A Companion to

Media Studies

Edited by

Angharad N. Valdivia

Blackwell
Publishing

A Companion to
Media Studies

BLACKWELL **COMPANIONS IN CULTURAL STUDIES**

Advisory Editor: David Theo Goldberg, University of California, Irvine

This series aims to provide theoretically ambitious but accessible volumes devoted to the major fields and subfields within Cultural Studies, whether as single disciplines (film studies) inspired and reconfigured by interventionist Cultural Studies approaches, or from broad interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary perspectives (gender studies, race and ethnic studies, postcolonial studies). Each volume sets out to ground and orientate the student through a broad range of specially commissioned articles and also to provide the more experienced scholar and teacher with a convenient and comprehensive overview of the latest trends and critical directions.

1. A Companion to Film Theory
   Edited by Toby Miller and Robert Stam
2. A Companion to Postcolonial Studies
   Edited by Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray
3. A Companion to Cultural Studies
   Edited by Toby Miller
4. A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies
   Edited by David Theo Goldberg and John Solomos
5. A Companion to Art Theory
   Edited by Paul Smith and Carolyn Wilde
6. A Companion to Media Studies
   Edited by Angharad N. Valdivia

Forthcoming:

A Companion to North American Indian Studies
Edited by Ward Churchill
A Companion to Gender Studies
Edited by Philomena Essed, Audrey Kobayashi, and David Theo Goldberg
A Companion to Third Cinema
Edited by Teshome Gabriel
A Companion to African American Studies
Edited by Lewis Gordon and Jane Anna Gordon
A Companion to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Studies
Edited by George Haggerty and Molly McGarry
A Companion to Museum Studies
Edited by Sharon Macdonald
A Companion to American Studies
Edited by John Carlos Rowe
A Companion to Literature in Film
Edited by Robert Stam
A Companion to Television Studies
Edited by Janet Wasko

A Companion to

Media Studies

Edited by

Angharad N. Valdivia

350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA
108 Cowley Road, Oxford OX4 1JF, UK
550 Swanston Street, Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia

First published 2003 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Valdivia, Angharad N.
A companion to media studies / Angharad N. Valdivia.
p. cm. – (Blackwell companions in cultural studies ; 6)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-631-22601-X (hard : alk. paper)
1. Mass media. I. Title. II. Series.

P91.25.V35 2003
302.23–dc21 2002152791

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library.

Set in 11/13pt Ehrhardt
by Graphicraft Limited, Hong Kong
Printed and bound in the United Kingdom
by T.J. International, Padstow, Cornwall

For further information on
Blackwell Publishing, visit our website:
http://www.blackwellpublishing.com

Contents

Notes on Contributors

Boatema Boateng is Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication, University of California at San Diego. Her research interests include the power dynamics of global cultural flows and the politics of feminist knowledge production.

Sharon L. Bracci is Assistant Professor of Communication Studies at the University of North Carolina, Greensboro. She is the co-editor of *Moral Engagement in Public Life: Theorists for Contemporary Ethics* (with Clifford G. Christians, 2002). She has published in *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *Argumentation and Advocacy*, and *Qualitative Inquiry* (2002). Her research interests focus on interdisciplinary intersections among communication ethics, public argument, and practical reasoning in contemporary social and healthcare contexts.

Jennings Bryant is Professor of Communication, holder of the Reagan Endowed Chair of Broadcasting, and Director of the Institute for Communication Research at the University of Alabama. He is president of the International Communication Association. Bryant's primary research interests are in entertainment theory, media effects, and uses and effects of new media.

Michael C. Casas is a graduate student in the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Michigan. He is primarily interested in examining the portrayals of people of color in the media and the effects of these portrayals on viewers.

Gail Dines is Professor of Sociology and Women's Studies at Wheelock College in Boston. She is co-editor of the best-selling media text book *Gender, Race and Class in Media* (Sage, 1995, 2003), and co-author of *Pornography: The Production and Consumption of Inequality* (Routledge, 1998). She lectures across the country on pornography and violence against women.

Travis L. Dixon is Assistant Professor of Communication Studies and a Faculty Associate at the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan. He

is primarily interested in the portrayal of African Americans in the mass media and the effects of these images on audiences.

John D. H. Downing is John T. Jones, Jr. Centennial Professor of Communication in the Radio–Television–Film Department of the University of Texas, Austin. He lived mostly in Britain until 1980 and since then mostly in New York City and Austin. He teaches courses on media theories; political cinema in Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East; racism and communication; alternative media; and Russian media since 1917. His current projects include a co-authored comparative study of racism, ethnicity and media; serving as chief editor of the *Sage International Handbook of Media Studies*; and as editor of the Sage *Encyclopedia of Alternative Media*.

James S. Ettema is Professor and Chair of Communication Studies at Northwestern University. His teaching and research focuses on the social organization and cultural impact of media – especially the news media. His books include *Custodians of Conscience: Investigative Journalism and Public Virtue* (with Theodore Glasser) and *Audiencemaking: How the Media Create the Audience* (with D. Charles Whitney). Professor Ettema earned his Ph.D. from the University of Michigan and formerly taught in the School of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Minnesota.

Margaret Gallagher is a freelance media researcher and consultant. Her work includes assignments for the United Nations and its agencies, the Council of Europe, the European Commission, the European Audiovisual Observatory and the WACC. Her many publications in the field of gender and media include *An Unfinished Story: Gender Patterns in Media Employment* (Paris: UNESCO, 1995), *From Mexico to Beijing – and Beyond: Covering Women in the World's News* (New York: UNIFEM, 2000), and *Gender Setting: New Agendas for Media Monitoring and Advocacy* (London: Zed Books, 2001).

Joke Hermes teaches television studies at the University of Amsterdam. Her publications include *Reading Women's Magazines* (Polity Press, 1995) and *The Media in Question* (Sage, 1998 edn.). She is editor of the *European Journal of Cultural Studies*.

Robert Huesca is Associate Professor in the Department of Communication at Trinity University in Texas. His areas of study are in mass media and society, democratic media practice, new communication technologies, and international communication. He has published essays in *Communication Theory*, *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *The Journal of International Communication*, *Studies in Latin American Popular Culture*, *Media, Culture and Society*, *Journal of Communication*, and numerous edited books.

Melissa A. Johnson is Associate Professor in the Department of Communication at North Carolina State University. She studies Latino/a ethnic media, general market media issues related to Latinos/as and Latin America, and the

role of visual images in media. Her doctorate in mass communication research is from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Sonia Livingstone is Professor of Social Psychology and a member of the interdisciplinary teaching and research program, Media@LSE, at the London School of Economics and Political Science. She is author of *Making Sense of Television* (Routledge, 1998) and *Young People and New Media* (Sage, 2002), co-author of *Mass Consumption and Personal Identity* (Open University, 1992) and *Talk on Television* (Routledge, 1994), and co-editor of *Children and Their Changing Media Environment* (Erlbaum, 2001) and *The Handbook of New Media* (Sage, 2002).

Armand Mattelart is Professor of Sciences of Information and Communication at l'Université de Paris VIII. His areas of study include communication theory, media studies, and international communication. He is author of more than 20 books, including *Networking the World, 1794–2000*, *Theories of Communication: A Short Introduction* with Michèle Mattelart, *The Invention of Communication*, and *Mapping World Communication: War, Progress, Culture*.

Sharon R. Mazzarella is Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Television–Radio at Ithaca College. She is co-editor of *Growing Up Girls: Popular Culture and the Construction of Identity* (Peter Lang, 1999) and of the new journal *Popular Communication* (Lawrence Erlbaum). Her research focuses primarily on media coverage and portrayals of youth.

Matthew P. McAllister is Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies in the Department of Communication Studies at Virginia Tech. His research interests include advertising criticism, popular culture, and the political economy of the mass media. He is the author of *The Commercialization of American Culture: New Advertising, Control and Democracy* (Sage, 1996), and the co-editor of *Comics and Ideology* (Peter Lang, 2001). He has also published in *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, *Journal of Communication*, *Journal of Popular Culture*, *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, and *The Communication Review*.

Cameron McCarthy is University Scholar and Research Professor in the Institute of Communications Research at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. His books include *Race and Curriculum, The Uses of Culture* and *Reading & Teaching the Postcolonial* (with Greg Dimitriadis) as well as several edited collections. He teaches courses in mass communications theory, post-colonialism, and cultural studies.

Denis McQuail is Professor Emeritus attached to the School of Communication Research, University of Amsterdam and Visiting Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Southampton, England. Recent publications include *Mass Communication Theory* (4th edn., 2000) and *Reader in Mass Communication Theory* (2002).

Dorina Miron is a senior research fellow with the Institute for Communication Research at the University of Alabama. She is interested in entertainment and hedonic theory. Her current research focuses on television and video game effects.

Sujata Moorti is Associate Professor at Old Dominion University and is the author of *Color of Rape: Gender, Race, and Television's Public Spheres* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2002) and other articles. Her research and teaching interrogate the representations of gender and race within a global context.

John Nerone is Research Professor of Communications at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He has written extensively on the history of the media in the United States, including *Violence against the Press: Policing the Public Sphere in US History* and, most recently, *The Form of News: A History*, co-authored with Kevin G. Barnhurst.

Virginia Nightingale is Associate Professor in the School of Communication, Design and Media at the University of Western Sydney, Australia, where she has taught since 1984. She is co-ordinator of the Affect, Image, Media research group within the MARCS Research Centre at UWS. Her research interests have focused on the theories and practice of audience research. In recent years she has been chief investigator for two studies on children and the media: Children's Views on Media Harm, and Television Advertising and Children's Culture. She is the author of *Studying Audiences: the Shock of the Real* (Routledge, 1996), but has also investigated cross-cultural audience experiences (Australia and Japan), and is currently exploring negative affect in the "horror experience."

Barbara J. O'Keefe is Professor of Communication Studies and Dean of the School of Speech at Northwestern University. Her research areas are interpersonal and organizational communication, with a focus on the role of training and technology in improving the capability of communicators and communities. Her research has been supported by the National Science Foundation, the US Department of Defense, and the National Center for Supercomputing Applications, the Markle Foundation, among others.

Mary Beth Oliver is Associate Professor at Penn State University. Her research pertains to the social and psychological effects of media on viewers, with a focus on issues related to race and gender. Her work has appeared in *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *Journal of Communication, Sex Roles*, and *Communication Research*, among others.

Radhika E. Parameswaran is Assistant Professor at the School of Journalism, Indiana University, Bloomington. Her research interests include feminist cultural studies, ethnographic media research, globalization, and postcolonial studies. Her publications have appeared in *Journal of Communication, Journalism & Communication Monographs*, *Qualitative Inquiry*, *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, and *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies*.

Elizabeth R. Perea is a doctoral student at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Institute of Communications Research. Her research is in cultural studies, popular culture analysis, popular music studies, globalization, and postmodern theory. She is also an instructor in the Media Studies department.

Carrie A. Rentschler teaches in the Department of Communication at the University of Pittsburgh. Her dissertation examines the media activism of the US crime victim movement and the role it plays in news and entertainment crime coverage. Her intellectual interests include the study of media and politics, social movements, and feminism. She has published on the security industry, women's self-defense education, environmental security and sexual violence, and local changes in the media landscape after the September 11 terrorist attacks in the US. She is also a women's and girls' self-defense instructor.

Vickie Rutledge Shields is the Director of the Women's Studies Program and Associate Professor of Telecommunications at Bowling Green State University. Her research has focused on critical/cultural approaches to the study of media and popular culture; gendered images in media; the relationship between media images and women's body discipline; and investigating alternative methodologies for cultural and feminist audience research. She is the author of *Measuring Up: How Advertising Affects Self Image*, from University of Pennsylvania Press. Dr Shields is a Fellow at the Institute for the Study of Culture and Society at Bowling Green State University where she continues her research on the cultural effects of advertising images as experienced by pre- and adolescent girls.

Ronda M. Scantlin has completed postdoctoral research fellowship at the Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania and has joined the faculty at the Department of Communication at the University of Dayton. She is a member of the research team examining the impact of V-Chip technology on dynamics within the family and on children's television viewing. Dr Scantlin received her Bachelor of Arts in Psychology from Bethany College, Master of Arts in Human Development from the University of Kansas, and her Ph.D. in Child Development and Family Relationships from the University of Texas at Austin. Her current research interests include exploring the positive and negative implications for interactive technologies to meet the cognitive, social, and health-related needs of children and adolescents.

Dan Schiller is Professor of Library & Information Science, Communications and Media Studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. A communications historian, he has written or edited five books, including *Digital Capitalism: Networking the Global Market System* (MIT Press, 1999) and, with Vincent Mosco, *Continental Order? Integrating North America for Cyber-Capitalism* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2001). Schiller also is a continuing contributor to *Le Monde diplomatique*.

Robert Sloane is a Ph.D. candidate in the Institute of Communications Research at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He is writing a dissertation on cultural production and reproduction in an independent record store.

Angharad N. Valdivia is Research Associate Professor at the Institute of Communications Research at the University of Illinois. She is the author of *A Latina in the Land of Hollywood* (Arizona) and editor of *Feminism, Multiculturalism, and the Media* (Sage) and co-editor (with matt garcia and Marie Leger) of the forthcoming *Geographies of Latinidad* (Duke). Her research focuses on transnational multiculturalist feminist issues with a special emphasis on Latinas in popular culture.

Ellen A. Wartella is Dean of the College of Communication, Walter Cronkite Regents Chair in Communication and Mrs Mary Gibbs Jones Centennial Chair in Communication at the University of Texas at Austin. She is co-author or editor of nine books and dozens of book chapters and articles on children and media. She is co-Principal Investigator on a five-year National Science Foundation funded, multi-site research project entitled Children's Research Initiative: Children's Digital Media Centers.

D. Charles Whitney is Professor and graduate adviser in the School of Journalism at the University of Texas at Austin, where he is also Professor of Radio–Television–Film. He was co-editor, with Professor Ettema, of *Audience Making* (Sage, 1994) and *Individuals in Mass Media Organizations* (Sage, 1982) and is co-author or editor of the *Mass Communication Review Yearbook*, 3 vols. (1982) and 4 (1983), and *Individuals in Mass Media Organizations: Creativity and Constraint* (1982). He is the author of more than 75 book chapters, journal articles, reports and papers, and three other books in media studies.

Acknowledgments

This book could not have been put together without the support of numerous individuals and institutions. In addition to the exemplary set of contributors who agreed to submit original manuscripts to this volume, there are others to be thanked. To begin with, the Institute of Communications Research at the University of Illinois remains an extremely generous supporter of all my endeavors. Under the leadership of both Clifford Christians and Paula Treichler, ICR provided the resources necessary to carry out this project. Outstanding assistance from Marie Claire Leger, Robert Sloane, Diem-my Bui, Susan Harewood, and Liz Perea was indispensable. A fellowship from the Illinois Program for Research in the Humanities (IPRH) provided the space and the forum to begin to write the salsa project. The Centre of Latin American Studies at the University of Cambridge, England provided a home during my sabbatical year when I commissioned and put together the bulk of this volume. I am intellectually indebted to Denis McQuail whose introductory volumes to communications theory remain, for me, the most accessible and comprehensive available in our interdiscipline. The breadth and depth of this volume speaks to the wonderful education and collaborations I have had from and with many colleagues in our field. Finally, Cameron McCarthy's continuing advice, help, and encouragement helped make this a better book. If I do not mention my three children, Rhiannon, Tobin, and Ailín, one or all of them would be eternally cross with me. All shortcomings, of course, are purely my own.

Introduction

Angharad N. Valdivia

A Companion to Media Studies intends to provide a broad overview to a generalist academic audience of the dynamic interdiscipline of Media Studies. Widely available as a university major and even included as part of the high school curriculum in some countries, Media Studies is a relatively new interdiscipline, roughly dating back to the 1920s as a set of studies and the fifties as a "formal discipline" (Grossberg, Wartella, and Whitney, 1998). However, early and repeated attempts to demarcate boundaries around this field of study have proven unsustainable. The contemporary situation is such that as an interdisciplinary field, Media Studies has no easy boundaries or parameters. It draws on some of the more established disciplines both in the humanities and the social sciences such as history, political science, sociology, psychology, anthropology, linguistics, and literature. Media Studies also has great overlaps with newer disciplines and interdisciplines such as cultural studies, popular culture studies, film studies, American studies, journalism, communications, speech communication, education, and ethnomusicology, to name a few. While it is a diverse, contested, and growing field of studies which has to be considered in process, there are nonetheless specific concentrations and particular scholars who have come to flesh out the contours of what must by definition be an amorphous and porous field. *A Companion to Media Studies* aims to provide this developing field with an overview of the theories and methodologies which have brought us to the present as well as with current deployments of these. Essays fall into six categories and are written by major scholars of national and international reputation as well as by some of the brightest young scholars in the field. *A Companion to Media Studies* strives for a representative, global, and multicultural approach throughout so that issues of difference will not be bracketed out in separate sections.

Media Studies is a term often used interchangeably with "mass communication" and with "communications." Usage of the term "communication science" has become less common as most scholars acknowledge that one of the central questions posed in the contemporary academy is whether science can continue to be the dominant theoretical discourse. Nonetheless it is important to note

Simpson's history of early communications research where he labels the period and the book *Science of Coercion* (1994) precisely because the "science" of communication was so often put to such crass political uses. However, as with any discipline and period of time, whereas the science approach may have dominated then and to a lesser extent now (certainly even the dwindling availability of US funding still favors scientific approaches), there were then alternative voices though smaller in number and heavily silenced.[1] Moreover, the study of communications was included in humanities based departments such as rhetoric and English, where both journalism and cinema studies, both crucial components of Media Studies, were pursued within humanistic approaches.

Whereas the use of the term media implies some form of mediated communications, usually through the use of mass media technologies, the term "communications" alone can also include the less technological and more personal and individual forms of communication. Although quite often these three terms are used interchangeably, it is more accurate to single out media studies and mass communication as having a major overlap. As well, Media Studies projects can include some measure of interpersonal communications such as the canonical *Personal Influence* (Katz and Lazarsfeld, 1955) which sought to establish a connection or relationship between mass media use and interpersonal communications. Denis McQuail's many editions of his *Mass Communication Theory* build on this fruitful tone set by Katz and develop a study of mass communication that is informed by the individual and psychological all the way to the social and institutional levels of analysis. For the purposes of *A Companion to Media Studies* Media Studies and mass communications will be used interchangeably.

Another major overlap in terms of this interdiscipline is the increasingly common connection between Media Studies and the study of culture. Culture is not synonymous with Cultural Studies though often this is the form that the overlap takes. Journals such as *Media, Culture & Society* include many cultural studies articles but use a more expansive application of the "culture & society" part of the title and thus embody this type of association. Indeed the inclusion of "society" signs in for social science and more traditional US approaches to Media Studies (e.g. Croteau and Hoynes, 1997). Also for example, the enormously successful *Media and Culture: An Introduction to Mass Communication* (Campbell, 2002) brings together mass communication and the study of culture as they overlap with Media Studies but not necessarily in a cultural studies formation. That this volume is already in its best-selling third edition indicates that at least at the US undergraduate teaching level, faculty find it useful to combine these three areas of study into an undifferentiated whole. On the other hand Giles and Middleton's *Studying Culture* (1999) tends to equate the study of culture with cultural studies. While it is a formidable and sophisticated text, *Studying Culture* may well be hampered in the US market because of its firm and inescapable grounding in contemporary British culture. In fact, whereas the influence of French, Italian, and British scholars reached US communications scholarship decades ago, the US mix still includes a healthy, indeed dominant

paradigm, dose of social science in general and structural functionalism in particular. Thus it would be very difficult to propose a communication theory reader excluding at least nominal mention of the dominant paradigm in the US whereas the graduate level *The Communication Theory Reader* (Cobley, 1996) and *Media Studies: A Reader* (Marris and Thornham, 2000) present us with good illustrations of the overlap between "cultural studies, communications, and media studies" (Cobley, 1996, p. 1) which nonetheless focuses primarily on influential European structuralist and post-structuralist approaches. Other influential forces in the turn to culture within mass communications and Media Studies is the growing interdiscipline of American Studies wherein the previous hegemony of US literary approaches is being challenged by an ethnically and globally sophisticated consideration of culture at large, much of it greatly overlapping with Media Studies, such as much of the work by George Lipsitz (e.g. 2001).

Thus as we enter the twenty-first century Media Studies remains, and indeed grows in stature, as a central field of academic pursuit influenced by and potentially influencing many other fields (see Downing, this volume). The traditional mass media of newspaper, film, radio, and television have been joined by electronic and digital options which both promise to increase accessibility and democratic potential as well as threaten to intensify economic concentration and knowledge gaps between rich and poor, whether these populations are within the North or between the North and South. Internet deployment; digital cameras, scanners, and video recorders; palm pilots and cellular telephony and internet access; DVD movies; biometric body scanning; and all of the overlapping and synergistic possibilities between these media make the interdiscipline of Media Studies both daunting and exciting. Indeed Turow (1999) repeatedly uses the word "exciting" and titles the first introductory section of his book "An Exciting Time." Even if we consider that electricity remains an issue for a huge proportion of the world's population, the reach of traditional and new media is still nearly complete. Nearly everyone has access to radio technology, for example, and we find digital technology in unexpected places. So coupled with the global reach of these technologies as well as the global mobility of populations, whether it be for voluntary or involuntary reasons, Media Studies stands out as a field that contributes to our understanding of the contemporary context in which communications, the circulation of information, and the representation of identities and issues form and inform our lives.

Given its diverse, and sometimes competing, backgrounds, defining Media Studies remains a project fraught with difficulty (Craig, 1999). Rapid changes in technology as well as increasing paradigm diversity precipitate an extremely dynamic academic formation. Not surprisingly then, there have been many approaches to a description and analysis of this field. One of the formerly most common ways to approach Media Studies was to follow a historical approach, listing each emergent new technology in a linear fashion. Of course every old technology was once a new technology (Marvin, 1988). Given the explosive

speed of development of new components to contemporary technology, which render everything that's bought already outdated, and the development of new hardware which not only abets but replaces the old, it is difficult to keep writing books adding yet another chapter on whatever the newest gadget is, but historical patterns of development, deployment, and institutionalization of media are nonetheless discernible. Early technological development, accompanied by utopian and dystopian visions, are usually followed by institutionalization and commercialization in order to distribute uniform interference free content and to derive profits, partly in order to fund the upkeep of technology and production of programming. Thus some attempts to map out the historical map of communications technologies begin as early as oral history whereas others date back to the printing press, or more usually, as is the case with Winston (1998), media technology is traced back to the late nineteenth century and the introduction of the telegraph. By now (2002) most of these historical approaches to media technology end up with an open ended chapter on the internet. Since mass media continues to be technologically intensive and dynamic, we can continue to expect such books to continue being written.

Other approaches to Media Studies explore the tension and possibility derived from the rise of new paradigms. Seldom, however, are new paradigms the exclusive concern as paradigms are themselves components of larger social forces (Craig, 1999). In this vein, on the one hand De Fleur (1999) wistfully asks "where have all the milestones gone?" in an essay that laments the dearth and potential death of large, longitudinal social science projects due both to paradigm shifts and to the decreased funding and increased work load situation under which most of us labor. Whereas De Fleur wishes for a return to the days when the social scientific paradigm reigned supreme, his argument is far more sophisticated than that. He explores the contemporary institutional and social issues why no scholar, not just social scientists, can produce milestones. As such his essay is both a way to police the boundaries around paradigms and the interdiscipline as well as a political intervention in terms of the declining public support for research and education.

Other approaches to Media Studies attempt, without prejudice, to map out the contemporary fault lines and debates of the field. As such succeeding editions of Media Studies "hit" books such as *Questioning the Media* change so substantially that the third edition, as the editors of that project assert, "Betrays little genetic relationship to its ancient great-grandparent" (Downing, Mohammadi, and Sreberny-Mohammadi, 2000, p. 1). Of course, we must notice that time moves rather quickly in the field of Media Studies, as the great-grandparent was published in 1991, barely nine years before the drastically different third edition grandchild! It is important to note, however, that what De Fleur sees as a weakness of our field can also be seen as its strength. Indeed as Downing, Mohammadi, and Sreberny-Mohammadi (2000, p. 2) conclude "Media Studies are therefore in need of constant, vigilant updating, lest the field be isolated not only from the realities of the turbulent changes in the 'real world' but also from

the new ideas and perspectives bubbling up in cognate areas." In sum, paradigm revision and shifts are not only desirable but downright necessary.

As a young field, Media Studies has had its share of paradigm shifts. Concerns about children and the body politic in relation to communications and mass media have been with us since the Payne Studies of the 1920s and remain strong in the present scholarship on both children and the media and political communication. Still, despite the persistence of these thematic concerns, the nature and flow of communications has been debated by succeeding generations of scholars. Early unidirectional models of effect and influence, such as what is now known as stimulus-response analysis or the transmission model, have been replaced by increasingly sophisticated quantitative approaches with sociological and psychological roots. However, anthropology and linguistics have also become increasingly influential, especially, but not exclusively, in the rise of Cultural Studies. With this wave of studies we have a turn to include not just technology and content specific traditional pursuits of news, advertising, and television but also overlapping issues of culture and popular culture. James Carey's *Communication as Culture* (1988) signaled a humanistic intervention which foregrounded ritual as an alternative paradigm to transmission. Both *Studying Culture* (Giles and Middleton, 1999) and *Media Making* (Grossberg, Wartella, and Whitney, 1998) either begin from a cultural perspective or attempt to combine traditional Media Studies with cultural approaches. In fact the latter, *Media Making*, is a conscious attempt to bridge the two paradigms as the authors represent prominent figures in both camps: Larry Grossberg, a preeminent US cultural studies scholar and Ellen Wartella and D. Charles Whitney, two major scholars of children and the media and the sociology of news, respectively.

By the 1980s prominent debates in the field had expanded beyond the transmission-ritual binary and into the uneasy tension between Political Economy studies and the then emergent paradigm of Cultural Studies. Journal issues and books attempted to settle this apparent chasm over the unresolved split about the relative merits of social scientific versus more qualitative and interpretive methodological approaches, especially in the US where positivist paradigms remain hegemonic in terms of government and nongovernmental funding. Neither of these fault lines has been resolved. Indeed they remain part of the field and, some would argue, generate vitality and energy. In fact, the blurring of boundaries seems to be one of the ways that we as a field have dealt with these demarcations. Again, whereas some, as Turow above, see this blurring as exciting, enabling, and productive, others (for example, Rosengren, 2000) see it as a sign that we have yet to mature into a formal discipline and that the field remains fragmented. Even here there is diversity for neither the mourners nor the celebrants of the lack of coherence of the field belong to just one camp (Dervin & Chaffee, in press). These two sets of positions illustrate Giles and Middleton's (1999) definition for the different positions on subjectivity. So if we are to think of the field as a subject, we certainly experience subjectivity as both "fragmentization and atomization, and . . . as fluid, flexible and plural" (1999, p. 197).

However, efforts to bring together binary divisions in the field are not so prominent beyond US borders. For example, Latin American scholars not only do not foreground the division but seem to perceive it as inconceivable that one would separate the political–economic from the cultural (for example, Martín Barbero, 1993; Rodríguez, 2001). These two areas are not treated separately. As well, from European perspectives there are other salient approaches. Given the immense structuralist influence upon continental theory, as well as its reach, albeit belatedly, to US shores, there are entire books which approach theory through signification, the sign and post-structuralist approaches to both the sign and the audience (Cobley, 1996). Similarly the work of Armand Mattelart, from the eighties to the present, including his essay in this collection, combines a political–economic analysis with an ever present semiotics of the debate. Whether one looks at his work on Chile, Nicaragua, or the contemporary global situation, Mattelart remains a scholar who demonstrates that political economy and culture can and should be studied together.

Emerging as new sets of research questions in the field, different approaches to difference have generated a growing amount and proportion of Media Studies scholarship (see, for example, the *Howard Journal of Communication* and *Feminist Media Studies*). Perhaps eclipsing both of the already mentioned debates, as we enter the twenty-first century, it is also undeniable that ignoring global realities is untenable in an engaged interdiscipline such as Media Studies. Thus many of the new voices in the third edition of *Questioning the Media* foreground issues of difference. The result is a further deployment of boundary blending. We have gone past the age when we had a side bar or box, a small chapter, or a book focused on, for instance, women and the media. As useful as those pioneer efforts were, they paved the way for yet another level of integration in the field of Media Studies. Indeed this book begins with such an overview by Margaret Gallagher whose *Unequal Opportunities* (1981) paved the way for future scholars of issues of gender, Media Studies, and a global situation. Issues of difference are now approached in a way that combines vectors of gender, race, ethnicity, class, global location, ability, and religion – to name some of the most salient signifiers of difference – into complex and often open-ended analyses (see Valdivia, 1995). Thus we have the best-selling *Gender, Race and Class in Media* (Dines and Humez, 2003 [1995]) in which all essays are diversity intensive. Readers such as *Studying Culture* (Giles and Middleton, 1999) are so thoroughly integrated that by the end of the first chapter students have been introduced not just to a range of abstract definitions of culture but also to grounded discussion points which include post-colonialism, gender, and ethnicity. The new century presents students of Media Studies with an increasingly complex situation as well as with an increasingly sophisticated approach to the study of this situation.

While scholars and textbooks have divided the interdisciplinary field in many ways, *A Companion to Media Studies* goes beyond binary definitions of administrative/critical, scientific/humanistic, quantitative/qualitative, or political economy/cultural studies. The contemporary field is much more complex

than that, and methodologies are not necessarily indicative of philosophical, theoretical, or political implications. For example, survey methodology can be used for "administrative" purposes, as in a study of advertising preferences partly funded by an advertising agency, as well as for critical scholarship, such as a study to determine who votes and what degrees of disenfranchisement tell us about the viability of our democratic process. Social scientific methodology applied to the study of the effects of televised violence can be useful in a philosophical, and thoroughly humanistic, discussion about the role and the roots of violence in contemporary culture, such as the essay by Bryant and Miron in this volume. A quantitative body of data about readership can be a springboard for participatory research on adult literacy. *A Companion to Media Studies* builds on the map set out by Denis McQuail in his fourth chapter of *Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction*, in all of its many editions. McQuail suggests four major sub-categories which increasingly overlap with each other as we experience media and as media attempts to reach us. These categories have to be studied separately though we experience them simultaneously. *A Companion to Media Studies* aims to bring both the model and Media Studies into the new century by infusing it with healthy doses of global sensitivity as well as the integral incorporation of issues of difference. At the four levels of production, content, effect, and audience, there is already a strong body of work which is either global and/or inflected by theories of difference. Students and scholars of media studies need to consider the cultural specificity of media messages and processes as well as the tendencies towards homogenization in a global media system that self-consciously fashions itself as crossing borders and erasing differences.

Bookended by "Foundations" and "Futures" (Parts I and VI) *A Companion to Media Studies* is divided into the four areas of studies – production, content, audience, and effects (Parts II–V). As suggested by the boundary crossing characteristic of Media Studies as a whole, many of the essays in these analytically separate sections actually straddle two or more sections. As such they provide a model for scholars who find it necessary to move among and beyond the four areas. The four areas of study are an ideal model to separate what is essentially an integrated reality and experience.

Part I explores some salient themes in Media Studies in an overview manner that provides a foundational, though not necessarily exhaustive, summary of the interdiscipline. Issues of gender, new technologies, international and developmentalist approaches to communications, and the inclusion of popular music and issues of authorship and authenticity give the reader a broad overview of themes in a number of, often interrelated, sub-specialties within Media Studies in all their complexity – that is, including issues of production, content, audience, and effects within a framework sensitive to difference in a global and identity sense. For example, feminist media studies, although quite recent, dating back to Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* in 1964, signal the pervasiveness of issues of gender in our field. As Gallagher points out, each and every area of Media Studies can be informed by a feminist perspective. Indeed a new collection entitled

Sex & Money (Meehan and Riordan, 2002) makes a forceful argument that political–economic studies can also be infused by a feminist analysis. Gallagher demonstrates that scholars all over the world are engaged in boundary crossing studies which foreground gender and Media Studies. In a similarly broad ranging effort, McQuail explores the applicability of "old communication theory" to the new communication technologies and concludes with an impassioned reminder that the uses of and the theories about the new technologies remain in human hands. From the sub-specialty of international and development communications, Robert Huesca provides an overview of the theories that have been used in this area of studies. From the early North American theoretical influence, critiques of the dominant modernization paradigm have been followed by different approaches, many of them from Latin America. Huesca privileges participatory communication approaches as embodying a more ethical and democratic philosophy and praxis than the early top-down efforts deployed within the modernization paradigm. Finally, rounding out this foundational section, Sloane proposes a way to cross between production, content, and audience analysis in popular music studies by exploring the agency of an individual communicator or artist such as is the case with Michael Stipes of R.E.M. Sloane explores issues of authenticity and commercialization, so prevalent in cultural and political–economic approaches to the study of music dating back to the work of Theodor Adorno and up to contemporary scholars such as Simon Frith and Larry Grossberg. The essays in this section were chosen to foreground both the diversity within the field of Media Studies and the growth in terms of theoretical and methodological sophistication.

Part II foregrounds the study of production which includes the parameters under which, in contemporary society, we produce mass media products. Within this category we can find the neo-Marxist political economists such as contemporaries Vinnie Mosco, Robert McChesney, Janet Wasko, Eileen Meehan, and Dan Schiller (for example, see his essay in this volume) as well as the previous, and original, first generation of political economists of communications such as Thomas Guback, Dallas Smythe, and Herbert Schiller, all of whom taught at the Institute of Communications Research at the University of Illinois and left their indelible mark in that doctoral program. Political–economic approaches to the study of media focus on the concentration of ownership and control over the production of media, issues of power, and the justification and challenge of privilege. Given the global reach of US media, beginning with Hollywood film, political–economic research turned our attention to international aspects of Media Studies before the current spate of globalization studies discovered the global situation. As such, Dan Schiller's "Digital Capitalism" in this volume is an excellent example of both the political–economic and its attention to global issues as it maps out the global reach of this economic concentration as it envelops the digital media. Schiller's elegant and exhaustive chapter on digital capitalism outlines some of the contemporary challenges across a broad range of media, countries, legislative, and regulatory bodies.

However, the area of production also includes sociologists of the newsroom, for example people like D. Charles Whitney and James Ettema whose essay in this volume continues to explore the degrees of freedom under which individual, organizational, and institutional communicators operate, especially in a rapidly changing global situation with high speed of technological innovation which presents both an opportunity and a challenge. Issues of history and ethics, both of which implicitly or explicitly pervade much of Media Studies scholarship, are carefully detailed in the essays by Nerone and Bracci in this volume. Approaches to history and to ethics, as one might expect, have changed in the near century of our interdiscipline's existence both in relation to our interdiscipline and to cognate areas.

This second section ends with a transition essay by Gail Dines and Elizabeth Perea comparing the cartoons in *Playboy* to those in the *Hustler* magazine. Underscoring the fact that it is very difficult to keep the analytical components of communication separate, Whitney and Ettema also often spilt over into the area of content as a way to talk about production. Similarly Dines and Perea examine the content of the cartoons through the production of a class-based masculinity and the development of an audience for two versions of mainstream pornography. In both essays production and content issues cannot be separated.

A second area of focus in Media Studies is the analysis of content of media. Here we can draw both on the extensive social scientific work, building on Berelson's famous objective analytical method to more interpretive, usually but not exclusively, semiotic or psychoanalytic approaches. Quantitative methodology forms the backbone of the Berelsonian approach, but it can also be used in conjunction with qualitative analysis. Whereas this may seem the most forward and easiest approach within Media Studies, students should be forewarned that it is neither obvious nor easy. Whether one is accounting for frequency or some numerical or statistical correlation, one still has to define or operationalize, in a mutually exclusive manner, what it is one is trying to measure. In the qualitative tradition, the trend has been to move away from the use of the concept "images" as it implied an untenable mimetic relationship to the use of "representation", as it includes the mediation that is always there in any media content. Representation is a theoretically complex concept about which entire books are written.

The essays in Part III explore a wide variety of content issues. Beginning with Matthew McAllister's essay on *Survivor*, the television show, the section highlights the advantage of using a combination of quantitative and qualitative methodology in one essay. In fact McAllister foregrounds content but against a backdrop of production in general and political economy in particular, a sort of reversal of the Dines and Perea approach. McAllister explores the philosophical and practical ramifications for democracy that the close connection between marketing and news production augurs. Sharon Mazzarella examines the historically rich area of youth. Differing from the audience centered traditions of studying youth, whether these were social scientific or cultural studies inflected, Mazzarella instead focuses on the construction of particular categories of youth

within the mass media. Not surprisingly she finds that these categories are much more influenced by social and adult concerns than by youth themselves. As such they tell us much about our larger culture, but little about youth. On a similar vein, but focusing on women and gender and on advertising, Vickie Shields expands her now classic essay on the internally conflictual literature of women's images in advertising (Shields, 1996). Bringing the study of gender and advertising to the contemporary 2002 situation, Shields includes issues of fat pride as well as of eating disorders. She documents some successes and failures in the unhappy marriage between advertising and feminist themes. Melissa Johnson takes the emerging variety of ethnic media, in particular, but not exclusively, Latina women's magazines, and attempts to develop a model which can be tested across the range of available mass media in order to study a continuum of identity. In particular she explores the function of visual media in the dynamic construction of identity. Johnson, while considering a typology of content of Latina or ethnic media, also must consider issues of reception and audience. Wrapping up this section, Sujata Moorti presents us with a feminist, postcolonial analysis of media representational practices that popularize "oriental" symbols and enable them to enter the mainstream vocabulary of the United States. Given that fashion more often than not pertains to women, and that the usage of Indian items and symbols refers to a racialized population within both the United States and Europe, Moorti explores the gender and racial components of the globalization of fashion. Moorti analyzes both advertising and fashion itself as representational of larger geopolitical issues.

Thus the essays in Part III explore a wide breadth of what scholars in Media Studies are currently doing. Whether it be quantitative, qualitative or both; focusing on gender, youth, or ethnic and/or racial populations; and whether it be television news, magazines, advertising, or fashion, all five essays explore the importance of content as it overlaps with major political, social, and economic issues of both media and the wider society, either at a national or a global and transnational level.

Part IV focuses on the study of audiences. Within this deceptively simple rubric, there are at least two major tensions. Audience studies include marketing approaches and attempts to reach a maximum audience as well as efforts to understand interpretive and identificatory positions of individual or group audience members. Within marketing there has been a shift from attempting to reach the largest number possible to contenting oneself with reaching the most desirable demographics that would maximize the likelihood of consumption of a particular product or set of products. Thus we could include both Nielsen studies as well as focus groups within this administrative approach to audiences. However, dating back at least to Janice Radway's *Reading the Romance* in 1984, the study of audiences has also sought to flesh out the agency of individual and group audiences. That is, in particular reacting to the dismissal of female audiences and their feminine genres such as romance novels and other forms of melodrama, Radway proposed the then radical, and now perfectly obvious, notion

that we should study the members of those audiences to see what they get out of those particular media and genres. What is their interpretive take on the novel? What does reading mean to them? As opposed to what do we think they ought to be reading. This form of analysis, often using ethnographic or pseudo-ethnographic (Nightingale, 1996) methodology, became increasingly influential as it overlapped with anthropological tendencies brought in with cultural studies. Some manifestations of this type of research celebrate every reading as an emancipatory political act. Resistance lurked around every corner. The essays in this section pull back from that euphoric moment and bring back some of the many contingencies which scholars of issues of power and agency have studied and proposed for the past few centuries. However, audience analysis also continues to be carried out in the more traditional "uses and gratifications" approach (Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch, 1974) and in survey methodology. As with other sections, audience scholars are trying to understand the uses of new media by a wide range of audiences. The essays in this section provide a globally wide ranging sample of the many contemporary possibilities within audience studies.

Part IV begins with Radhika Parameswaran's essay on post-colonial theory and global audiences, in particular Indian women readers of romantic fiction produced in England. Through her grounded analysis, Parameswaran both deploys and expands the accumulated knowledge of interpretive audience studies. She investigates the complex affiliations that women have to fiction, nation, class, and gender. She demonstrates that easy mappings do nothing but obscure complex and dynamic situations. Switching back to a more traditional approach, Sonia Livingstone deploys her considerable history of audience research to explore the contemporary concerns about the audience in relation to new technology and makes a call to keep the analysis historically grounded. People's continual and intimate engagement with the world through the mass media, especially in industrialized countries, can only be understood by studying previous introductions of "new" media. Virginia Nightingale takes an epistemological and theoretical look at the academic situation that engendered the initial scientific approach to audiences, followed by a cultural turn, and followed, once more by an attempted combination of the two. She finds that in an age of increasing "manipulation and exploitation of information" it is time to answer the by now old challenge, proposed by Merton (1968/1949) of "middle range theorization" which would force us to consider how information is generated in conjunction with how it is interpreted. Joke Hermes traces the more positive components of audience research in media and cultural studies to feminist roots. Taking the often-ignored feminist legacy seriously means exploring both its useful and restraining aspects, especially the methodological pitfalls. She concludes that "to understand . . . different experiences and to validate serious discussion of all of them is what reception analysis should be about." Building on the broad range of Media Studies audience analysis, Angharad Valdivia proposes that the active audience in fact crosses over into the arena of the production of both identity and of new media situations and products. With increased, voluntary and forced, global

mobility, audiences are not what audiences used to be, and the study of audiences needs to consider the hybrid media and situations in which people make sense of themselves, the media, and the world. As with many of the other essays in this book, this chapter begins in audiences and overlaps into production, but not just the production of media but the production of identity, which Hermes and Parameswaran foreground as well.

Part V turns to the still-dominant paradigm within US Media Studies, the study of "effects" and cognition. Given the positivist tone of the US academy, this social-scientific pursuit, based largely on Merton's structural functionalism, remains the dominant paradigm in the US but is usually less central and downright marginal in other countries and continents. To this paradigm we owe the huge literature on children and the media, in particular studies of television and violence, as well as studies of political communications, in terms of voter participation and choice. As well, we have here feminist studies, especially sex role research and the effects of pornography, especially violent pornography, research. In the relatively short history of media studies since the twenties we have already had four distinct eras of dominant theories within the effects tradition. Theories of the strong effects have been overshadowed by focused small effect theory with a swing back to the middle range and a return to strong effects. Not impervious to larger social issues, this area of studies has also incorporated racial and ethnic concerns into its overall attention to issues of violence as well as an attempt to figure out how children are affected by the new media.

Two of the essays in Part V unpack the topic of stereotypes, mostly of African Americans but also of Latinos, and their effects on perceptions of and attitudes about minorities. Mary Beth Oliver suggests that the stereotyping of African Americans as criminals has potentially strong effects in terms of how African Americans are treated and Whites' perceptions and attitudes about African Americans. She also reminds us that effects research seldom relies only on effects research. Instead effects research relies and overlaps with issues of content, production, and audience. The potential of the rather pessimistic literature of the effects of race and crime in the media is that the patterns demonstrated by the scholarship will be highlighted and will therefore encourage a break in the vicious cycle of negative representation followed by negative effect. Oliver's overview of research on crime and the media contextualizes the issue of effects within a foregrounding of both content and audience. Careful to point out some of the logical leap pitfalls that many students and popular press representations of social scientific research engage in – the careful detailing of what a particular data implies and can be misconstrued to imply is something that is sorely needed in an age where there is still much too much distortion of carefully pursued studies.

Michael Casas and Travis Dixon examine the impact of stereotypical and counter-stereotypical representations of Blacks and Latinos in the news media and found that those exposed to stereotypical portrayals of Blacks and Latinos had a greater fear of crime than those exposed to counter-stereotypical portrayals,

a combination of portrayals, or those not exposed to news programs. Casas and Dixon insist that televisual content is best for exploring these issues, and suggest that further research might want to differentiate between the race of the perpetrator and the victim.

Commenting on the salience of sex and violence to effects scholars, Jennings Bryant and Dorina Miron argue that issues of sex and violence were on the public agenda before they received extensive attention from "curious scientists." As such, these two concerns should always be considered within the broader social and historical setting which demands we pay attention to them. For example, the Columbine shooting was a wake-up call to anyone who thought the issue of children and media violence was settled. Tracing the connection between pleasure and violence back to Aristotle, Bryant and Miron delve into the contested choice between freedom or censorship in regards to sex and violence in the media. Effects research, they conclude, can guide those responsible with making those choices.

Finally, to round out Part V on effects Ellen Wartella, Barbara O'Keefe, and Ronda Scantlin write on new media, particularly the interactive component and children's cognitive development. Given that children are born into and grow up in media rich homes, with expected differentials according to income, and that mass media is a dominant activity in their childhood, Wartella, O'Keefe, and Scantlin find that there is great potential for the new interactive media. However, that potential needs our parental and social vigilance as well as further research to explore how to maximize the potential benefit of these technologies for children. In sum, scholarship on children and the media in the effects tradition continues to be of great importance in terms of understanding the relationship between media, in its great diversity, and people from an early age.

The book ends with "Futures," which aims to map out some especially promising areas of study as well as ask certain scholars to assess our likelihood of following up on these promising areas. More so than the preceding four parts and paralleling "Foundations," all of these chapters self-consciously or implicitly cross the boundaries between the four areas of Media Studies. Part VI begins with John Downing's call to arms for the field, specially its US variant. He singles out the US because the sheer amount of scholarship produced and published in this country contributes to making it a hegemonic force in the global Media Studies arena. Downing's eight areas for improvement are partially answered in this volume, for example with its global diversity beyond comparing everything with an Anglo-American setting in Gallagher, Hermes, Huesca, Valdivia, Livingstone, and Parameswaran; the move beyond concept fetishism in all essays; and the inclusion and foregrounding of social class in some of the chapters, notably in Dines and Perea. However the volume falls short of two of his suggestions in terms of the importance of religion and human rights both of which are implicitly addressed in Bracci's chapter on ethics and Rentschler's study of activism and the media but are not frontally discussed by any of the other chapters. Were such cross-cutting research potential borne out, Downing

suspects that we would experience not only increasing intellectual stimulation but also greater public policy influence and thus an ability to influence the world beyond academic walls.

Downing's chapter is followed by four chapters, each of which extend Media Studies into fruitful areas of study and potential social and policy implications. Cameron McCarthy's essay on the mutually productive relationship between Media Studies and education scholarship takes up the topic of multicultural education, as it is partly struggled over and disseminated through the mass media. He explores the deployment of powerful discourses which potentially inform both educated global citizens and the politics of resentment. The Foucaultian approach is one that increasing numbers of Media Studies scholars are using, and it is beginning to appear even in undergraduate introductory texts such as *Studying Culture* (Giles and Middleton, 1999). Carrie Rentschler explores the ways that different organizations, with different resources and proximity to power, can use the media to get their message out. Rentschler criss-crosses between political economy in terms of production and ownership and control of the media, content, and issues of audiences. Many social movements originally turn to media activism for fund raising reasons, but many find that they also need to reach out to those who need the services they offer. In the process of figuring out how to interact with the media, an organization's way of being may well change. Despite the many potential pitfalls, Rentschler resoundingly holds out great democratic promise for the media overlap with social justice groups.

Stepping back to a global level of analysis, Armand Mattelart discusses the contemporary uses of the term "globalization," which, he admits, signals "a set of new realities destined to deeply change the forms of universal social links" within a historical examination of the uses and geopolitics of the term. Rather than dismiss the global solidarity potential afforded by new communication networks, he urges us not to forget the tensions between the gurus of management and the actors of social change. Boatema Boateng brings us around full circle in her study of issues of intellectual property as they relate to countries of the South, especially Africa, and, in particular, Ghana. Philosophical disagreements over the development and sustainance of intellectual property regimes by the year 2002 have more or less solidified into promoting the needs and interests of transnational corporations as opposed to encouraging and protecting the creativity of individual or group producers. Regulatory frameworks, at the regional, national, and international levels, embody hegemonic approaches to asymmetric relations of power and need to be challenged and changed at all levels. Media Studies research and activism can play a crucial role in this process. Boateng deploys a global analysis of the production of regulation as it influences the production and circulation of cultural products and media.

Thus in six separate but overlapping parts, *A Companion to Media Studies* presents a contemporary overview of the interdiscipline of Media Studies. As readers make their way through the book, they will notice that old themes are hard to abandon, primarily because they remain central themes in the