes, “the chapter reports on the coverage of the Norwegian party-affiliated press, not least on the dilemmas of the main social-democratic newspaper” (p. 255), torn between a comprehensive coverage of the debate and support for the government. Rasmussen aims to understand the various strategies taken by the press in approaching this divisive issue.

Long reports in the print media formed only one shaper of public opinion. Rolf Werenskjold and Erling Sivertsen (“Soviet and American Leaders in Ice-Cold Lines: The Political Cartoons in the Norwegian Newspaper *Aftenposten* 1980-1984”) look at political cartoons. Rather than simply examining news coverage, these researchers contrast of the ways that Soviet and American leaders were pictured by the different cartoonists as a way of highlighting the attitudes toward the different power blocs. “The chapter provides a survey of how the cartoons were used, which cartoonists were employed, and how the cartoons entered into the editorial processes.” The chapter pays attention to framing and how the different frames in the newspapers revealed how concepts of the enemy might be “created, reproduced, and changed” (p. 271),

The last Soviet leader before the breakup of the Soviet Union was Mikhail Gorbachev. Henrik Bastiansen (“Towards Glasnost? A Case Study of the Norwegian News Coverage of Mikhail Gorbachev as Soviet Leader in 1985”) studies the press coverage of one year in the run-up to the end of the Soviet Union, the period of glasnost. Bastiansen offers a case study of the Norwegian news coverage of Gorbachev as the Soviet leader, asking “how did they [Western leaders and by implication the press] evaluate his personal position of power, his interior policy, and his foreign policy during his first year in office?” (p. 307). By examining the leading Norwegian newspaper, staffed with large number of Soviet experts, he attempts to get a sense of the larger cultural view of the Soviet Union at what turned out to be a key time in Soviet and Cold War history.

Bjørn Sørenssen (“Frozen Kisses: Cinematographical Reflections on Norway’s Role”) looks not

at news coverage, but at the cinema as he examines Norway’s role in the Cold War as it was pictured in the Norwegian film industry. “The article draws special attention to renowned documentary film maker Knut Eric Jensen’s two fiction films *Brent av frost* (1997) and *Iskyss* (2008), both based on actual stories and dealing with Norwegians who became directly involved in the Cold War as servants to the Soviet intelligence service” (p. 333). The chapter proposes a consideration of a wider range of media responses to the Cold War, not only through newspaper and traditional opinion leaders but, in this instance, through the medium of film. Another use of film to examine the Cold War comes from Jon Raundalen (“The End of the World Revisited: Nuclear War Films and their Reception in Norwegian Media”). His interest falls on films dealing with the theme of nuclear war: *The Day After* (U.S., 1983), *Threads* (UK, 1984), and *Letters from a Dead Man* (USSR, 1987). He writes “these three films were the most widely distributed and discussed representations of nuclear Armageddon in the U.S., Western Europe, and the Soviet bloc respectively” (p. 347). Raundalen then compares the films in an examination of how the stories of the nuclear threat were told in the different countries and then how Norwegian viewers received them.

This collection provides an interesting look at the time period and the region through various kinds of mediation study. Well-known in other countries to scholars paying attention to press coverage and opinion formation, these approaches work well here to offer insights into an unusual kind of war as it affected a region caught between two powerful blocs and threatened with physical and political destruction. As such, the book offers an important corrective to media and government and war coverage in the West. News coverage of issues of war and peace carried out in the United States, for example, focuses on United States issues; similarly a British scholar looks at the UK experience. While not surprising that Nordic scholars would look at the Nordic region, their outlook is not yet well-known in other parts of the world and provides a refreshing and sorely needed addition to this kind of communication research. The methods used by the different scholars are typical for communication research methods and so researchers will find each of the articles accessible even if they do not know the particular cultural or historical background. The book certainly provides a refreshing and interesting approach to the topic.

Each chapter has its own reference list and endnotes, where needed. The book itself has no index but does include a detailed table of contents and a section about the authors and their work.

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

**Boerboom, Samuel** (Ed.) *The Political Language of Food*. Lanham, MD; Boulder, CO; New York; and London: Lexington Books, 2015. Pp. xii, 275. ISBN 978-1-4985-0555-0 (cloth) \$90.00 (£60.00); 978-1-4985-0556-7 (E-book) \$89.99 (£60.00).

*The Political Language of Food* proves extremely informative on various subjects related to the misleading language in the politics of food. This text presents a collection of essays, each coming from a different perspective. The common theme linking the essays arises from the political nature of the language used in marketing, selling, making, and consumption of food. Language used alongside food affects all people, but apparent inconsistencies emerge in the language used to describe food being produced, sold, and consumed.

In the first essay, “Tracing the ‘Back to the Land’ Trope: Self-Sufficiency, Counterculture, and Community,” Jessica M. Prody discusses how many people over various time periods have sought escape from cities to grow their own food, bringing a sense of achievement and peace. However, going “back to the land” is only possible if some people live in the city. The second essay, “Végétariens Radicaux: John Oswald and the Trope of Sympathy in Revolutionary Paris” (Justin Killian) touches on how food relates to status. Written from the perspective of a vegetarian who describes the decision to not eat animals and how people criticize, jump to conclusions, and use confrontation, the essay uses the setting of 18th century Paris to illustrate this long-standing debate about food.

In “The Revolution Will Not Be (Food) Reviewed: Politics of Agitation and Control of Occupy Kitchen,” Amy Pason tells the story of how food affected the Occupy Wall Street movement. Food held great symbolic power because it played a role in the survival of the movement. When journalists and other writers described the strength of the movement, they included positive comments about the food served to the Occupiers; when they described weakness, their descriptions of the food turned negative. This essay also touches on the current “Foodie culture,” where

chefs have celebrity status, and an increasing number of features appear in food magazines and specialized television shows.

Casey Ryan Kelly (“Haute Colonialism: Exocitizing Poverty in Bizarre Foods America”) discusses the ways in which “culinary slumming,” or eating food from the slums, has piqued interest. Recent history has shown an increase in excitement of new foods meant for the poor or the under-represented. The show, “Bizarre Foods America” reacted to this culinary slumming trend and gave an unrealistic representation of cultures. The next essay, “Pungent Yet Problematic: The Class-Based Framing of Ramps in *The New York Times* and the *Charleston Gazette*,” takes up a similar theme. Melissa Boehm notes how ramps started as a food for the poor, ostracizing them because of their odor. Now, they are desirable.

In “Constructing Taste and Waste as Habitus: Food and Matters of Access and In/Security,” Leda Cooks takes up the themes of food, culture, and identity. Because food directly relates to judgements about oneself and others, food can create insecurity or pride. Joseph L. Abisaid (“Tying the Knot: How Industry and Advocacy Organizations Market Language as Humane”) talks about the reasons people choose the food that they eat, such as for convenience, expense, and more recently with consciousness of what is in it and how it is made. With the population increasing, factory farms have increased. And at the same time, animal advocacy groups have taken up a stand against the terrible animal conditions of the factory farms.

In “Corn Allergy: Public Policy, Private Devastation,” Kathy Brady notes that she is allergic to corn and explains the struggles that go along with this allergy. Since food processors place corn in many things (often mislabeled), people with corn allergies have a very hard time consuming food. In some cases, the government does not require corn be listed. For example, corn starch plays a role in most packaging of foods, even in water bottles. It is shocking the lengths to which people with corn allergies must go to keep from having reactions—all because of misused language on food labels. Jennifer L. Adams raises a different issue with mislabeled foods. “Family Farms with Happy Cows: A Narrative Analysis of Horizon Organic Dairy Packaging Labels” discusses the growing “organic” trend. But many companies have labeled their products as organic when they are not. This essay brought up many language misconceptions that occur with labeling, one of these being the com-

mon term, “Family Farm.” Overall, the labeling system remains imperfect.

Ellen W. Gorsevski’s “*Chipotle Mexican Grill’s Meatwashing Propaganda: Corporate-Speak Hiding Suffering of ‘Commodity’ Animals*” is about Chipotle’s misleading language in their restaurants, in their commercials, on their website, and even on their quarterly statements. Chipotle claims to have fresh, fast food, which the author argues is not possible. She writes, “If we are what we eat, we should be troubled indeed” (p. 219).

“Corporate Colonization in the Market: Discursive Closures and the Greenwashing of Food Discourse” (Megan A. Koch and Cristin A. Compton) raises issues about the morality and ethics involved in food. Food shares meaning with others, social status, culture, and morality. It represents our personal morals and values and so any misuse of language affects not only what people eat but how they morally engage with the world. In the final essay, “Mistaken Consensus and the Body-as-Machine Analogy,” Boerboom discusses the “Fat War,” where nutritionists advised Americans to stop eating fat, and the new research stating that this is not true. Many Americans are obese, and the calories-in-calories out theory has promise and the science to back it up.

This book is extremely clear and will prove helpful for people interested in any subject relating to the (political) language involving food. It would work well for a classroom setting because it covers so many different perspectives. It is great for people to know about the discrepancies involving the food industry, with examples and individual stories. I recommend this book to anyone who is looking for new perspectives on this concept.

—Laura Pope  
Santa Clara University

**Horsfield, Peter.** *From Jesus to the Internet: A History of Christianity and Media.* Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2015. Pp. xii, 322. ISBN 978-1-118-44737-6 (cloth) \$105.00; 978-1-118-44738-3 (paper) \$34.95; 978-1-118-44736-9 (e-book) \$27.95.

Until recently historical studies have generally ignored the role that communication media play within the events of the world unless they specifically examine the history of a given media, as for example the printing press. In this volume Peter Horsfield chal-

lenges that pattern and raises the question of the relationship of Christianity to the media. Grounding his study in the fact that contemporary studies of media and religion have begun to ask the question of how much particular religious practices or religious traditions have made use of different media systems, he attempts to apply that connection between media systems and religion to Christianity. The study sets out to explore not so much religious institutions but religion in general. He writes, “this view sees religion as something that occurs because people work with symbolic resources provided by their culture to create meaning for their daily lives, to share experiences of awe and mystery, to explore new alternative realities, and to manage the anxieties and unfulfilled possibilities of life” (p. 1). In this context he examines Christianity.

Arguing that people experience social reality in general as a mediated phenomenon, Horsfield follows this manifestation of social reality in practice through the history of Christianity.

For that reason, this book addresses a wide variety of mediated communication: the numerous styles and uses of oral communication; written text such as scriptures, different genres of religious writing, correspondence, signage, and archival libraries; visual media such as painted images, statues, decorations, symbols, illustrations, photographs, and moving pictures; material forms of communication such as prayer beads, bread and wine, buildings, and landscapes; tactile forms of communication such as physical greetings, kissing, the use of water or smell, and the feel of artifacts; sounds such as chanting, singing, intoning, and bell ringing; as well as technologically based media such as print, television, radio, telephone, and computer-based digital technologies of communication. (p. 5)

This ambitious list gives a sense of what Horsfield seeks to do. The book does not quite live up to this promise—an impossibility for a book of only 300 pages—but the list does invite the reader to get a sense of what Horsfield wants people to think about.

The book follows the historical trajectory of Christianity, beginning in the ancient Middle East. Starting with some of the background of the life of Jesus, the book traces the use of oral proclamation in early Christianity and then shifts to the spread of Christianity through the use of letter writing. Horsfield examines not only the Jewish origins of Christianity but also what he calls the Gentile origins of Christianity in the writings of the apostle Paul.

Horsfield traces early Christianity primarily in the Mediterranean area through the use of letter writing and the writings of those called the “Fathers of the Church.” In the development of what he terms the “Catholic-Orthodox brand,” Horsfield looks at individuals such as Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen. Here and in other places he does not shy away from sometimes contentious issues such as the role of women in early Christianity, arguing (in this instance) that these roles were omitted from the written text and subsequently “written out” of Christian history. Though it occurs at the same time and under mutual influence, for the sake of clarity, Horsfield separates the discussion of Latin Christianity from Eastern Christianity, but makes only some brief reference to the spread of Christianity outside of the Mediterranean area. Given a lack of sources, particularly those tied to communication practices, this is an understandable limitation.

Following a chronological pattern Horsfield examines other historical periods: early medieval Christianity, what he calls the new millennium (the period of the 11th, 12th, and 13th centuries), the Reformation, the modern world, and the contemporary world. Necessarily a sweeping history, Horsfield picks particular themes within each period of Christian history in order to highlight the various links to communication practice or to writings about communication. Within each chapter he offers a brief history of the period, commentary on the particular events or individuals whose lives shaped Christianity at that time, and a discussion of some of the communication resources or communication practices associated with Christianity in that period. Within each he tries to give several examples of the communication practices, but he only occasionally suggests the consequences of those practices for Christianity in any detail. He correctly presumes that some consequences appear clearly; however, others do not and the reader would benefit from added detail.

The overall topic, of course, is incredibly ambitious. It is also incredibly important. Christianity, perhaps more so than some of the other world religions, has drawn on almost every type of communication, usually as an early adopter of those communication patterns, technologies, or practices. How much the communication media and practice influence the development of Christianity is another question. Communication media, for example, do offer affordances for both ideas and practice. Communication scholarship should explore this, but it is in some ways beyond the scope of this book. Horsfield does hint at his understanding of this

second question but has not completely developed these approaches. One does get the impression that he plans to extend his study in this area.

Perhaps unavoidably, the book does occasionally lapse into a certain anachronism. Horsfield will use contemporary terminology and understanding of communication to refer to practices in an earlier historical period. For example, he writes about “media strategies” as though figures in historical Christianity had consciously developed them in those earlier historical periods. Apart from a figure like the professional rhetorician Augustine, few would have thought in those terms, though a contemporary scholar would read such an understanding into the historical record. At other times Horsfield seems to weaken his argument drawing on minority positions within the scholarship on Christianity. While these should be acknowledged, one must recognize the difficulty of developing sweeping conclusions based on what seems to be relatively thin historical evidence. The book, as noted, is an enormously ambitious project. Asking Horsfield, who has training in theology, to comprehensively draw on and fully evaluate historical sources may require resources not available to him.

In his conclusion, Horsfield notes that “the intent [of writing this book] is to add an historical perspective to current scholarly discussion and wider public interest in what is happening in religion and Christianity today, and the place of new and legacy media in that. The approach has been to understand the part played by media in religion by studying the mediation of one religion, Christianity, from its beginnings to the present time” (p. 285). From this perspective, Horsfield has succeeded quite well. The book forms an important resource for this larger study. This book should be read by any scholar interested in communication history, religious history, the media ecology tradition of communication study, the contemporary use of media within religious settings, and the development of new media and its impact for religious practice.

Much of the scholarship that Horsfield reviews began in different areas and uses different approaches and methodologies within communication study. Horsfield is one of the first to draw these together in one volume. For this other scholars should be enormously grateful.

The book contains extensive references, end notes for each chapter, and a subject index.

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

**Kotilainen, Sirkku and Reijo Kupiainen** (Eds.). *Reflections on Media Education Futures: Contributions to the Conference Media Education Futures in Tampere, Finland 2014*. (International Clearinghouse on Children & Media Yearbook 2015). Göteborg: Sweden: NORDICOM, 2015. Pp. 301 ISBN 978-91-87957-16-1 (paper) 250,00 kr.; €28.00. (Also available as PDF download from <http://www.nordicom.gu.se/en/publikationer/reflections-media-education-futures>).

This edition of the yearbook from the International Clearinghouse on Children, Youth, and Media addresses questions dealing with new technologies. The Media Education movement has become intensely aware of the need for it to rethink many of its principles, trainings, and approaches. At the time of its foundation “media” referred primarily to television and media education focused its attention on the interactions of children and television, and on the need to better prepare children to live in a world that presented information in ways so different from the traditional classroom or the traditional textbook. In the last decade, those involved in what they now term “media and information literacy” (MIL) have become deeply aware of the impact of screen technology, the use of so many different kinds of digital technologies that appeal to children. Children’s total hours of screen time far exceed their hours of television alone. The focus of the conference on which this book reports dealt specifically with these kinds of new technologies as well as with the future of media education.

The editors note, “the rapid changes in technologies, including developments in the content and marketing of media, are challenging from the perspective of children and youths. . . . The need for media education has been experienced on every continent of the world, and several international efforts have recently been established by actors such as governments, the EU, and UNESCO to promote attention to the relationships within youth and media as well as media literacies and education” (p. 7). The material collected here approaches this problem in two ways: first from an academic perspective, in which writers offer theoretical overviews and descriptions of approaches for a new media education, and second, from a practical perspective in which the writers present case studies of media education projects.

Divina Frau-Meigs (“Augmented Media and Information Literacy (MIL): How Can MIL Harness

the Affordances of Digital Information Cultures?”) sketches the new world for media education, the world which includes everything from digital life to augmented technologies—what she calls human enhancement technologies. She describes these as “on the one hand an augmented human with digital wearables, and on the other an augmented robot with humanlike characteristics” (p. 13). After describing in more detail what she means by augmentation and then looking at its challenges for media education, she suggests three models with which schools and media educators might proceed. The first, a competence model, “tends to place learners at the center of the process, to enable them to be aware of media uses and effects.” The second, a citizenship model, “tends to present media in relation to the public sphere, and focuses on the press as a means of constructing an enlightened opinion. It tries to foster participation and agencies among young people.” Finally, “the creativity model proposes a hands-on approach and indirect use of the media themselves, and tends to be more image driven. It posits that producing media generates critical thinking and understanding” (p. 17). She asks how schools might implement each of these models in their pedagogy and then offers suggestions for what might be necessary in terms of public policy.

Johanna Sumiala, Leena Suurpää, Titus Hjelm, and Minttu Tikka (“Studying Youth in the Media City: Multi-sited Reflections”) examine the methodological challenges of studying youth and new media. They describe the media city as the place where young people live with technology. “Cities and youth are both fluid phenomena that evade rigid definition: youth . . . are everywhere and nowhere; and contemporary cityscapes are sites that occupy both physical and digital realms, often simultaneously” (p. 27). The team then introduces their qualitative, ethnographic approach to studying urban youth, their media habits, and their socialization both with friends and into the city itself. They note that the idea of a media city is not really new: even 19th-century cities combined a great deal of media experience, whether in terms of public advertising or newspapers or theaters. What we see today simply increases the complexity of that media environment. By observing young people and spending time with them in these media spaces, the team suggests ways that those interested in media education might learn from the existing habits of young people.

One concern for media education has to do with competence and helping children and young people

grow in their own capabilities with the new technologies both as consumers and possibly as producers. Ida Cortoni and Veronica Lo Presti (“Digital Capabilities”) offer an initial definition of digital competence and then use that definition to articulate several models for development digital competence. In reviewing the literature they note that “competence refers to a combination of knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate to the context” (p. 39). They argue that digital competence must rely on different kinds of knowledge, which they arrange according to a program they draw from a review of the literature. These would include access, critical thinking, user awareness, creative production, and citizenship (p. 43). They put this together with Harold Bloom’s taxonomy of learning to develop what they call an “evaluation model of digital competences” (p. 45). Following Bloom, they set out six stages of learning: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation (p. 46). Putting both of these together into a matrix of possibilities, they create a model in which one could evaluate digital competence in the scope of identifying and then teaching these digital competencies.

In a similarly theoretical approach, Minna Saariketo (“Reflections on the Question of Technology in Media Literacy Education”) offers another look at the nature of digital competence and then adds reflections about educational needs and processes, drawing on software studies to suggest how one might approach these things in the classroom. In her model she notes the difficulties that result from various paradoxes: the challenge of a state sponsored education dealing with private sector knowledge practices, the ethical challenges that occur when schools begin to teach digital technologies, and so forth.

Iłona Biernacka-Ligieza (“Journalists’ Role in Media Education in Poland in a Time of Globalization”) offers yet another theoretical paper but one based on practices in Poland. There, much of media education occurs in the journalism schools or in professional schools preparing students for the media industry. While the Polish programs follow typical media education theory, they also recognize the need to move beyond the traditional approaches of journalists and media education because of the changing world of the digital media.

Camille Tilleul, Pierre Fastrez, and Thierry De Smedt (“Evaluating Media Literacy and Media Education Competences of Future Media Educators”) turns from the students to the educators themselves.

What kind of educational program would best serve those who would teach young people and young adults in this area of new media? They raise the question of competence and competencies; from the literature, they conclude a view of “media as informational, technical, and social objects” (p. 77). For each of these aspects, they note that students and those teaching need to develop skills in reading, writing, navigating, and organizing. Based on this matrix they suggest both methods and tasks that educators could accomplish in the classroom and then recount how they tested this model with a class of students.

Anne Lehmanns and Vincent Liquète (“Conditions for a Sustainable Information Transculture”) report a research project that deals with “French high school pupils’ *information transliteracy*” (p. 91, italics in original). They note that “the concept of transliteracy refers to the ability to use and produce a large variety of multimedia layout, with a large variety of skills—reading, writing, counting, and computing—and the capacity to adapt information processing to its knowledge and social context” (p. 91). Their study objectives include examining the transfer of literacies, the analysis of how students would “find and use information” including environmental factors (resources, tools, services, spaces, etc.) and determining the social interactions that occurred among the students. In all of these things they highlight what they call “new forms of grammar and information” (pp. 92–93). The study considered the work that the students did as a cognitive process that took place within a group; they also paid attention to how their participants documented work and the kinds of knowledge formats that they produced.

In addition to the curricula proposed for younger students, the media literacy movement also considers university curricula. Matthias Karmasin, Sandra Diehl, and Isabell Koinig (“International University Curricula: The Relevance of Convergence to Media and Communication Studies”) propose just such a curriculum. Rooted in the discussions of convergence, they expand convergence to include the business environment, the customer, and professional media workers such as journalists. In many ways the university curriculum must prepare students for the workplace. They survey 273 degree programs in various countries around the world to get a sense of how faculties manage the curricula. They report that they found courses dealing with, for example “media and convergence management, convergence journalism, integrating media: convergence and practice, cross-media journal-

ism, media literacy, and culture and media education” (p. 114). They conclude with some reflections on the ways these curricula could serve as models and how faculty could continue to develop them based on greater collaboration among schools.

Zhang Yanqiu (“Media Literacy in China: Research, Practices and Challenges”) reports how media literacy has taken root in China. Though such literacy has become part of the educational institutions for decades in many countries of the world, he notes that “China is still young at the end of the 20th century when media literacy remained as a borrowed term from the English-speaking world. It was right at the end of the last century scholars in mainland China started to fix their eyes on media literacy and media education” (p. 123). This article offers a historical review of developments in China in media education. In his survey Zhang includes journalism education in the early part of the 20th century, the use of what he terms “political communication through wallpaper” in the revolutionary period, film education in the 1980s and 1990s, the “first wave of media education.” The second wave occurred beginning in the late 1990s and drew on some of the media literacy movements from around the world. He concludes “the developments and achievements in media literacy research and practice so far are inspiring” (p. 132). He also makes recommendations for moving forward in this enterprise in contemporary China.

Leonardo Custódio (“Political Peculiarities of Media Education in Brazilian Favelas”) turns attention to Brazil. Based on fieldwork in Brazil, Custódio analyzes “the relationship between participation in NGO-driven media education and favela media activism in Rio de Janeiro” (p. 135). He discusses both the background situation of the favelas and the approaches to media education, which is provided not so much in schools but by the non-governmental organizations. In the media education programs three particular characteristics emerge: a focus on social inequality, on ideas of citizenship, and on the role of politics in that particular situation.

Sirkku Kotilainen and Manisha Pathak-Shelat (“Media and Information Literacies and the Well-being of Young People: Comparative Perspectives”) step back from individual countries and look at the ideas of media education across the global South. Choosing to focus on “child well-being” rather than “child welfare” (p. 148), they report a comparative study of four sites: Argentina, Egypt, Finland, and India. In each site they

gathered data on common themes in media literacy education. These include “1. Practices and media use and motives for media use . . . 2. Activities, participation in events through public media . . . 3. Ethical reflections including media criticism” (p. 150). In their conclusions they note, regarding worldwide efforts that universal media literacy education “cannot address the well-being of our large and diverse global youth population” (p. 154). But they also comment that “we definitely see a relevant role for international organizations as well as educators (international, national, and local) in the modular and situated approach to MIL we are developing. We suggest three important dimensions for planning specific MIL programs: media and infrastructural access, political situation, and local media cultures including opportunities for MIL” (p. 154).

Marketa Zezulkova (“Media Learning in Primary School Classrooms: Following the Teacher’s Pedagogy and the Child’s Experience”) also reports on a research study of media learning. Her study brings together “teachers’ pedagogical beliefs and practices with children’s multifaceted media engagements” (p. 159). Based on interviews with teachers in a number of regions throughout the world she describes primary school teachers’ approaches to media literacy education, noting the successes and failures, given the varying situations of their students.

Lana Ciboci, Igor Kanižaj, and Danijel Labaš (“Public Opinion Research as a Prerequisite for Media Education Strategies and Policies”) offer “a new approach to the implementation of media education policies in countries accessing the EU. We are exploring the degree to which public opinion research has been recognized by the member states as an important prerequisite for new policies” (p. 171). The study, based in Croatia, tested several hypotheses regarding how the citizens of the Republic of Croatia would understand media literacy education and how they would wish to see it implemented. The researchers also noted some of the areas in which media information literacy has succeeded, including the use of volunteers, the analysis and critical evaluation of the media, creating new media, identifying action steps, raising awareness in the scholarly community, and cooperating with organizations for research, publicity, and pressuring governments (pp. 176–178).

As several of the previously reported studies make clear, the media literacy and education programs do involve political discussion and political decision-making. Matteo Stocchetti (“Making Futures: The

Politics of Media Education”) directly examines the role of politics. He writes that “in relation to the future of media education, a most relevant problem among these is *the relationship between the crisis of capitalism and the role of digital technology*” (p. 183, italics in original). He notes that this crisis combines a political crisis and involves both global markets as well as understanding the needs of the future. How should the liberal democratic tradition address this? He concludes with some suggestions, including ways to address individual needs to form students for greater participation in the democratic tradition.

The second part of the volume deals with case studies of media and information literacy education. Covering a wide range of regions, classrooms, and approaches, most chapters are relatively short, but the studies do provide introductions to the issues and the approaches in the regions. These include Li Xiguang (“Teaching a Journalism that Never Dies: A Learning Caravan in the Asian Borderlands”). This study examines what happens in the Tuva Republic and offers a sense of hands-on teaching and learning with migrant people. Using very different technologies, Maria Aparecida Campos Mamede-Neves and Stella Maria Peixoto de Azevedo Pedrosa (“The Use of Social Networks Online: A Cause of Intergenerational Conflicts?”) return to Brazil. In their course, they focus on the difference between the parents’ and children’s uses of social networks. The research involves profiling the children’s approaches, identifying the daily interactions with family members as well as social networks, and examining “aspects of their relationships with peers, teachers, and other school actors” (p. 207).

Much writing on the digital world involves the blurring of lines between production and consumption, with many of the users of social networking sites actually producing the content for the site. The description of these practices has resulted in the neologism “prosumer.” Daniela Cinque and Claudia D’Antoni (“Teen Prosumers: Possible Mission on the Web”) offer a case study “to focus attention on these teen *prosumers*, particularly some forms of identity construction and cultural self production on the web, and in the meantime bring into focus the role of the web in arousing or eroding the teens’ social capital” (p. 215, italics in original). Their pilot study of Italian teenagers focused on four venues of production: blogs, Tumblr, web radio, and fan fiction. In each of these they examined the ideas of the “1. creator’s self presentation and identity, 2. conversations and interactions, 3. recurring themes, and 4.

virtual semantic communities as participative prostheses:” (p. 216). Among other things they discovered the complexity of teen life in the online world and realized that generalizations really do not apply given the variety of situations. They also noted that “the recovery of the role of cultural mediation by adults” becomes important in this particular work, because many times younger students cannot critically think about even the work that they themselves are doing (p. 220).

In a similar study based in Madrid, María José Díaz-Aguado, Laia Falcón, Patricia Núñez, and Liisa Hanninen (“Media Literacy and Identity of Adolescent Students in Media Fiction”) report a pilot study that examines how Spanish students work together to create media fiction. They note that “it is principally through our own narratives that we introduce ourselves to the world, and it is through a culture’s narrative that it provides models of identity to its members” (p. 225). They studied student narratives to follow this process in action. In reviewing the narratives they wanted to “1. understand that audiovisual fiction follows economic, narrative, and media factors that may affect its representations; 2. learn to critically analyze media representations; 3. apply the skills described above to evaluate teenage student characters delivered by the different types of audiovisual narrative; 4. be aware of the possible influence such representations may exercise on the construction of the teenage identity, taking into account the characteristics that match what we want to develop . . . ; and 5. apply the previous aims to the inner storytelling of their self identities by integrating the role that school plays in their future” (p. 227). In addition to looking at student creations they also met with the students in discussion groups about various media products and asked how the students understood themselves vis-à-vis these products.

Ana Solano, Tamara Bueno Doral, and Noelia García Castillo (“Corporal Imaginaries: Gender Perspective Applied to Digital Media Literacy in Early Childhood”) describe a video installation intended for museums, based on the research of two of the authors. The installation YOYOMIOMIO attempts to “translate into artistic language McLuhan’s exploration of the visual and acoustic space, as well as Haraway’s assertion about the sex/gender system” (p. 237). The authors’ concern includes the gender socialization that occurs in childhood as well as the familiarization for children with museums and art. In their case study they describe the installation and then the observations they made of children at the museum.

Working with a younger group of students, Klaus Thestrup (“A Framework for the Future: When Kindergartens Go Online”) presents a research project from Denmark that “aims to investigate how children and pedagogues can communicate with kindergartens and others around the globe” (p. 247). Focused on preschool children, ages 3 to 6, and the integration of social media technologies in the classroom, this study explores how very young children might use narratives and technology, asking for example about how these young children communicate about the things that they wish to communicate. The observations of the study indicates that even young children can develop some of the initial skills regarded as important for media literacy education, including telling stories and talking to one another.

Dag Asbjørnsen provides another perspective on the European Union and the ways in which EU policies on the audience develop, especially for these younger groups (“Media Literacy and the EU: From Consumer Protection to Audience Development”). This case study presents “the development of the concept of media literacy through close reading of the most important [EU policy] documents from the end of the 1990s until today” (p. 257). This review of the various documents provides an overview of the ways in which media literacy education has entered into the discourse of the European Union, particularly in terms of protection discourses: protecting cultural policy, protecting cultural heritage, or protecting the audience.

Kostas Voros (“Media Education in Greece: Antecedents and the New Challenges in a Time of Crisis”) outlines the background for media education in Greece, its history, and then of course the challenges that it currently faces during the financial crisis. Voros includes developments that occurred in the schools, film festivals, official government offices, the academic sector, and so on. The current developments show certain limitations by some of the actors, given the financial constraints. He concludes that “the situation in media education in Greece is fragmented and its direction unclear. The current situation is comprised of a mixture of approaches to media as an art form, as a transparent language not involving critical thinking, coupled with fears about manipulation that lead to views of media education as a way of protection” (p. 276).

Agata Walczak-Niewiadomska (“Media Education as an Important Part of Library Services in Poland”) calls attention to the extension of media messages and the increased access to various types of

equipment in Poland. She writes “paradoxically, however, the rapid development of technology and the growing group of citizens able to buy the cheaper devices have contributed to the identification of new research problems involving, among other things, heavy users of the Internet and computer games, and the creation of a group of excluded people who did not keep up with this rapid rate of change” (p. 279). The situation opens up a new opportunity for media literacy education and could be fulfilled by library services, which allow media literacy to take place outside of the formal school system. She writes “libraries, regardless of which groups of readers they serve when it comes to age, beliefs, or attitudes, will certainly have to pay greater attention to media education” (p. 288).

Patrick Verniers (“Four Scenarios to Consider Regarding the Future of Media Education”) closes the book with this overview of potential directions for media education. The four scenarios that he suggests are “Scenario one. A structured ‘standalone’ discipline.” This refers to a classroom-based disciplinary approach similar to what has traditionally occurred. “Scenario two. An integrated and transversal development.” In this approach “learners are engaged at several levels in Media Education learning activities with the specific added value of each discipline” (p. 292). The third scenario involves a “project oriented integration,” which “intends to develop Media Education at the crossroads of school and society. Based on specific projects, handled by the learners themselves, Media Education is conceived as an open space into a citizenship experience.” The final scenario involves media education as “a single ‘meta’ discipline” in which “media education is conceived as a new way to access the emerging knowledge society. This scenario starts from the idea that school is no longer the place where knowledge is delivered, but rather where the learner develops his/her capacities to access, critically understand, and efficiently use the network, mediated knowledge available online” (p. 293).

This volume provides a wealth of information about media and information literacy education around the world. As is evident in each of the case studies and in the theoretical work, media literacy educators wrestle with the idea of both convergent technologies and the digital world with its constant, always-on approach to delivering mediated content. They also show great awareness of the shifting roles of the consumer and producer of these materials, and note in some of the

case studies that even though children and young people have rapidly embraced these technologies, they do not always understand the technologies nor what these kinds of technologies can do to them. Social media have provided a new kind of socialization for young people, a process that not even the educators fully understand. The media and information literacy group shows now that it both struggles to theoretically understand this world and is willing to experiment with different approaches to it. The case studies from around the world offer different approaches that others might try, although the researchers themselves know the cultural variety in different parts of the world requires different approaches.

This book certainly should be part of the library of anyone interested in children and media or in media and information literacy. The book does contain brief information about each of the contributors, including contact information for them. However there is no index and the reader must depend on the table of contents as a guide to the materials themselves.

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

**Lemish, Dafna.** *Children and Media: A Global Perspective.* West Sussex, England: Wiley Blackwell, 2015. Pp. 296. ISBN: 978-1-118-78706-9 (cloth) \$92.95; 978-1-118-78677-2 (paper) \$41.95; 978-1-118-78708-3 (E-book) \$33.99.

There are no shortage of textbooks that attempt to provide a broad overview of the research on children's relationship to media. Most take a decidedly empirical and individualistic approach, summarizing quantitative research evidence about media impacts on individual children. Individual differences in children are addressed, but in most standard texts, the cultural context in which children grow is reduced to variables like socio-economic status or race/ethnicity. This text stands out among other books that could be used in college/university courses for its more holistic approach and discussion of research evidence that draws on a variety of paradigms and methodologies. Throughout the text, Lemish emphasizes the need to consider the interactions between the "four big Cs: the Child, the Content of the media, the Context in which media are integrated, the potential for Consequences of media experiences." (pp. 238–239).

I first encountered the work of the author when I was in graduate school and was assigned to read her "Viewers in Diapers" chapter in Thomas Lindlof's edited book *Natural Audiences: Qualitative Research of Media Uses and Effects*. It was the mid-1980s and the real beginning of a movement to disrupt the dominant paradigm at the time: the focus on individual differences in children's cognitive development as the primary explanatory mechanism for the influence of media on youth. Lemish was among those who challenged this dominant paradigm by focusing attention on naturalistic observations of children's interactions with and use of media technology and content in their environments (homes, schools, day care centers) which provided rich accounts of the multiple and complex relationships between children and their screens.

In her work, Lemish not only focuses her attention on the role of children's environments in shaping their experiences with media, but she also advocates for the rights of children to be served by media systems that promote their health and well-being, as well as for producers' rights to serve children and not the marketplace. This perspective comes through in this text as she takes readers on a journey through the academic research that is increasingly cross-disciplinary, providing evidence of the reciprocal relationship between children and media around the world. She explains the importance of taking a global perspective on this topic by highlighting the universality of psychological explanations of children's cognitive development, the increasingly global access to media provided by mobile technology and the Internet, and the globalization of media industries that provide so much of the story content that children consume around the world.

The chapter topics are somewhat standard for an introductory textbook: theoretical models for understanding how children learn from media; media impact on school achievement; learning from educational media; impact of media violence and sexual content on youth behaviors and knowledge; advertising and consumer culture; media representations and their impact on perceptions of self and society. But while the topics may be familiar, her approach is unique: she encourages readers to see the varied interconnections between ways of thinking about children coming from a breadth of research. She draws upon the work of scholars in media studies, psychology, sociology, health, and education to challenge the reader to see the multiple perspectives.

She also provides evidence of negative *and* positive uses and impacts of media in each chapter. (It is not unusual for texts in this topic area to focus on negative impacts in the bulk of the text, save for a chapter on “prosocial effects.”) For instance, in the chapter on “Media and Health-related Behaviors,” Lemish provides a comprehensive introduction to the study of media impact on children’s physical and mental health through addressing the following outcomes: physical and social aggression; sexual activity and sexual knowledge; eating, drinking, and tobacco or drug use. Her chapter addresses the relevant theoretical explanations, and illustrates how antisocial *and* prosocial outcomes are possible from media exposure. Individual differences among children are discussed as mediating factors, but so are contextual factors such as family and culture, as well as historical circumstances. In the section on violence, for example, she challenges the reader: “Could the fact that Israeli children glorify wrestlers of the *World Wrestling Federation* as American heroes be due to their living with an omnipresent threat of violence and terrorism, and thus viewing the *WWF* intensifies their vulnerability to such portrayals of violence?” (p. 108).

The chapter I found most intriguing is the one titled, “Media and Perceptions of Self and Society.” In this chapter, Lemish takes readers through the theoretical models of identity development and socialization and then challenges us to think about what it means to develop an identity in the world today. With mass emigration from many countries, today’s children are growing up in societies that are dramatically different from the ones in which their parents grew up, and often ones that tell stories about “self” and “other” that challenge traditional beliefs. The many diaspora children who inhabit geographical space that is unfamiliar can find familiar stories and characters in online or televisual spaces. They can connect and tell their stories as they shape new trans-cultural identities. While she acknowledges the role of youth in creating a “hybrid glocalized culture that emerges from the struggle between local and global forces and results in a culture that is a combination of different characteristics” (p. 163), she nevertheless reminds us that the stories available in the globally-distributed media come embedded with messages that reinforce particular worldviews that “make it hard for children to resist them, or to undertake an oppositional process of negotiation with them” (p. 167). With this in mind,

she explores media literacy and media policy exemplars around the world.

This text provides a very accessible introduction to the standard range of topics typically covered in books of its ilk. But it also provides a much broader perspective than any other text available. Lemish’s holistic perspective integrates quantitative, qualitative, and critical research from a variety of academic disciplines. She challenges the reader to examine the actual lived realities of children around the world, and to imagine the range of possibilities that media can provide as they navigate their way to adulthood. It is a book that both celebrates and problematizes children’s growing access to and use of media. It offers a comprehensive snapshot of a vast body of knowledge to date, and encourages readers to reflect on the how the changing nature of media will be consequential in the lives of children in the future.

—Katharine Heintz  
Santa Clara University

**Olsson, Tobias** (Ed.). *Producing the Internet: Critical Perspectives of Social Media*. Göteborg, Sweden: NORDICOM, 2013. Pp. 259. ISBN 978-91-86523-59-6 (paper) 250,00 kr, €28.00. (Also available as a PDF download from [www.nordicom.gu.se](http://www.nordicom.gu.se))

*Producing the Internet* provides both theoretical and practical reflections on the Internet 2.0, participatory social approaches to the Internet, and the various things arise from them. The sense of a participatory online culture raises any number of theoretical considerations, not the least of which has to do with what “participatory” might mean. Many authors have called attention to the fact that more people have access to online applications and online participation, how this phenomena blurs lines between producers and consumers, and how it changes notions of work, advertising, or commercial activity, and even the voluntary surrender of personal information as users contribute to the various Internet sites. The book sets out to examine this phenomenon through a series of individual but interrelated reflections. The editor, Tobias Olsson, explains that “the book is divided into four sections that organize the chapters according to their main areas of interest. The first section is named ‘Producing Social Media Platforms: Power and Organization’ and is mainly concerned with overarching, theoretical aspects” (p. 15). The second part of

the book has to do more with ideas about how the notion of producing media content has changed. The chapters in that section look at media organizations and the media professionals who work in this new environment. The third part of the book “Producers of Communities/ Communities of Producers” examines the various people who (voluntarily) participate in online writing and producing. The last section returns to some of the theoretical debates about social media.

The first section of the book presents more theoretical studies, which raise quite interesting questions, particularly in the light of how many commentators have more or less assumed the notion of a participatory web culture. In “Social Media and Capitalism,” Christian Fuchs offers a “critical political economy analysis of social media” (p. 25). His perspective comes from Marxist analysis and offers a new interpretation of how this analysis of capital, the accumulation of capital, the role of labor, and the creation of surplus labor can describe what has happened within the notion of the participatory Web 2.0. As a grounding for his analysis, he highlights the various definitions of participation, participatory media, and participatory democracy. Noting correctly that any sense of participation already includes a hierarchy of who is allowed to speak or how seriously comments from different individuals might be taken by the community of web users, Fuchs raises questions about the roles of participation, particularly as a capitalistic society defines them. The idea of participation has intimate connections with capital and labor and the power relations of society. Fuchs concludes by writing, “Corporate social media are not a realm of user/prosumer participation, but a realm of Internet prosumer commodification and exploitation. The exploitation of Internet processing and labor is one of many tendencies of contemporary capitalism” (p. 39). He suggests four strategies of how people might resist this kind of corporate capitalism in terms of the development of Web 2.0: “1) the advancement of opt-in online advertising, 2) civil society surveillance of Internet companies, 3) the establishment and support of alternative platforms, and 4) the establishment of an alternative societal context of Internet use” (p. 39).

José van Dijck in “Social Media Platforms as Producers” argues “that the production of sociability, connectivity, and creativity should be accredited to a complex amalgam of actors” (p. 45). In this he wants to create a realistic model of social media that includes more than the corporate production of Web 2.0 or even

the owners or the participants. He concludes that social media production has become a very complex thing, “no longer a singular entity, but is distributed among various levels: technology, users, content, as well as owners, business, and governance models” (p. 59).

Nico Carpentier (“The Participatory Organization. Alternative Models for Organizational Structure and Leadership”) theoretically examines the idea of democracy and democratization. Much of the writing about Web 2.0 praises it as leading to greater democratic participation. However, Carpentier raises questions about the very nature of what this kind of democracy means, pointing out that any organization must in some way structure the lives of its participants. He focuses the chapter “on one concept, the notion of organization (and its tracks, leadership), which has arguably gone through such a change and fell from discursive grace in the third stage of democratization in the media sphere” (pp. 63–64). Throughout the chapter he identifies multiple models for democratization and suggests that organizations could structure themselves in different ways to allow different forms of governance in different forms and levels of participation. He notes that one resolvable challenge includes providing both physical and virtual spaces for different kinds of participation.

The second section of the book turns towards media producers. With often rapid, and sometimes completely disruptive change in the media world as a result of digital convergence, media workers find themselves struggling to keep up. Many of the chapters in this section provide case studies of particular groups and the kind of work that they do in this changing environment for their work. In “Dirty Work: Why Journalists Shun Reader Comments,” Dino Viscovi and Malin Gustafsson report on a series of interviews with journalists in Sweden in which they investigated both the scope of journalistic work and the ways that journalists responded comments that readers would leave on stories. Their employers (the newspaper owners) had attempted to get more reader participation and increase readership through this method. Noting that the journalists question the quality of the user comments, they apply an anthropological principle from Mary Douglas in her analysis of taboos—what she calls the “dirt” that cultures wrestle with. Here, “dirt” refers to something that people say “simply does not fit into the categories of the cultural system” (p. 91). This serves to frame the discussion of user comments. Historically in Sweden, newspapers, even 200 years

ago, welcomed material from readers, both comments on stories and reporting itself. But as journalism and journalists became more highly trained, they embraced a gradual professionalization within journalism that still exists today even in the online world. And that professionalization leads, the authors maintain, to the lower status of user comments.

Another experiment with user generated comments, this time for television, appears in “Transmedia Storytelling and a Young Audience: Public Service in the Blogosphere Era” (Ulrika Sjöberg and Ingegerd Rydin). Sjöberg and Rydin examine how one television network attempted to involve the younger teenage audience in the production of a television series in Sweden. The producers created a blog ostensibly written by the characters of the program in which they would both sketch out the daily life of a teenager but also welcome comments from other teens that could then be incorporated into the storyline. This became a way of using social media to market the program and to build an audience. Not surprisingly, some evidence of parasocial interaction appeared, as teens treated the characters as real and tried to interact with them as peers; this led to some dissatisfaction with the program itself. The authors offer criticisms of this kind of use of digital platform, although they do recognize the creativity in that particular approach. María Isabel Villa reports a third case study (“Cross-media Production Networks: Comparing Organizations in Public Service Broadcasting Programmes”). Villa introduces some of the theoretical background on cross-media production noting that it draws on “the rationalist school of thought” and fosters a particular production model, which may or may not work in the media convergence world. She writes,

this investigation breaks away from this view [functionalist or positivist paradigms] and takes a different approach to the problem. We do not intend to provide definite answers to the tensions that inevitably occur in a cross-media environment, nor did we attempt to abridge the complexity of the dynamics involved. Rather we are interested in examining the interrelationship between actors during the production of cross media television content. The aim of this research is to find out how the production practices are designed and redesigned in order for each program to fit the changes in context, to study the similarities and differences between them, and compare the advantages and disadvantages of each organization. (pp. 122)

After reporting in some detail case studies of several networks which attempted this kind of convergence in their production and using an actor network theory analysis, she reports that “the findings showed that cross-media production practices are not predictable; they do not imply routine and rigid work patterns and evade every attempted generalization” (p. 139). If anything, this case provides yet another perspective on the complexity which arises from the kind of Web 2.0 participatory production the other cases describe.

The third section of the book wrestles with the idea of community.

“Bringing up Bg-mamma: Organized Producers between Community and Commerce” examines a Bulgarian social media site. Maria Bakardjieva spent a number of years doing a very close qualitative study of the site. She reports both on the activity on the site and on several larger themes that emerge: *materiality*, which she points out as underlying any virtual world (the hardware, software interfaces, and various kinds of technical support); *personality*, which obviously plays a role in why people continue on the site; *utility*—users must find a social media site useful for them to continue with it; *sociability*; and *solidarity*. She notes that “sociability cannot be separated from utility . . . It is often itself utility the user seeks” (p. 151). For many users the sociability is the reason for any kind of social media site. Solidarity refers to a required mutuality or reciprocity through which the users form a kind of community. In examining the success of this Bulgarian site, Bakardjieva points out the need to balance what she calls community with commerce since all of the sites exist in a for-profit world. Another approach to the sense of online communities comes from Stina Bengtsson (“The Producer as Vendor: Producing Public Space in a Virtual World”) who looks at the case where the producer of the site also functions at the same time as a vendor. She focuses on a civic effort in Second Life, “Malmo and Second Life,” the attempt by the Swedish city of Malmo to provide a presence within this virtual reality world. The effort ultimately failed but it offers a good understanding of what might be required to produce a civic space in an online world. Some people found the site a helpful enterprise while others regarded it as a waste of civic resources. Cities have always existed in media spaces, and the question facing many cities now is how to make themselves present in a new media world.

Another way of looking at social media sites comes from Anna Lund (“The Civic Potential of the

Digital Horse”). She examines a site called “The Stable,” a Swedish site focused on girls and young women with an interest in horses. However, as she points out, the discussions among the members of the social media site went far beyond simply a love of animals, horses, and outdoors topics, but touched on a lot of other lifestyle choices in the discussion forums. These included things like social expectations, school, strategies for dealing with the day-to-day problems that young girls and teens might face, experiences of hierarchical relationships, and interpersonal issues. Lund’s ethnography examines how the users negotiated the virtual space and supported one another in it. The larger question she identifies has to do with creating a democratic integration for girls and young women. She writes “perhaps The Stable is of particular importance to democratic integration from a feminist perspective. The history of citizenship is a male story, and when a woman takes her place in public life, it is common that she is primarily seen as a woman and secondarily as a public person with official duties, responsibilities, and knowledge” (p. 199). Lund argues that the experience of The Stable allows young women and girls to create a kind of civic environment for themselves with the freedom to experiment that public civic engagement does not offer.

The fourth part of the book deals with creating civic spaces in the online world. Peter Dahlgren (“Contingencies of Online Political ‘Producers’: Discourse Theory and the ‘Occupy Wall Street’ Movement”) presents a thought experiment to explore what would need to happen in order to produce such an online space, using discourse theory as a theoretical grounding and the Occupy Wall Street movement as his case study. After noting a number of ways in which civic engagement takes place outside of traditional electoral politics, he notes, “these phenomena differ greatly in circumstances and character, but in all cases they make use of up-to-date digital multimedia, especially portable variants. Many among the activists or what we can call political producers, that is, while they are users in the traditional sense, they also specifically make use of these communication technologies to produce their own materials” (p. 203). In the rest of the chapter he explains the methodology of discourse theory and the tools that it provides, which he applies to the Occupy Wall Street movement. He notes the unusual quality of that movement in terms of “the hegemonic discourses of late capitalism, offering many people critical subject positions

that previously were not possible within the realm of legitimate politics” (p. 218).

Another set of case studies examines web producers for civic purposes in Europe and in Turkey. Shakuntala Banaji and David Buckingham (“Creating the Civic Web: Exploring the Perspectives of Web Producers in Europe and Turkey”) call attention to the “the organizations or individuals who produce such sites [and] the context in which they are actually created” (p. 221). They aim to examine how workers produce the sites and the labor involved in those sites. Banaji and Buckingham provide a detailed look at this work in “Hungary, Netherlands, Spain, Slovenia, Sweden, Turkey, and the UK” (p. 221). The methodology included interviews with the people involved in each site regarding both questions of practice and discussions regarding philosophical issues about audience conceptualization, the affordances of the medium, and their conceptualization of civic participation. The researchers also examined funding models, the attempts to market the sites to young people (the intended audience), and the appropriateness of the Internet as the medium to do this. The interviews also explored notions of interactivity, of safety online, and of the larger political sphere. In conclusion, they note that “for the young people in our focus groups, the most important forms of civic motivation and serious political action are usually found off line. The Internet is seen to serve various political functions here: it might provide a spark that provokes people to action; it might serve as a conduit or tool or a space for storing information and for communication; it might be primarily a promotional gimmick enabling ideas and issues to circulate, and campaigns and movements to organize and debate” (p. 235). In other words the two realms serve as complements to each other.

In some ways the final chapter in the book returns to the questions of production and capital raised in the first essay. Anders Svensson (“Adopting Social Media in the Corporate Sphere: The Tricky Route to Monetization of Facebook Fan Pages”) examines how Facebook managed to turn their highly popular pages into sources of income. Many of the social media sites are indeed corporately sponsored and exist for a profit-making motive. At the same time this raises questions about the relationship of the motivation of the sites to make money and the motivation to provide a public service or to be seen as serving the public good. The essay presents a case study of Facebook and how that company negotiated

its needs in terms of relationships with the users, gaining credibility, and making a profit.

*Producing the Internet* offers a number of perspectives on the Internet, though frozen in time during the period in which the book was produced. Given the rapid change of the Internet, some of these studies seem prescient in raising key issues while time and online practices have more or less bypassed others, with a different growth model gaining ground in the online world. However, the essays justify time spent in reading. Each tries to theorize a complex ongoing communication movement and environment, and in doing so challenges the reader to take a broader view of something that may seem quite well-known.

Each chapter contains its own reference list. There is no index for the book; one needs instead to refer to chapter titles for a sense of the topics raised throughout.

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

**Vecsey, Christopher.** *Jews and Judaism in The New York Times*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield (Lexington Books), 2013. Pp. 395. ISBN 978-0-7391-8469-1 (cloth) \$100.00; 978-0-7391-8491-2 (paper) \$49.99; 978-0-7391-8470-7 (E-book) \$49.99.

Reviewing the articles in *The New York Times* on Judaism published over a 30-year period, 1970–2001, Christopher Vecsey seeks to construct an image of how Judaism is presented in *The New York Times*, one of the world's leading newspapers. Given the newspaper's influence on the U.S. national agenda, as well as that New York has over 1.7 million Jews, and that the newspaper is Jewish-owned, a book about Jews and Judaism in *The New York Times* is timely, indeed overdue. The newspaper's awareness of its Jewish readership is evident from the fact that, according to the author's estimate, 13% or 2000 of the 15,000 articles about religion published in the 30-year period examined dealt with the Jewish religion.

Unlike an academic tome, a newspaper's day-by-day coverage necessarily produces a disconnected picture—covering those aspects of Judaism defined by the newspaper as newsworthy, such as being important or interesting, and like much coverage of news, being conflict-focused. “My aim,” Vecsey writes, “is to compile a multi-detailed encyclopedic portrait of Jews and Judaism.” The concept may seem to some to be an

upgraded version of “Front Page *New York Times*.” Indeed, the author broadly succeeds in presenting a coherent picture drawing upon the mass of articles under such chapter headings as “The Structure of American Judaism,” “Jewish Institutions,” “The Legacy of the Holocaust,” “The Jewish Diaspora,” “Relations with the Gentile world,” as well as “Israel and Zionism.” And, while *The New York Times* itself has been subject to a number of book-length and monograph studies, both academic and not, this is a rare book-length account of the paper's Jewish aspects.

The author, a theology professor at Colgate University, New York, is at his best in discussing the religious dimensions of his topic. Even though the creation of Israel, together with the Holocaust, was, in the author's own words, the major story for *The New York Times*, the ins-and-outs of the various political, diplomatic, military, and economic elements and stages of the Arab-Israeli conflict attract his interest much less. Instead the author focuses upon internal Israeli religious and cultural dimensions—producing an albeit abysmally incomplete and superficial treatment of the paper's coverage of the Arab-Israeli conflict—all in a single chapter. In-depth analyses of the newspaper's coverage on Israel have appeared elsewhere—such as Neil Lewis's (2012) study on “Israel in *The New York Times* Over the Decades,” published by Harvard University's Shorenstein Center. Yet, that so little research attention has been given to such other “internal” Jewish themes like rabbis, Jewish educational institutions, relations between different branches of Judaism, and different Jewish communities, means that Vecsey has nevertheless made a valuable contribution.

The author focuses on the numerous news reports and articles by the paper's reporters and correspondents. But he also covers the hundreds of books published about Jews and Judaism reviewed on the paper's pages. Unexplainedly, however, he ignores almost entirely the unsigned editorials by *The New York Times*—which surely provide the most authoritative statement of what *The New York Times* thinks about Israel, Jews, and Judaism.

In focusing on the post-1970 period, the book does not discuss the two major developments, the Holocaust and the creation of the State of Israel—which were controversial and problematic for *The New York Times*—even though the book covers the newspaper's coverage of related developments to these after 1970.

These two events did test (and fail) the newspaper's independence from publisher pressure. The newspaper came into the possession of the current owners, the Sulzbergers when it was bought in 1896 by Adolph Ochs, the son of a lay rabbi from German stock and married to the daughter of the leading reform rabbi, Isaac Mayer Wise. Like his son after him, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, both were acutely concerned about their social standing in American society and were anxious that the newspaper should not be perceived as "a Jewish newspaper."

When the Second World War broke out, the newspaper missed what would be one of the war's major stories: the annihilation of six million Jews. Sulzberger deliberately lowered the newspaper's attention to the story. Despite the paper's network of foreign correspondents—considered one of the paper's great assets—the paper failed to fully grasp the genocide. Laurel Leff, author of *Buried by The Times: The Holocaust and America's Most Important Newspaper* (2006), charges that the newspaper treated it as a secondary story and that only six times during the entire war did the genocide make the paper's front pages, instead being tucked away on inside pages. True, other U.S. papers also failed at the time to gauge the scale of atrocities but just 11 editorials appeared in *The New York Times* about the persecution of the Jews in 1938, and only three each in 1941, 1942, and 1943. Partly, the "low profile" reflected how Sulzberger wholly identified with Reform Judaism's belief that the Jews were a religion, not a nation.

Even a tour of Dachau and the ovens by Arthur Hays Sulzberger failed to move him to support a Jewish homeland, according to Susan Tiffit and Alex Jones in their widely acclaimed book, *The Trust* (1999) about the Sulzbergers. However, Sulzberger's influential wife, Iphigene, did change her view following the genocide to back the idea of a Jewish state—if only also to cease attending the reform temple, Temple Emanu-El, of which her husband was a trustee, asking, "Had God never heard of Auschwitz?"

So, it was no surprise that come Israel's independence, the newspaper editorialized against the creation of the Jewish state. Arthur Hays Sulzberger instructed staff not to refer in editorials to "the Jewish nation."

Anxious not to be seen as the "Jewish newspaper," journalists who were Jewish were not appointed during the Ochs and Sulzberger years to senior editorial positions. Indeed, journalists with Jewish names were asked to be discreet and write in their by-line only

their initials. Thus, for example, Abraham Rosenthal became "A. M. Rosenthal." Although the paper was one of the first foreign media organizations to open a full time bureau in Israel, no Jew was appointed to being the newspaper's correspondent until well into the '80s.

Yet Arthur Hays Sulzberger was wise enough to appoint Irving Spiegel to cover New York's largest Jewish community.

But once his son, "Punch" Sulzberger, took over as publisher 1963, it led to a significant change in the paper's stance. Indeed, according to Edwin Diamond's study, *Behind The Times: Inside The New York Times* (1993), the 1967 Six Day War so impacted upon "Punch" that he became a Zionist. Jews were appointed to senior positions. Indeed, A. M. Rosenthal (married to a Catholic but identifying as a Jew) became the paper's editor, the first of three Jews appointed to the post. The others were Max Frankel (the son of Israeli emigres to New York) and Jill Abramson (the first woman to be appointed to the editor's chair). The current publisher, Punch's own son, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, Jr.—who was confirmed in Church as an Episcopalian—even spent time on an Israeli kibbutz, continued with the more balanced approach.

Yet much of this newspaper history is lost in Vecsey's study not only because the book begins only from 1970 but also because of the author's approach of not probing behind the coverage; that would have offered the reader an insider view of the factors that led to the coverage of Jews and Judaism.

A clue by Vecsey to the paper's controversial handling of the Holocaust is his opening sentence at the outset of his chapter on the paper's reportage about the Holocaust after 1970 where he blandly writes "No aspect of Jewish experience has received more *Times* coverage over the past several decades than the Holocaust"—a seeming *mea culpa* by the paper.

True, in an introductory chapter Vecsey summarizes briefly this history, as well as provides pen portraits of four staffers: the paper's religion affairs reporter who was Jewish, Ari Goldman, and the paper's reporter who covered the New York Jewish community, Irving Spiegel, as well as portraits of Rosenthal and Frankel. But Vecsey fails to provide new information about them, and draws almost entirely upon other published sources.

Some Jewish readers may look askance that the very first section of this first chapter, entitled

“Protocols,” revisits the question of Jews controlling the media or the infamous Protocols of the Elders of Zion—even if the author does state that “rather than count up the number of Jewish staff members and their positions at *The New York Times*, my concern in this book is to comprehend what kinds of coverage *The Times* has given to Judaism, in its many forms.”

It is no coincidence that the book is entitled *Jews and Judaism in The New York Times* rather than, say, “*The New York Times’* view of Jews and Judaism” because while the book chronicles in a systematic way how the newspaper today covers Jews and Judaism, it fails to tell us *why* it covers it in this way. To do that, the author ought to have systematically interviewed all who have been involved in covering Israel, Jews, and Judaism from the publisher to editors, religion affairs reporters, and those covering the Jewish community, the paper’s Israel-based reporters—even Jewish community leaders and pro-Israeli activists and Israeli and Arab diplomats. He ought also to have used the paper’s power archives.

And, unforgivable is the author’s failure to also survey the unsigned editorials—surely the best clue to what *The New York Times* thinks of Jews—as distinct from signed articles. Ironically, in an earlier study about the coverage of *The New York Times* post 9/11, Vecsey did go behind the scenes in a study of insider journalism to trace the newspaper’s decision-making process and interview reporters and editors. Excusing himself in the book about the Jews and Judaism, Vecsey explains that “I have not asked *Times* writers to recount emendations or rejections or to explain why they chose one topic, or one source, or one angle, over other possibilities.”

Had he have done so, he would have produced a more authoritative and significant account. This awaits another researcher’s pen. Notwithstanding this, the author skillfully weaves together an interesting contemporary mosaic of Jews and Judaism in general and in the U.S. in particular as expressed through the newspaper’s pages.

—Yoel Cohen  
Ariel University, Israel

## References

- Diamond, E. (1993). *Behind The Times: Inside The New York Times*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Leff, L. (2006) *Buried by The Times: The Holocaust and America’s most important newspaper*. Cambridge, UK and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, N. A. (2012). *Israel in The New York Times over the decades: A changed narrative and its impact on Jewish readers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy. Retrieved May 23, 2016 from [https://www.hks.harvard.edu/presspol/publications/papers/discussion\\_papers/d69\\_lewis.pdf](https://www.hks.harvard.edu/presspol/publications/papers/discussion_papers/d69_lewis.pdf)
- Tiftt, S. E., & Jones, A. S. (1999). *The trust: The private and powerful family behind The New York Times*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.

## Briefly noted

**Jockers, Matthew L.** *Macroanalysis: Digital Methods and Literary History*. Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield: 2013. Pp. 192. ISBN 978-0-252-03752-8 (cloth) \$95.00; 978-0-252-07907-8 (paper) \$32.00; 978-0-252-09476-7 (E-book).

A volume in the University of Illinois Press series Topics in the Digital Humanities, *Macroanalysis* introduces a particular approach to the digital humanities. Jockers first places his subject matter in the larger history of the rapidly growing area of the digital humanities—a history that begin in the 1940s with a lemmatized index of the corpus of the works of Thomas Aquinas. In its broadest definition, the digital humanities refers to connecting literary or textual studies to computer studies, using various kinds of digital tools in order to analyze texts in one way or another. After sketching the broad sense of that tradition, Jockers suggests one particular approach that he calls macroanalysis. He explains it by an analogy to economics. “The approach to the study of literature that I am calling ‘macroanalysis’ is in some general ways akin to economics or, more specifically, to macroeconomics.” He continues his comparison to “microeconomics, which studies the economic behavior of individual consumers and individual businesses. As such, microeconomics can be seen as analogous to our study of individual texts via ‘close readings.’ Macroeconomics, however, is about the study of the entire economy” (p. 24). Jockers’ interest then has to with a large corpus and asking questions about, for example, the “historical place of individual texts, authors, and genres in relation to a larger literary context” or “literary production in terms of the growth and decline over time or within regions or within demographic groups” or “literary-patterns and lexicons employed over time, across

periods, within regions, or within demographic groups” or “the culture and societal forces that impact literary style and the evolution of style” (p. 27). In each of these the interest in literary study has to do with larger overarching topics rather than the study of individual texts.

But how can the scholar or researcher accomplish such a sweeping perspective? Most of the book provides an introduction to particular approaches to this kind of analysis. Chapters deal with the analysis of metadata, style, nationality, theme, and influence. Each chapter identifies and defines a specific kind of macro-analysis and then gives illustrations of how researchers might carry out such work, using computer-assisted analysis. In addition to the how-to guide, Jockers also offers insights into interpreting the data generated in the project. He provides examples of analysis, reproduction of output graphics, and commentary to help the reader grasp the methods. The book also provides references to tools that digital humanities researchers might use, many of which are available online. Jockers illustrates what can happen with this kind of analysis by reference to particular literary theorists as well as to some of the background approaches that led up to the series.

The book contains an extensive reference list and a subject index. Jockers teaches English at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

**Kember, Sarah and Joanna Zylinska.** *Life after New Media: Mediation as a Vital Process*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2012. Pp. xx, 268. ISBN 978-0-26201-819-7 (cloth); 978-0-26252-746-0 (paper, issued 2014) \$20.00; 978-0-26230-627-0 (E-book) \$24.00.

Kember and Zylinska propose that the many discussions surrounding “new media” serve only to reveal the limitations of current thinking about media. Each generation, of course, discovers its own “new media”; within living memory people experience television as a new medium and 150 years ago, they considered the telegraph the transformative medium of the era. Instead of a focus on individual media, Kember and Zylinska propose that we think more seriously and systematically about mediation. In their words, “There is also a need to look at the interlocking of technical and biological processes of mediation. Do so quickly reveals that life itself under certain circumstances becomes articulated as a medium that is subject to the same

mechanisms of reproduction, transformation, flattening, and patenting that other media forms (CDs, video cassettes, chemically printed photographs, and so on) underwent previously” (p. xiii).

In their argument they draw on the theoretical work of Henri Bergson, Gilles Deleuze, and Jacques Derrida, posing them as complementary figures. Among other key topics, the book revisits the ideas of mediation, remediation, expression, photography, sustainability, and the ethics of mediation. The authors carefully craft each chapter, extensively engaging the thought of key figures and leading the reader through sometimes confusing claims about the media. Each chapter serves as a provocative and thorough review of the relevant literature.

The chapter on photographic mediation—with its reflection on “the cut”—proves particularly insightful. Photography mediates experience by removing it from time and forcing a balance (or a choice) between “the vitalism of Henri Bergson and Gilles Deleuze on the one hand, and the *différance* of Jacques Derrida and Bernard Steigler on the other” (p. 71). Again in their words, “we are interested in foregrounding the productive and performative aspect of photographic acts and practices that are intrinsic to the taking or making of a picture. With a view to this, we propose to understand photography as an active practice of cutting through the flow of mediation, where the cut operates on a number of levels: perceptive, material, technical, and conceptual” (p. 71). This cut, they show, occurs in every art, pressing human choice onto human perception. The cut also challenges recent theory about thinking—it does require a kind of cut or stopping of time, interrupting a flow in order to analyze or understand it.

Throughout they argue for “mediation” rather than “media.” The former occurs in all areas of human life whereas communication scholarship at least has limited the latter to particular forms of expression. The former focus on mediation has begun to more widely appear in communication research, primarily in the media ecology movement, which sadly the authors do not cite. Though Kember and Zylinska claim no affinity with media ecology, their *Life after New Media* provides an excellent theoretical grounding for it.

The volume features extensive end notes, bibliography, and index.

**Powell, Helen** (Ed.). *Promotional Culture and Convergence: Markets, Methods, Media*. London and

New York: Routledge (Taylor and Francis Group), 2013. Pp. x, 238. ISBN 978-0-415-67279-5 (cloth) \$135; 978-0-415-67280-1 (paper) \$45.00.

This edited collection introduces new trends in how the idea of promotion works in a digital world. Generally, promotion refers to the role of public relations, advertising, and other kinds of product promotion. In her introduction, Powell notes that this volume develops the idea of promotional culture introduced by Andrew Wernick in 1991. She writes that Wernick described the idea that “every aspect of life began to be informed by and adopt promotional strategies in order to gain attention. This infusion of publicity was to seep seamlessly into a plethora of new promotional spaces, both physical and virtual, and was framed by increasingly neo-liberal policies taking hold in the UK and the U.S. from the 1980s onward” (p. 1). Arguing that the Internet and other digital technologies have dramatically changed life in the last 20 years, Powell introduces these essays that examine how promotion and promotional culture take place in the contemporary world and how they play an increasingly large role in strategic communication..

The first part of the volume deals with methods and includes chapters on “Consumers, Markets, and Marketplaces” (Powell); “The Promotional Industries” (Powell); the move from “Integration to Convergence: The Management of Marketing Communication in Promotional Culture” (Chris Hackley and Rungpaka Amy Hackley neé Tiwsakul); “Connecting with Consumers: Branding and Convergence” (Cheryl Martens); and “The Public Relations Perspective of Promotional Culture” (Heather Yaxley).

The second part of the collection groups essays around the topic of media in context and examines how promotion occurs in different, but converging, media. Chapters here include “The Changing Relationship Between Media and Marketing” (Jonathan Hardy); “Media Convergence and Newspapers” (Daniel Lee); “Magazines and Promotion” (Tim Holmes); “Television: The TV Ad and Its Afterlife” (Jeremy Orlebar); and “Cinema: A Reflection on How the Film Industry Promotes Itself” (Searle Kochberg). While recognizing the convergence of media, the chapters treat each medium as separate, at least for analysis.

While each chapter stands alone as a separate essay, each builds on the others to provide a comprehensive look at how the idea of promotion and the groups trying to promote products have to work in a

culture in which all things move together in the digital landscape. Many of the chapters offer case studies as well as practical suggestions for the given industries that they represent.

The book has an index and each chapter has its own reference list, along with links to online sources for further data.

**Schultze, Quentin J. and Diane M. Badzinski.** *An Essential Guide to Interpersonal Communication: Building Great Relationships with Faith, Skill, and Virtue in the Age of Social Media.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015. Pp. xii, 145. ISBN 978-0-8010-3894-5 (paper) \$15.99; 978-1-4412-4872-5 (e-book) \$15.99.

The authors suggest this book as a supplement to interpersonal communication courses, even including an appendix of ways to use it in those courses. They write, “we wrote this book for everyone who wants to enjoy great relationships in our technological age. We wrote it for people of faith who desire relationships that are a taste of heaven on earth” (p. ix). Each of the eight chapters in the book approaches interpersonal communication through a brief thematic element. These include “be grateful,” “listen attentively,” “single-task,” “know yourself,” “relate openly,” “encourage others,” “promote peace,” and “restore relationships.” They end of the book with a brief conclusion on celebrating friendships.

Because the authors write from the perspective of faith, each chapter draws not only on communication research but also on biblical or other faith statements. They often cite other researchers and writers in the various Christian faith traditions to illustrate the points that they make, thus providing students with an implicit introduction to many other works in this tradition of religiously reflective communication thinking. The chapters are each relatively short, but contain material in which people can apply knowledge of interpersonal communication to particular settings. The book itself successfully combines both the communication research tradition and a religious perspective.

By including many concrete examples, the book should help undergraduate students as well as church study groups, wrestling with day-to-day issues in communication, helping them see the relevance of interpersonal communication in their daily lives.

The book contains endnotes and an index.



