

of incorporation. Particularly salient here is Eduardo Bonilla-Silva's prediction that while part of the Latino and Asian population may "become white," others will become "honorary white" (such as Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Asian Indians, and lighter-skinned Latinos), while still others will become "collective black" (Cambodians, Hmong, Laotians, and darker-skinned Latinos, along with American blacks).

One of the most interesting findings is the profound generational divide in these attitudes between the first immigrant generation and their children. For as one might expect, O'Brien finds that Latin American and Asian immigrants brought their prejudice against blacks with them, and were reinforced by the American context. But their children grew up in a post-Civil Rights movement America, and are far more inclusive than their parents. And now that intermarriage rates are triple what they were 50 years ago, O'Brien finds that intermarriage with whites is accepted, while blacks continue to be seen as undesirable. She does not address what the meaning of intermarriage within the larger ethnic group (e.g., Japanese with Koreans, Cubans with Puerto Ricans) means to them.

A major weakness of her work lies in the limited number of theoreticians whose work she covers: she fails to take into account the work of Mia Tuan, who studied various groups of Asians in California (all third generation and above, the descendants of nineteenth-century Asian migrations), with respect to whether they were to be *Forever Foreigners or Honorary Whites? The Asian Ethnic Experience Today* (Rutgers University Press, 1998). Tuan also addressed many of the same issues: residential segregation, patterns of intermarriage, and the like, with a large sample. Mia Tuan's work, in turn, was guided by Mary C. Waters' *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America* (University of California Press, 1990). Waters first established the way in which identity formation took place for the descendants of European immigrants who had become successful and lived in suburbs. Tuan explored the process of identity formation for third or higher generation Asians. Her analysis of the descendants of the old Asian immigrants in California, for example, leads

to a thesis that O'Brien could have explored: while Asians have succeeded in American society—evidenced by their levels of education and income, termed "the model minority"—they have not gained social acceptance. Tuan posits that intermarriage within the larger ethnic group has a different meaning than intermarriage with whites, as the intent is to form a bulwark against the loss of their Asian or Latin cultures, customs, and languages.

Rather than the whitening and the browning theses, which are too stark, O'Brien proposes "a color-nuanced understanding" that pays attention to the unique hybrid space of the racial middle. Ultimately they have the potential to create a powerful antiracist force.

Lastly, O'Brien also fails to note that the white population is quite diverse. There was a time when white supremacist attitudes were dominant, but now those movements have become fringe groups, as plenty of attitudinal research shows. These days, rather than the hegemony of the white, Anglo-Saxon culture of the past, many white, middle-class Americans can be found eating *sushi* and *chilaquiles*, doing *Tai-Chi* and yoga, and playing soccer, while considering the teachings of the Buddha alongside those of Jesus and Moses.

Despite its shortcomings, O'Brien's book has opened a useful path of study regarding the racial middle. Hopefully, others will widen that path.

The History of Media and Communication Research: Contested Memories, edited by **David W. Park** and **Jefferson Pooley**. New York: Peter Lang, 2008. 390pp. \$34.95 paper. ISBN: 9780820488295.

SARAH E. IGO
Vanderbilt University
sarah.igo@vanderbilt.edu

In *The History of Media and Communication Research*, David W. Park and Jefferson Pooley have accomplished that rare feat: an edited collection that adds up to far more than the sum of its parts. Moreover, they have brought a good deal of coherence to what even scholars and practitioners will admit

is a dizzyingly incoherent field, equal parts sociology, social psychology, political science, journalism, rhetoric, and cultural studies. The goal of the volume is to give communication and media studies a history—or rather, to give it a rigorous, honest one rather than a Whiggish past that mainly serves disciplinary and professional needs in the present. Lamenting the existing history of communication research as “anemic and notably unreflective” (p. 1), the editors are out to chart (and guide) an emerging subfield.

What is striking about this effort is that there are few agreed-upon strands of communications history apart from canonical, if contested, lists of “founders” (Kurt Lewin, Harold Lasswell, Paul Lazarsfeld, Carl Hovland, and the like) or key studies (the Payne Fund studies of moviegoing, wartime morale, and propaganda work, and above all, Lazarsfeld and Elihu Katz’s *Personal Influence* and its finding of “limited effects”). Equally striking is the immaturity of the field at large. The editors’ call for basic archival work, for attention to political-economic context and institutions, and for awareness of the parallel historiography of the other social sciences indicates that the history of communication studies is at its rudimentary stage of development indeed.

The collection is divided into three parts: the state of the historiography, institutional histories, and “people and places in the history of the field.” Essays range from accounts of the establishment of media studies in different national settings (newspaper science in Germany and cultural studies in Britain, for example), to quantitative analyses of the topics tackled by media researchers in the past, to histories of key organizations such as the International Association for Media and Communication Research, to intellectual biographies of figures in the field both well known (Lazarsfeld) and forgotten (William McPhee, Paul Cressey).

There is an inevitable unevenness to the contributions. The one piece to deal directly with gender, for instance, offers undigested questionnaire responses about female scholars’ experiences rather than a bold vision of how feminist communication studies might unsettle the field. This is more than made up for, however, by rich essays like David

Park’s, which restores the classic *Personal Influence* (1955) to its proper intellectual milieu, enabling us to see it as a work that departed fundamentally from most contemporary social scientists’ deep concerns about conformity. The legacy for communication studies, he suggests, was an idealized model of the public sphere based on face-to-face interaction. In the same vein, William J. Buxton’s discussion of the competing strands of communications research within the Chicago School of Sociology brings nuance to a falsely homogenized tradition. He locates a path not taken in early media studies (only to be rediscovered decades later), an approach that attributed as much power and meaning-making to audiences—here, moviegoing East Harlem juveniles—as to the medium.

Many essays are of the debunking variety. Sue Curry Jansen effectively shows how Walter Lippmann has been misread by communications scholars eager to codify a behaviorist, mechanical scholarly tradition as a foil to a more democratic Deweyite one. Similarly, Deborah Lubken traces the career of the “hypodermic needle” theory of all-powerful media influence, supposedly overthrown by the discovery of “limited effects”; she doubts whether anyone ever believed in the former theory, seeing it instead as a useful weapon in disciplinary battles and in drawing a firm line between experts on the media and mere laypeople. And Jefferson Pooley elegantly summarizes the “new” and darker history of communications that has taken root since the mid-1990s, which links the field less to progressive scientific achievements (not to mention “limited effects”) than to propaganda and psychological warfare initiatives sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation, the CIA, and the State Department.

As with all such volumes, it is impossible to summarize the contents. But several themes emerge strongly: the late-blooming historiography of the field related to its mid-century birth, the need for institutional as well as externalist histories to challenge well-worn origin myths driven by charismatic individuals and studies, and the peculiar disciplinary shape of “media and communication studies,” which arguably has been far more

successful institutionally than it has been intellectually.

Nearly all of the essays address this last theme, either implicitly or explicitly. Several grapple with the trajectory of communications research as it moved from a concept to a field to a discipline, to borrow the schema laid out by J. Michael Sproule. Veikko Pietila fruitfully explores the "social" (organized and institutional) versus "cognitive" (intellectual) consolidation of a discipline like media studies. In the process, he exposes the problematically dualistic nature of communications as a field, its roots not simply in "science" but in the need to provide journalists with professional training. A wonderful essay by John Durham Peters reconsiders the intellectual lineage of media studies. Noting the mismatch between the wide-ranging *subject* of communications and the oddly narrow ambit of the professional *discipline*—"a stunning variety of twentieth-century intellectuals had tackled communication as one of the great problems of the age, almost all of them in happy ignorance of the academic field that claimed special expertise about that problem" (p. 143)—he urges scholars to engage with the history of social psychology but also cybernetics, psychiatry, and cultural studies.

Intriguingly, Park and Pooley's volume arrives at a moment when sociologists of science have thoroughly scrutinized the process of discipline-formation as politically and ideologically loaded. One of the tantalizing questions this important volume provokes but does not quite tackle is how scholars ought best launch a new subdiscipline like the history of communications research in a postmodern era when that very project is suspect. The highly self-conscious essays assembled here, dedicated to crafting a "warts and all" historiography against the self-serving history of the past, is an excellent start.

The Problem of Order in the Global Age: Systems and Mechanisms, by **Andreas Pickel**. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. 218pp. \$74.95 cloth. ISBN: 9781403972446.

THOMAS BURR
Illinois State University
 tburr@ilstu.edu

This is a difficult yet worthwhile book. The author's style is dense and abstract—some might say a fitting style for political theory—and the reading is slow going, but it has its virtues and is worth tackling. Andreas Pickel examines the problem of political order. His stated purpose is "to contribute conceptualizations, analytical tools, and perspectives that may be of use in the many different situations in which the problem of order is salient" (pp. 1–2). The book does exactly this, relying on empirical research throughout; yet empirical evidence is secondary here—wrestling with and refining conceptualization is the prime object. And while Pickel is obviously a political scientist, he takes an explicitly interdisciplinary approach to the subject, cites a number of sociologists throughout, and ultimately makes a contribution to understanding politics through social psychology.

Since order is a perennial problem, it has been treated as a perennial problem—that is, as a general problem that should be analyzed by theory. Yet as Pickel points out, such political problems always appear in particular settings under particular circumstances. He argues for analyzing sociopolitical order with a system approach, explicitly arguing against methodological individualism, and posing three types of systems: material, semiotic, and conceptual. Systems operate through mechanisms, or processes that have effects. He gives examples of mechanisms in social systems drawn from sociology (social boundaries, the Protestant Ethic, and postcommunist transformation). Unfortunately, despite the fact that "order" is the central concept in the book, he never defines it at length, only quickly as stability or "a viable framework of political power, that is, a political order" (p. 54), or contrasts it with chaos, violence, and anarchy (pp. 56, 68). This is barely sufficient; had he

satire when it sees it (p. 100). Audiences are smart, so says this collection, but the implication that satire TV is pedagogical is a more tenuous argument without evidence of any learning going on, an oft-cited Pew Report notwithstanding. As we might expect, Henry Jenkins holds Internet parody in high esteem for its pedagogical possibilities in engaging youth as part of participatory democracy. Joanne Morreales puts the pedagogical model at the center of her rhetorical analysis of *TDS* but without an adequate accounting of how pleasure figures into the equation. Her discussion of the *TDS* is a double-positioning of epideictic rhetoric, for not only does *TDS* employ this form of persuasion (presumably from an ethical position, particularly as she positions Stewart as an “educator” who leads by example), the show critiques this rhetorical technique when employed in the production of news and in the propagating of politics (presumably from an unethical position?). There is an underlying assumption throughout that when satire is working, laughter will lead to deliberation or critical thinking, which will lead to something next. Ideally, this is better citizenship, but will we know it when we see it?

There is such a thing as bad satire (or satire gone bad, as some authors point out), and even failed satire. There is no contribution in this book that examines Fox’s recently failed fake news show, *The Half Hour News Hour*. Does satire TV’s success have a “well-known liberal bias,” to borrow from Stephen Colbert? Neither does this book stray from English-speaking political satire TV to invite us to consider the genre’s workings in other languages and cultural contexts. (Some examples include the long-running success of Italy’s *Striscia la Notizia*, Sweden’s *Helt Apropå*, and Argentina’s *Caiga Quien Caiga* and its adaptations in Italy, France, Brazil, and Portugal.) Nonetheless, this book offers historical depth and theoretically sophisticated approaches to satire TV’s contemporary breadth in North American televisual programming. It also contributes to the call for political communication to widen its purview on what constitutes the political, how that gets represented, and how to think about its possible impacts and efficacy in the postnetwork era.

Sue Collins
New York University

Park D. W., & Pooley, J. (Eds.). (2008). *The History of Media and Communication Research: Contested Memories*. New York: Peter Lang.

DOI: 10.1177/0196859909334842

Anthropologists have come to recognize that information on cultural practices of a given society may be most fruitfully gleaned from the society’s misfits and deviants, for such individuals have the keenest knowledge and eye for contradiction because they know exactly where they do not fit in. A similar dynamic may be in play when charting the intellectual history of a discipline, with sufficient time and a

safe institutional remove providing the historian with ways of seeing that escape the everyday practices of a scholarly community.

Those familiar with the uncertain identity of communication and the need for strengthening the knowledge of our past have observed over the past few decades several histories of communication emerging from various corners of the field. Some have involved lamenting communication's missed opportunities for following more substantial intellectual trajectories and advancing arguably larger questions. Or, in a similar vein, others have suggested how the Anglo-American empirical tradition may have played a central role in obviating communication from the general equation of social inquiry (and hence institutional viability). Historians of communication have also looked back on the ideas and research of those in other disciplines to better understand their own, finding the grass not only seems healthier in adjoining fields but also is, in some places, a far deeper shade of green. Such a historical project on the whole, however, has usually been the product of individuals whose isolation speaks emphatically to the very essence of their undertaking.

In *The History of Media and Communication Research*, David W. Park and Jefferson Pooley have assembled a set of essays from both younger and more established scholars that will deepen our understanding of communication's intellectual and institutional history, in addition to the field's inevitable crosscurrents with what have often been more established disciplines. The volume's contributors likewise provide a multitude of opportunities for rethinking future approaches and continued possibilities for such a developing history in light of the recent historiography. Each of these essays are mature, carefully researched, and solidly argued throughout, and this volume will, without question, be a valuable resource for many years to come.

In the book's foreword, Hanno Hardt considers the significance of the history of communication in terms of the field's identity, pointing to the crises experienced in other disciplines when coming to terms with their histories. In their Introduction, the editors provide a helpful conceptualization of the contents by explaining how the chapters "exemplify one or more of the following traits": "Qualified historicism," "Explanatory eclecticism," "Dirty Fingernails," "New, search-based methods," "Openness to institutional histories," "international and comparative histories," and "Dialogue with the historiography of the other social sciences" (pp. 5-9). The chapters are formally presented in three sections. The first, "State of the Historiography," forcefully exerts certain prospects for disciplinary history, often by exorcising old demons. In her essay, "Remembering the Straw Man: The Travels and Adventures of *Hypodermic*," Deborah Lubken puts to rest once-and-for-all a myth that has helped sell many thousands of mass communication theory textbooks—the "hypodermic needle" that has played the perfunctory antagonist to the intrepid limited effects model. Yet this is hardly another chorus to Todd Gitlin's familiar diatribe against the "dominant paradigm." Rather, Lubken presents a more productive exploration of how the hypodermic needle/limited effects "debate" developed to the point where its echo—and the necessity for disciplinary boundaries—far surpassed any original vibration.

“The New History of Mass Communication Research,” Jefferson Pooley’s contribution, presents a meticulous yet expansive review of the growing sophistication of the work of historians such as William Buxton, Brett Gary, and Timothy Glander. The subject matter builds on Lubken’s chapter by explaining how the new historians’ more mature approach to the field is markedly distinguished from those of the 1980s that sought to break from or critique the alleged limited effects model. “Communication research, as a field,” Pooley concludes, pointing to its peculiar institutionalization, “badly needs the glue of tradition, however invented” (p. 59).

In “Walter Lippmann, Straw Man of Communication Research,” Sue Carry Jansen returns us to a familiar terrain to consider a misunderstood figure of a more concrete fabric. Due to years of arguably selective interpretation, this is an open-and-shut case. A progressive journalist and public intellectual before World War I, Lippmann’s experience as a government propagandist catalyzed his already skeptical regard for popular democracy. For more careful and appreciative readers of Lippmann, however, *Public Opinion* and related works have both explicit and subtle nuances that have been ignored or recast by popular authors like Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman, Stuart Ewen, and the most obvious emissary of the elitist Lippmann within communication studies proper, James Carey, who explains Lippmann’s ideas vis-à-vis John Dewey.

Lana Rakow’s “Feminist Historiography of the Field” takes up an imperative task that communication studies has left unaddressed for far too long: laying the groundwork for “a feminist historiography of our field” where “‘great men, great events, great places’ have been used to make a historical canon repeated in introductory undergraduate textbooks and graduate textbooks on communication theory and research” (p. 114). Rakow sent a six-part e-mail questionnaire to members of six different professional organizations (or divisions) of feminist communication scholars soliciting responses on experiences, influences, historical understandings of the field, and the prospects for feminist communication scholarship. Much of the chapter is devoted to consideration of numerous quotes from the survey. “It’s a continuing battle,” one respondent notes. “We have more journals now, and yes there has been more feminist scholarship in ‘mainstream’ ones, but only because leaders in our field . . . keep fighting” (p. 132).

The second section, “Institutional Histories,” calls on several more senior scholars for historical insights on the generally ambling, circuitous way communication studies established itself in the academy. In the autobiographical “Institutional Opportunities for Intellectual History in Communication Research,” John Peters revisits his 1986 essay, “Institutional Sources of Intellectual Poverty in Communication Research.” Drawing in part on autobiographical observations to which many communication scholars will relate, Peters illustrates the frequent institutional reality of communication studies by recalling his shattered idealism as a graduate student at Stanford:

I asked about the Palo Alto Group, led by Paul Watzlawick, which had become famous for its exploration, in the intellectual wake of [Gregory] Bateson, of the part played by

the double bind and distorted communication in the familial genesis of schizophrenia. No one on the faculty had any connection with them, even though they were in the same town and ostensibly studying the same thing. Quite greenly, I found this lack of communication about communication astonishing. (p. 147)

In the remainder of the essay, Peters recounts areas of postwar information theory—social psychology of media effects, cybernetics, psychiatry—amounting heretofore to missed opportunities for “the enlarging of” communication’s “intellectual possibilities” (p. 144).

J. Michael Sproule’s “‘Communication’: From Concept to Field to Discipline,” explains in some detail how the now taken-for-granted term *communication* that designates various research and teaching orientations (journalism, broadcasting, rhetoric) is the foremost remnant of a less apparent historical struggle whereby from the 1930s the master term was used for “inclusionary or exclusionary” purposes by individual researchers, eventually giving way to fledgling research programs and departments. This tension culminated in the descriptor’s adaptation by the primary American professional organizations—the International Communication Association (ICA), the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC), and the National Communication Association (NCA).

David Morrison uses biography to relate the trials of communication’s most well-known and accomplished European émigré in “Opportunity Structures and the Creation of Knowledge: Paul Lazarsfeld and the Politics of Research.” Drawing on archival materials and personal interviews with Lazarsfeld, the author weaves a fascinating account of Lazarsfeld’s Jewish-socialist bearings and European academic experience alongside his American role as struggling entrepreneur-methodologist. It was in America, however, where due to the political strictures borne by research foundations during the Cold War, Lazarsfeld had fewer avenues to pursue his research than in his native Austria.

The two chapters bringing the second part of the book to a close share a welcome international theme that is too often overlooked in many-a-history of the field. In the valuable “How Does a Discipline Become Institutionalized?” Veikko Pietila arrives within terrain previously visited by James Carey and Hanno Hardt, focusing on the development of “newspaper science” or the “science of public communication” (p. 209) in Germany and Finland to explain the fields’ differing “cognitive and social” (intellectual and professional) “institutionalization” from the 1910s. Thereafter, Kaarle Nordenstreng’s “Institutional Networking: The Story of the International Association for Media and Communication Research,” lays out the 50-year history of the UNESCO-affiliated body devoted to the study of international communication and information flows.

Section three, “People and Places in the History of the Field,” highlights several fascinating individuals and approaches to communication. A vital reappraisal of the

intellectual history of mass communication research has looked to Elihu Katz and Paul Lazarsfeld's *Personal Influence*, yet this time not to cast aspersion à la Gitlin, but rather understanding the work both for its influence but also as a product of its sociopolitical and cultural milieu. In "The Two-Step Flow Vs. *The Lonely Crowd*," David Park traces the shared notions of 1950s' conformity evident in Katz and Lazarsfeld's 1955 book and David Riesman's celebrated work. "Katz and Lazarsfeld treated conformity with a counterintuitive and upbeat touch," Park observes, "parts of which would later become institutionalized into mainstream communication research, minus the self-awareness. Riesman approached conformity in a manner largely in keeping with a broader conformity trope running through 1950s intellectual culture" (p. 261).

The emergence of media studies from New Left politics as an effort to redeem and empower the British working class is the topic of Wendy Worrall Redal's "Making Sense of Social Change: Studying Media and Culture in 1960s Britain." Redal's contribution is unique not only because of the author's able grasp of this important era and its principal figures but also because it draws on the recollections and insights of Stuart Hall and James Halloran through personal interviews.

Peter Simonson treads carefully into the biographical to discuss an oft-overlooked media researcher in, "Writing Figures into the Field: William McPhee and the Parts Played by People in Our Histories of Media Research." Though McPhee appeared as one of the three authors of *Voting*, alongside Paul Lazarsfeld's Bernard Berelson, his work traversed and touched on a broad array of important media research, particularly at Columbia's Bureau of Applied Social Research. In the process of relating McPhee's professional life and work, Simonson provides a richly compelling theoretical explanation for the significance and usefulness of biography as a legitimate tool in the history of media research (pp. 292-297), one that allows us to learn not only about an individual's life (McPhee, in this instance), "but also about the institutions, dramas, and collective decisions with which it intersected" (p. 310).

James A. Anderson and Janet W. Colvin's "Media Research 1900-1945: Topics and Conversations" is a content analysis of 225 articles by media and communication researchers from a wide swath of social science journals. The authors code and quantitatively organize the subject matter of these pieces, in addition to the methods used and concepts considered in each piece. Although the sample is not exhaustive, its findings reveal a surprisingly eclectic array of scholarship produced during this period.

The book concludes with "From Park to Cressey: Chicago Sociology's Engagement with Media and Mass Culture," William J. Buxton's examination of Chicago School product and Payne Fund Studies contributor Paul G. Cressey. Cressey's observations on film and youth were distinctly at odds with Robert Park's sociology, as well as Chicago peers Herbert Blumer and Philip Hauser. Instead of understanding movies for their social-integrative function, Cressey and his mentor-colleague Frederic Thrasher contended that cinema was also a potent form of "informal education" that served boys in a far more direct and practical way than did schools or Boys' Clubs" (p. 350).

In concluding, it should be noted that this collection is dedicated to James Carey. With this in mind, one of the book's most heartening aspects is its implicit promise. Whereas several familiar authors represented here have worked tirelessly to salvage the history of media and communication research from obscurity and caricature, the editors and several other contributors have their careers spanning before them. This bodes well for the continued development of a much more sophisticated history of the field and is an especially fitting tribute to Carey's substantial contribution toward this end.

James F. Tracy
Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton

For reprints and permission queries, please visit SAGE's Web site at <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>.

Books

■ Park, David and Jefferson Pooley, eds. (2008). **The History of Media and Communication Research: Contested Memories.** New York: Peter Lang, pp. 390.

■ Weinberg, Steve. (2008). **A Journalism of Humanity: A Candid History of the World's First Journalism School.** Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, pp. 238.

In a foreword to the first of these important and useful studies, media theorist Hanno Hardt declares that “the field of communication studies has come of age, and with this new maturity comes the need to construct a genealogy of practices in a manner that explains and connects the various strands of fact and fiction, validates memory, and confirms intellectual identities to secure its place among the social sciences.” This statement could serve as coda for both volumes.

Although these two studies are markedly different, both offer an explanatory framework and fill in field, institutional, and conceptual gaps heretofore ignored or treated in a less substantial manner. They tell the story of people and institutions engaged in the pursuit of learning and the advancement of knowledge about the history of research on media, communication, and journalism.

In mostly chronological form, Steve Weinberg, author, reporter, and professor, offers a comprehensive treatment of the origins, development, and current state of the iconic Missouri School of Journalism, the world's first. No hagiography this, Weinberg's *A*

Journalism of Humanity is an insider's view of a journalism school and the people who built it as well as their products—the students and a particular style of serious public affairs journalism. Like other journalism school histories, he moves from the founding dean (Walter Williams) to the current dean (R. Dean Mills), explaining the work and achievements of each regime. There is a critical and explanatory tone here that does not ignore the conflicts and controversies that influenced the shape and direction of the world's first journalism school. The school's signature programs, especially the unique *Columbia Missourian*, the faculty-led daily, are all here, as is an examination of their impact on journalism education and the practice of journalism, both in the United States and internationally.

As is often the case in studies of this kind—James Boylan's *Pulitzer's School* and George Turnbull's *Journalists in the Making* come to mind—the comings and departures are charted of faculty members within the administration of particular deans whose leadership sets the agenda for a period as the school accepts, assimilates, or rejects their leadership and ideas. Happily some of the key faculty personalities are showcased along with their individual interests and contributions to the school and its program. This can be a tedious endeavor, but Weinberg presents such information painlessly on the way to the next stage of institutional development.

While capturing much about the curriculum and the teaching of journalistic skills, he gives less attention to what has been a remarkable corpus of research at the school, especially in recent years. Similarly, the author, in

attempting to cover in detail the activity on the ground at the school over 100 years, he says less about the institutional context such as other models of journalism education. The book's independent mindedness makes it stand out among histories of higher education and especially professional schools.

By contrast, *The History of Media and Communication Research* is the latest in a modest flow of books charting the origins and development of mass communication research and covers the whole field quite broadly, but with a critical eye. Editors David Park and Jefferson Pooley, both authors of notable studies on research history, bring together several scholars who assess (a) the state of historiography, (b) institutional histories, and (c) people and places in the history of the field. In doing so, they examine research that has spanned the separate divisions of the field, including that emerging from the journalism and communication schools, the speech and communication arts departments, as well as other allied disciplines. While each of the authors brings their own analytic frame, most favor a cultural studies perspective over that of empirical social science. As always, the debate over the naivete of the hypodermic needle theory and the propensity toward minimal effects gets a strong rebuke. While thoughtful and thorough, some of the chapters are clearly new voices trying to correct what they see as the foibles of researchers in times past. There is rigor to the critique, but little empathy, although some recognition that Todd Gitlin's much-heralded attack on the dominant paradigm of media research, circa 1977, might have overstated the

case. This book is less judgmental than some and less scathing than others in trying to understand the development of the field. Still, any sense of real appreciation for early developments when communication researchers worked against great odds or had to find creative use of funding to support graduate students is missing. The generosity of this early work standing "on the shoulders of giants," in Robert Merton's phrase, is not always evident. Ironically, the book is dedicated to the late James W. Carey, who is heavily quoted throughout, even though he himself debunked the efficacy of the history of media research.

Each chapter is notable in its own way, but especially intriguing are a masterful "new history" by Jefferson Pooley, whose earlier work on Edward Shils set new standards for scholarship in this field, as well as one on Walter Lippmann as a "straw man" of communication research by Sue Curry Jansen and yet another by John Durham Peters on "institutional opportunities for intellectual history." In a sense there is something for everyone here—feminist historiography, a synthetic explication of communication itself, and even a study of the International Association for Mass Communication Research, the left wing of the field, and more. Notably missing are other scholarly and professional associations and venues, the role of various university programs, and think tanks. Perhaps another study will assess Leo Bogart's notion of research as an instrument of power or consider the venues that have spent the most money on research, including that from governmental, philanthropic, and commercial sources. The treatment of the eminent humanist and social scientist Wilbur Schramm, a true

founding father of the field, is somewhat misleading and even dismissive. But all in all, this is a collection of some of the strongest intellectual work in the field in years.

Recognizing that the field is still relatively young compared with other disciplines and has been part of predictable cant, this book does illuminate and demonstrate that some very talented scholars are at work, revising and reconsidering the history.

These are two fine studies that warrant attention—and that will no doubt have a long life as texts for those devoted to the history of media education and research.

EVERETTE E. DENNIS
DENNIS@FORDHAM.EDU
Fordham University

■ Sarikakis, Katharine and Leslie Regan Shade (2008). **Feminist Interventions in International Communication: Minding the Gap.** Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield. pp. 337.

■ Poindexter, Paula, Sharon Meraz, and Amy Schmitz Weiss (2008). **Women, Men, and News: Divided and Disconnected in the News Media Landscape.** New York: Routledge. pp. 356.

I regularly teach undergraduate and graduate courses that explore the perennial question: Where are the women and where are women's theories and perspectives in media representation, industries, and our field? Given the time constraints of teaching on the quarter system, much of the attention is devoted to recognizing the

missing voices and faces in U.S. mass media, relying on courses in international communication to pick up the rest of the planet. The publication of these edited texts, both designed to bring awareness to global gaps in scholarship, participation, and representation of women in media, contribute important readings and resources for narrowing the divide in teaching and scholarship.

Taking a feminist political economic stance, the Sarikakis and Regan Shade book identifies, as a field, *international* communication studies and explores gendered policies in areas as diverse as global pornography, mobile communication, and development issues. The editors correctly point to the Eurocentric gap in literature about women's lives and mass media, and thus the book includes much-needed research about women's participation in and consumption of mass media in Ecuador, Africa, the Philippines, Eastern Europe, Arab countries, and India. Importantly, the chapters are written by international scholars who have first-person experience in the countries they describe. The book addresses three gaps in standard international communication (IC) literature in which feminist activities and theorizations should be accounted for that extend the issue of sexualized representation: technology, labor, and consumption.

Employing Cynthia Enloes's concept of the Curious Feminist, i.e., staying curious about and grounded in women's lived experiences, the editors bring together twenty-seven authors who address neglected areas of IC. The book is divided into five sections. Part I revisits international communications studies and calls for greater inclusion