

COMMUNICATION RESEARCH TRENDS



Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture

Volume 27 (2008) No. 3

IN THIS
ISSUE

Dialogue as an “Enlarged Communicative Mentality”

Ronald C. Arnett, Celeste Grayson, Christina McDowell
Duquesne University

A QUARTERLY REVIEW OF COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

ISSN: 0144-4646

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Dialogical Frameworks	4
A. Buber's Dialogic Principle	4
B. Dialogue Schools and Difference	5
3. Dialogic Scholarship: A Communicative Perspective	7
A. Key Dialogic Essays: Heuristic Implications ..	8
B. Books	9
C. Disciplinary Articles	11
D. Temporal Assessment: An Ongoing Conversation	12
4. Conclusion	16
5. Dialogic Engagement as an "Enlarged Communicative Mentality"	17
References	18
Appendix A: Journals Included in Literature Review	21
Appendix B: Disciplinary Articles Categorized by Emergent Theoretical Biases	23
Book Reviews	25

Communication Research Trends
Volume 27 (2008) Number 3
<http://csccl.scu.edu>

Published four times a year by the Centre for the Study of
Communication and Culture (CSCC), sponsored by the
California Province of the Society of Jesus.
Copyright 2008. ISSN 0144-4646

Editor: William E. Biernatzki, S.J.
Managing Editor: Paul A. Soukup, S.J.

Subscription:
Annual subscription (Vol. 27) US\$50

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

Checks and/or International Money Orders (drawn on
USA banks; for non-USA banks, add \$10 for handling)
should be made payable to Communication Research
Trends and sent to the managing editor
Paul A. Soukup, S.J.
Communication Department
Santa Clara University
500 El Camino Real
Santa Clara, CA 95053 USA

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

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

Tel: +1-408-554-5498
Fax: +1-408-554-4913
email: psoukup@scu.edu

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

Dialogue as an “Enlarged Communicative Mentality”: Review, Assessment, and Ongoing Difference

Ronald C. Arnett
arnett@duq.edu

Celeste Grayson
graysonc@duq.edu

Christina McDowell
mcdowel338@duq.edu

1. Introduction

We commence this essay with a definition of dialogue intentionally more akin to an impressionistic painting than to the clarity of a photograph. The article that follows will announce the complexity of dialogue through the various schools or theoretical approaches that constitute the horizon of the term called “dialogue.” However, four commonplaces, or places of agreement, unite the various approaches to dialogue. First and foremost, dialogue suggests that an emergent meaning in discourse does not belong to either communicative partner; it is a product of the relationship. The term often used to announce this construct is “*the between*.” The second major configuration that frames dialogue is the presupposition that the I of the human being is *derivative* of the alterity to be engaged. The third construct highlights the importance of *ground*, or position, from which the discourse begins. This particular construct presupposes that the ground that nourishes the fundamental center of dialogue about dialogue is *a priori* to the actual conversation. This particular construct remains central to this essay. Its driving force comes from a Continental philosophical understanding of dialogue, one that does not agree with the discourse-specific dialogue driven by a more psychological or a Rogerian framework. Fourth, dialogue presupposes perhaps the obvious, though at times the forgotten; it cannot be demanded and it is not the only appropriate form of discourse.

The key to dialogue is that it is not owned by a solitary person. It is emergent. Dialogue presupposes the derivative nature of human identity. The ground of meaning is central to the shaping of dialogue. Dialogue is content-rich, not just process-specific. Finally, dialogue *cannot be demanded*, and it is a companion to other forms of speech. Martin Buber outlined mono-

logue, technical dialogue, and dialogue all as essential to human construction. Whenever people privilege dialogue as the only form of discourse, it fades from a relational gathering and something darker takes its place. Demand masquerading as dialogue is simply what it is: demand.

This essay offers both descriptive and additive contributions to the noteworthy history of dialogue scholarship within the communication discipline. Following Soukup’s (1992) summary of interpersonal communication scholarship in *COMMUNICATION RESEARCH TRENDS*, we add to the conversation by providing a focused look at the origins of a related area—dialogic theory.

Buber’s (1965/2002) “History of the Dialogical Principle” begins the conversation, rendering a framework for understanding key questions in engaging dialogue scholarship. This principle is attentive to the biases as well as the emergent questions of dialogic philosophers concerning the metaphors of the I and the Thou. In application of Buber’s framework to contemporary dialogue scholarship, we first ask *who*: Who are the major authors and scholars of dialogue scholarship? This project acknowledges the theories of Buber, Mikhail Bakhtin, Hans-Georg Gadamer, and Jürgen Habermas as foundational to the study of dialogue from the very beginning of its scholarly conception. Second, we ask *what*: What do the theories of these major dialogue scholars suggest? Interpretive and philosophical approaches to dialogue, as suggested by these scholars, engage this phenomenon as emergent, as multivocal, as a fusion of situated biases, or as publically situated. Third, we ask *when*: When did the dialogic approach to communication begin within the literature of the discipline? After attending to important dialogic frameworks, this essay offers an

extensive literature review of the history of dialogue scholarship within the discipline. Starting with key writings that provide substantive contributions to dialogue scholarship, this essay briefly traces the theoretical turns guided by emergent questions of the discipline. Fourth, we ask *where*: Where do we find these particular approaches to dialogue theory published most frequently within the discipline? The project offers an assessment of dialogic scholarship by aligning these works according to the influences of major dialogue scholars and the demands of the discipline.

2. Dialogical Frameworks

The following section outlines the frameworks within which this project engages dialogue scholarship. As noted, we begin with Buber (1965/2002), which traces the philosophical lineage of dialogue: the I, the Thou, and the It of human existence. He claims that the revelatory character of the dialogic is essential to a phenomenological understanding of the world, for “the saying of Thou by the I stands in the origin of all individual human becoming” (Buber, 1965/2002, p. 249). Next, this project turns to essays published within the discipline that articulate the various schools of dialogue theory. These essays are examined following Buber’s historical understanding of dialogue as the emergent trends of dialogue scholarship are brought into the foreground of discussion.

A. Buber’s Dialogic Principle

In 1965, the Macmillan Paperbacks edition of *Between Man and Man* began to include Buber’s “The History of the Dialogical Principle” as an afterword to that volume. This afterword was later to be included in the 1985, 1993, and 2002 editions, but was not included in earlier publications of *Between Man and Man* (mainly, those published in 1947, 1955, and 1961). In “The History of the Dialogical Principle,” Buber begins with a discussion of reciprocity, a controversial term within philosophical circles. Buber’s understanding of human growth and becoming necessitates the importance of the I and the Thou in relationship with one another. The Thou changes and reconstitutes the I, and the I is the originative ground from which a meeting must forever commence.

Buber cites a 1775 essay by Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi as perhaps one of the first renderings of the

To conclude, we ask *how* and *why*: How does dialogic communication address a given understanding of “why,” or how does it address a question of meaning within the human condition? This question situates the significance of this project by reiterating the importance of public accountability to this line of scholarship, for these theories articulate a “how” of practicing any given dialogic “why.” In order to frame these substantive questions as a public roadmap of dialogic scholarship, this essay begins with theoretical frameworks for understanding dialogue.

inseparability of “Thou and I, I and Thou” (Buber, 1965, p. 250). A half-century later, Ludwig Feuerbach emphasizes the primal relationship between I and Thou in that through this relationship “the consciousness of the world” is made manifest (Buber, 1965/2002, p. 250). It is in the work of Søren Kierkegaard, through the emphasis on the Single One, that the I-Thou relationship is made philosophically transparent and existentially pragmatic. The notion of the Single One presupposes the relationship of the Thou in relation with God, because the Thou presupposes the I. Buber then alludes to the work of Neo-Kantian thinker Hermann Cohen at the time of World War I, emphasizing the significance that is possible only through the Thou, which shapes the consciousness of the I becoming realized. Cohen’s disciple was Franz Rosenzweig, whose work supposes an independent Thou calling out to one’s I the following: “Where art thou?” Rosenzweig begins to examine clearly not only how consciousness comes to us, but how identity is derivative of one basic fundamental question: “Where art thou?” In 1919, Ferdinand Ebner, a Catholic schoolteacher in Austria, emphasizes the person who reaches out to others is ultimately and fundamentally in the last instance attentive to God alone.

Buber then moves to the introduction of his 1907 *The Legend of Baal-Shem* (1955) in which the emphasis on the I and the Thou unites the caller and the called. Still emphasizing a human I and a divine Thou, Buber continues in discussion of some of his own work, emphasizing *Daniel* (1913/1965), in which orienting, or the sense of direction, is important. The Thou orients and directs the I. In response to the work of Rosenzweig comes the work of two

Protestant theologians, Hans Ehrenberg and Eugen Rosenstock-Heussy, who emphasize the non-dialectical nature of human history through a dialogic understanding of the Thou and the I. It is in the work of Karl Heim that the emphasis upon the I-It as the given is transformed by the I-Thou as a radical institution of discovery. Buber alludes to the ongoing work philosopher of Gabriel Marcel, whose *Métaphysique* (1927) continues the emphasis on the I-Thou and the eternal. Four additional works that emerge at this time include Theodor Litt's work *Individual and Community* (1924, 1926), Eberhard Grisebach's *The Present* (1928), Karl Löwith's *The Individual in the Role of Fellowman* (1928), and Karl Jaspers's volumes I and II of *Philosophie* (1932) (Buber, 1965/2002, p. 258).

Löwith begins a phenomenological understanding of the I-Thou relationship. In 1928, Grisebach takes the notion of the I-Thou to the point at which the calling forth of the I makes the "possession of an absolute" impossible (Buber, 1965/2002, p. 259). Jaspers takes the I-Thou relationship into existential life itself. Jaspers walks from the connection of God and the Thou stating that "'the genuine consciousness of transcendence' guards itself against thinking of God 'simply as personality' " (Buber, 1965/2002, p. 261). It is existential life, not transcendental life, which propels Jaspers. In 1948, Karl Barth emphasizes the basic form of humanity as having both It and Thou characteristics (Buber, 1965/2002, p. 262). What unites the It and the Thou is the same entity, the I. It is the human—the person—that makes manifest both the It and the Thou, which in the meeting transforms the I. Buber ends by saying, in Hasidic form, that all life is meeting. He refers to the notion of the Hasidic dance, the meeting of the I and the It, the I and the Thou, with the It making the Thou possible and the Thou making the It meaningful.

Buber's (1965/2002) summation of the history of dialogue provides the foundation for this project's engagement of the philosophical origins and heuristic implications of dialogue within the discipline of communication. From Buber's treatment of dialogue, we now move to the history of the development of dialogic scholarship within the discipline by beginning with an exploration of how contemporary communication scholars have thought about dialogue. From the following historical surveys and summaries of dialogue scholarship emerge an articulation of the differences among various schools of dialogue as well as

new ways to think about traditional and emerging dialogic coordinates.

B. Dialogue Schools and Difference

The earliest survey of dialogue scholarship appears in *The Interpretation of Dialogue*, an edited volume by Tullio Maranhão published in 1990. In the introduction to this work, Maranhão (1990) discusses how a "dialogic hermeneutic" can provide an alternative framework to epistemology (p. 1). He divides the book into six sections that represent different interpretations of the nature of dialogue, including the grounding of dialogue in classical philosophy, the nature of dialogue within religious discourse, literary perspectives on dialogue, frameworks for understanding dialogue emerging from psychotherapy and anthropology, and dialogue in relation to truth and rhetoric. Maranhão situates the parameters of his discussion of dialogue within the works of contemporary philosophers such as Rorty, Bakhtin, Gadamer, Habermas, Heidegger, Kierkegaard, Buber, and Levinas. He summarizes the entirety of dialogue scholarship—from the classical era of Socrates to the postmodern philosophers—into either descriptive or ideal accounts of dialogue as a phenomenon. Within this method of categorization, Maranhão discusses how each thinker approaches the components of dialogue—dwelling, subject, language, and meaning—with either descriptive or ideal frameworks. Although this summation of dialogue scholarship does not include works within the communication discipline, it offers a strong philosophical account of how scholars have represented dialogue within their works through the ages.

Maranhão's summation of dialogue scholarship points to the importance of a dialogic approach to subjectivity. He places the "awakening interest" in dialogue scholarship with hermeneutics, literary criticism, phenomenology, and the postmodern debate (Maranhão, 1990, p. 2). Like Buber (1965/2002), this work points to the role of dialogue within the development of human consciousness. Maranhão explores the implications of engaging in either descriptive or ideal understandings of dialogue. Descriptive dialogue, as a product of modernity, aims at mutual understanding of meaning, while within ideal dialogue, the identity of each dialogic subject and the "dwelling" between them emerges from the dialogic encounter (Maranhão, 1990, p. 5). Maranhão's account ends with a return to ethics, or a return to an articulation of the importance of the Thou in human communication. While Buber's understanding of human

consciousness moves out of the sphere of the subjective and into the realm of the between, Maranhão recognizes the subject as embedded in dialogic Otherness.

The second summary article within this literature review is Kenneth N. Cissna and Rob Anderson's (1994) introduction to *The Reach of Dialogue: Confirmation, Voice and Community*. Their chapter, "Communication and the Ground of Dialogue," provides a comprehensive framework for understanding dialogue scholarship by offering a summation of the traditions and characteristics of dialogue. Cissna and Anderson identify four conceptual categories of the literature on dialogue. One, derived from the writings of Buber and similarly minded philosophers, theologians, and psychotherapists, conceives of dialogue as a form of human meeting or relationship. A second, based on the work of conversation analysts, ethnomethodologists, and others, understands dialogue to refer to the intricacies of human conversation. A third, derived largely from the work of Mikhail Bakhtin and his contemporary interpreters, views dialogue primarily as a cultural form of human knowing. Finally, a fourth conception of dialogue can be traced to Hans-Georg Gadamer's philosophy of textual understanding and interpretation (p. 10). Integrating these four traditions of dialogue, Cissna and Anderson expand upon Johannesen's (1971) characterization of dialogue and identify eight characteristics of the phenomenon: immediacy of presence, emergent unanticipated consequences, recognition of "strange otherness," collaborative orientation, vulnerability, mutual implication, temporal flow, and genuineness and authenticity (pp. 13- 15). For Cissna and Anderson, then, dialogue continues to emerge as an ethical, relational encounter between the self and other. Their call within this article is to reflect upon the "ground" of dialogue and its significance within communication scholarship and practices.

Like Buber (1965/2002), Cissna and Anderson's (1994) treatment articulates the status of dialogic scholarship within their historical moment. They cite Buber's historical review of dialogue theory as a reaction to the 18th century questions of the self in relation to society. Cissna and Anderson likewise treat the self in relation to society and distinguish the postmodern moment as characterized by the likelihood of falling into individualism, conversational narcissism, pragmatism, and emphasis on technique. Like Buber, they situate dialogue in the interpretation of confirmation and the "between" as a reflection on the richness of human relation.

A third summary piece treats the direction of dialogue scholarship. Scott C. Hammond, Anderson, and Cissna (2003) include an extensive literature review of recent scholarship in dialogue as well as a list of prominent scholars within the discipline in their article "The Problematics of Dialogue and Power" published in *Communication Yearbook*. In order to situate dialogue within a discussion of power, Hammond, Anderson, and Cissna differentiate dialogue from other forms of communication by extending some of the characteristics of dialogue as set forth by Johannesen (1971) in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, pointing toward the inherent tensions in dialogue. Prior to this discussion, however, the authors articulate a history of dialogue scholarship within the discipline, citing Buber's (1965) *Between Man and Man*, Johannesen's (1971) "The Emerging Concept of Communication as Dialogue," Poulakos's (1974) "The Components of Dialogue," Stewart's (1978) "Foundations of Dialogic Communication," Newcomb's (1984) "On the Dialogic Aspects of Mass Communication," Habermas' (1984/1987) *The Theory of Communicative Action*, Christians's (1988) "Dialogic Communication Theory and Cultural Studies" in the edited work *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, and Wold's (1992) edited book *The Dialogic Alternative: Towards a Theory of Language and Mind* as those works that launched the communication discipline into dialogue scholarship (Hammond, Anderson, & Cissna, 2003, p. 128). They continue a discussion of recent dialogue scholarship in scholarly journals and disciplinary texts in order to show how "this vigorous dialogue about dialogue has led to disagreements" between scholars about what dialogue is and how it should be engaged (p. 130). They offer a new perspective to the conversation by suggesting that dialogue is inherently about power in all forms of its conceptualization. This piece engages both a descriptive and an additive approach to dialogue scholarship.

While Buber (1965) focuses on development of theories regarding the relational encounter of the I and the Thou, Hammond, Anderson, and Cissna (2003) bring texture to the discussion of interpersonal relationships with the claim that the dialogic relationship always includes issues of power. The "permanent tensions" between self and other, content and process, coherence and incoherence, monovocality and mutuality, and convergence and emergence that exist in dialogue echo Buber's rendering of the dialectical relation among the I, the Thou, and the It as central to dialogue theory (Hammond, Anderson, & Cissna, 2003, p. 136). Both works articulate that con-

sciousness of the coordinates of dialogue is necessary for human existence and growth.

Another summary work, also associated with Cissna and Anderson, creates a context for understanding where dialogue scholarship has come from and to where it is advancing. In *Dialogue: Theorizing Difference in Communication Studies* (2004), editors Anderson, Leslie A. Baxter, and Cissna introduce the work with the “Texts and Contexts of Dialogue” (p. 1). Anderson, Baxter, and Cissna trace significant texts of dialogue scholarship through the 1970s and 1980s, focusing on how the conversation surrounding the issue of dialogue has historically reflected the works of four theorists: Buber, Gadamer, Bakhtin, and Jürgen Habermas. These “touchstone theorists,” as the authors call them, represent the philosophical anthropological, philosophical hermeneutic, linguistic and cultural, and public contexts of dialogue scholarship respectively (Anderson, Baxter, & Cissna, 2004, pp. 3-4). The authors then provide a comprehensive survey of disciplinary and scholarly books addressing issues of interpersonal communication and dialogue, as well many of the seminal works listed above. Anderson, Baxter, and Cissna then trace dialogue scholarship from 1990 to 2004, emphasizing how an understanding of dialogue continues to contribute to interpersonal communication and begins to break new ground into political, intercultural, and media communication. With this summary, the authors hope to contribute to “an adequate history of the development of its concern with dialogue” (Anderson, Baxter, & Cissna, 2004, p. 16).

Anderson, Baxter, and Cissna (2004) outline a clear history of dialogue scholarship within the 20th century, much like Buber (1965/2002) did for the 18th and early 19th centuries. They define these “contemporary sites of intellectual inquiry” as “contexts” and focus on the emergent questions and presuppositions of theoretical frameworks that led to a particular understanding of

dialogue (Anderson, Baxter, & Cissna, 2004, p. 2). While Anderson, Baxter, and Cissna place dialogue within contending communicative perspectives and spaces, Buber questions the notion of orientation, or how the philosophers of his historical moment turn toward the I and the Thou of human relation. Anderson, Baxter, and Cissna and Buber agree both on the importance of understanding dialogue as crucial for human development and on dialogue’s status as one, but not the only, means of communicating with others within existence.

These works reiterated the importance of remembering dialogue scholarship as a public conversation and illustrated the need for continual accountability and engagement in order to avoid unreflective practices. Taken in light of Buber (1965/2002), the above dialogic frameworks (1) recognize the importance of the Thou in human communication (Maranhão, 1990); (2) confirm the richness of texture that consideration of the “between” brings to communication theory (Cissna & Anderson, 1994); (3) point to the dialectical tensions inherent in the dialogic relationship (Hammond, Anderson, & Cissna, 2003); and (4) attend to the contexts of emergent dialogic theories within the discipline (Anderson, Baxter, & Cissna, 2004). We note the sizable contribution provided by Anderson and Cissna in the delineation of dialogic theories. They, together with Meghan K. Clune, published an application of dialogic theory to public rhetoric in *COMMUNICATION RESEARCH TRENDS* in 2003. They continue this contribution in a special issue of *Communication Theory* (2008) devoted to dialogic themes in which they function as guest editors.

In order to situate a reflective hermeneutic for understanding dialogue scholarship within the discipline, our project utilizes Buber’s dialogic lineage as coordinates for creating a summary of dialogic scholarship. This summary engages a survey of the key scholarly texts in the communication discipline that shaped dialogic scholarship.

3. Dialogic Scholarship—A Communicative Perspective

Buber’s (1965/2002) history focuses on the philosophical and phenomenological origins of dialogue theory. From these origins, we join other scholars who continue to move dialogue scholarship into the communication discipline, particularly the

areas of interpersonal communication and communication ethics; some of whom engage dialogue from a Buberian perspective and others who engage it from other perspectives delineated by authors such as Anderson and Cissna (2008; with Arnett, 1994; with

Hammond, 2003; with Baxter, 2004). This section examines (1) essays that have shaped the disciplinary ground of dialogue scholarship within the field of communication; (2) books that have contributed to theoretical engagement of dialogue from a communicative perspective; and (3) scholarly articles that extend dialogic scholarship into the realm of interpretation and application of communicative theories and contexts. This section ends with (4) a temporal assessment of dialogue scholarship, paying particular attention to the emergent trends and questions raised from different philosophical frameworks for understanding dialogue.

A. Key Dialogic Essays: Heuristic Implications

In order to map dialogue scholarship within the discipline, we located the essays which have established disciplinary ground. Decisive works of dialogue scholarship include Richard L. Johannesen's (1971) "The Emerging Concept of Communication as Dialogue" published in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, John Poulakos's (1974) "The Components of Dialogue" published in *Western Speech* (now *Western Journal of Communication*), John Stewart's (1978) "Foundations of Dialogic Communication" published in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, and Ronald C. Arnett's (1981) "Toward a Phenomenological Dialogue" published in the *Western Journal of Speech Communication*. These early articles provided ground for the communication discipline to engage the notion of dialogue from ethical and phenomenological frameworks by opening up the discipline to the works of Buber, Edmund Husserl, and Gadamer.

Johannesen (1971) suggests the importance of Buber's notions of the I-It and the I-Thou as determining components of engaging the concept of dialogue. He references some preliminary scholarship, including *The Miracle of Dialogue* (1963) by Reuel L. Howe and *The Human Dialogue: Perspectives on Communication* (1960) edited by Floyd W. Matson and Ashley Montagu, as well as the writings of Buber and Maurice Friedman, to show how effective human communication is beginning to be understood within the discipline. He describes the "essential movement in dialogue," in Buberian understanding, as turning toward the Other and connects this understanding with Carl Rogers's characteristics of client-centered psychotherapy (Johannesen, 1971, p. 375). These two understandings merge with what Johannesen contends are the major components of dialogue as discussed by scholars

within the field: genuineness, accurate empathic understanding, unconditional positive regard, presentness, spirit of mutual equality, and supportive psychological climate. He also discusses Buber's understanding of monologue and dialogue to emphasize the importance of the intentionality of a dialogic encounter and its ethical implications: "dialogue seems to represent more of a communication attitude, principle, or orientation than a specific method, technique, or format" (Johannesen, 1971, p. 374). Finally, he offers pedagogical and scholarly implications of adopting Buber's understanding of dialogue within the communication discipline. Poulakos, in another seminal work within the discipline, would later cite this work by Johannesen.

Poulakos (1974) offers a description of the self, the other, and the "between" as key components of dialogue. Poulakos argues that Johannesen's (1971) work describes the *characteristics* of dialogue but not necessarily the *components*. Accordingly, Poulakos understands the self, the other, and the "between" as being critical parts of the dialogic "mode of existence manifested in the intersubjective activity between two partners, who, in their quest for meaning in life, stand before each other prepared to meet the uniqueness of their situation and follow it wherever it may lead" (1974, p. 199). Poulakos draws largely on the works of Buber and Jaspers in order to provide philosophical renderings of the self, the other, and the "between." He claims that each component of dialogue is essential for the emergence of intersubjective meaning and communicative significance. With this essay, dialogue scholarship continued with the focus on the intersubjective and intentional characteristics of the dialogic phenomenon.

This account of dialogue was advanced further by Stewart (1978). Stewart engages the central philosophical issues of dialogue mainly through the works of Husserl and Gadamer. He emphasizes the phenomenological nature of what communication scholars consider as the basic dialogic components of the "transaction," the "relationship," and the "between" (Stewart, 1978, p. 184). Phenomenological studies emphasize the metaphysical and epistemological primacy of relationship and offer an understanding of embedded intentionality within existence, all of which play a crucial part in understanding dialogic communication. Stewart concludes his phenomenological rendering of dialogue by returning to the works of Buber, who "brings the phenomenological concept of relational reality to human ontology," and therefore offers a more holistic,

anthropological understanding that “humanness is dialogic” (p. 197). The challenge, Stewart claims, is for communication scholars to support research that is consistent with this phenomenological, relational perspective on dialogue.

Arnett (1981) answers Stewart’s call to recognize the original phenomenological roots of dialogue. Arnett warns against the tendency of communication scholars to conflate humanistic, psychological renderings of dialogue such as those proposed by Abraham Maslow and Rogers with the phenomenological understanding of dialogue as supported by Buber and Freidman. The equating of these two very different understandings of dialogue often confuses the notions of the “between” with psychologism, and Buber’s “being and seeming” with Rogers’s “congruence and incongruence” (Arnett, 1981, pp. 203-204). Arnett cautions that terms for dialogue must be used with care; the phenomenological perspective of dialogue implies a different interpretation of human communication from one derived from psychology, one that is based on the “between” and intentionality. Buber’s approach to understanding dialogue offers an alternative to purely subjectivist or objectivist views of human communication, for dialogue occurs not *in* the individual or *in* the world but *between* us and the world. With this differentiation in mind, Arnett writes:

The implications of rooting the notion of the “between” in the phenomenological notion of intentionality may be summarized as: (1) a radical critique and alternative to humanistic communication, and (2) the communicative shift of emphasis from self to the ontological reality of the “between” in the rhetorical situation that is given life in dialogue. (1981, p. 211)

These implications, Arnett claims, offer a step further toward the phenomenological understanding of dialogue that was introduced by Stewart (1978). Arnett’s work thus opens the conversation of dialogue scholarship to new possibilities for application within the discipline.

Together, these essays have shaped the history of dialogue scholarship and helped to establish a disciplinary ground. Reflecting back on Buber’s dialogic coordinates as a hermeneutical framework, we recognize the contributions of each of these essays in the following manner: (1) Johannesen (1971) introduces the discipline to dialogic communication from the hermeneutic of Buber’s notions of the I-It and the I-Thou; (2) Poulakos (1974) emphasizes the intersubjective realm

of the self, the other, and the “between” within the realm of dialogue; (3) Stewart (1978) introduces the phenomenological origins of dialogue as was supported by Buber; and (4) Arnett (1981) implicates the importance of differentiating the humanistic, psychological understanding of dialogue in favor of a phenomenological understanding of the “between” and intentionality in dialogue. From these key essays, we now branch out to the wider scope of dialogic theory as it appears within the communication discipline by offering a picture of the major trends of dialogue scholarship within books and articles.

B. Books

The majority of significant scholarship addressing dialogic theory within the communication discipline can be found in primary texts and collections of essays. For the purposes of this project, the authors reviewed publications based on two criteria: (1) the inclusion of dialogic summaries and/or essays on dialogue within disciplinary texts; and (2) their contribution to keeping the conversation about dialogue going within the discipline.

A survey of the most significant books on dialogue within the discipline initiated this comprehensive study. First, we recognize *The Human Dialogue: Perspectives on Communication* edited by Matson and Montagu (1967). This edited volume includes a comparison of communication as science and communication as dialogue and presents essays concerning psychological approaches to dialogue, the intersubjectivity of dialogue, the realms of dialogue, and the sociology and culture of communication written by major dialogue theorists, including Buber and Marcel. It is one of the earliest interpersonal communication books specifically addressing dialogue theory.

Next, *Bridges Not Walls: A Book about Interpersonal Communication*, edited by John Stewart (1973), is included in this review of key texts. Stewart’s work provides multiple essays that address central concerns of the discipline, including verbal and nonverbal communication, awareness and perception of others and social events, relationship development and communication, and inter- and cross-cultural communication. Although this book does not have “dialogue” in the title, it has proved to be an invaluable resource for the study of dialogue in interpersonal communication due to its role in establishing dialogue’s theoretical frameworks within the discipline. Like Stewart’s work, Charles T. Brown and

Paul W. Keller's (1979) *Monologue to Dialogue: An Exploration of Interpersonal Communication* stands as one of the earliest text books engaging dialogic theory. Brown and Keller explore major metaphors of interpersonal communication, including points of view, the communication of meaning, the role of expectations, and the influence of the environment or context on communicative acts. They conclude the study with issues of power in communication and the movement from monologue to dialogue.

In addition, we recognize the importance of the application of dialogic theory to important ideas within interpersonal communication texts. *Communication and Community: Implications of Martin Buber's Dialogue* by Arnett (1986) engages Buber's dialogic theory to confirm the importance of dialogue in groups and organizations. By placing focus on the self and the community together, Arnett's work opens up new possibilities for interpersonal communication. This text illustrates the importance of recognizing community, and not the individual self, as the source for opening up conversation. Likewise, Arnett's (1992) *Dialogic Education: Conversations about Ideas and Between Persons* offers a new approach to education by focusing on dialogue as an overarching metaphor to be used into the classroom. Within this analysis, Arnett defines what it means to be an educator and at the same time a learner. Arnett stresses the importance to an educator of the difference between public and private contexts for dialogic engagement, introducing the reader to a significant theory of relational praxis that emerges within the classroom.

Following the first few decades of the emergence of dialogue scholarship within the discipline are *The Interpretation of Dialogue*, edited by Maranhão (1990), and *The Reach of Dialogue: Confirmation, Voice, and Community*, edited by Anderson, Cissna, and Arnett (1994), both of which survey dialogic scholarship in a multitude of disciplinary contexts. Maranhão's work, drawing on literary, philosophical and linguistic concepts, covers a variety of topics concerning dialogue and communication theory. Included in this text are explorations of dialogue and dialectic, narrative and interpretation, therapeutic dialogue, and dialogical anthropology. This work's significant contribution lies with the number of disciplinary contexts in which dialogue theory is engaged, as well as providing an essay summarizing dialogic theory and the different schools of dialogic scholarship. Anderson, Cissna, and Arnett (1994) capture dialogue as a whole though ana-

lyzing its particulars within each chapter, offering essays that explore dialogic themes, including dialogue as invitation, the arena of dialogue, and the ethical implications of dialogue. This work provides a substantial understanding of dialogue in different theoretical contexts, especially through its summary essay discussing the characteristics of dialogue and dialogic scholarship.

Within the past 15 years, scholarship on dialogue has supported "thinking otherwise" when it comes to relational communication. In *Relating: Dialogues and Dialectics* (1996), Baxter and Barbara M. Montgomery intend to think dialectically about communication in personal relationships. With an analysis of interpersonal relationships not specified by relational contexts, Baxter and Montgomery offer an exploration of how dialogic actions take place within communication between persons. This treatment allows for the emergence of a discussion about relational praxis, using Bakhtin's dialogism to emphasize the core components of interpersonal communication. Likewise, *Dialogic Civility in a Cynical Age: Community, Hope and Interpersonal Relationships* by Arnett and Pat Arneson (1999) engages a dialogic framework by articulating how individual voices are reclaimed in the public sphere through an openness to the other. The text reintroduces the discipline to the idea that conversations take place at a public interpersonal level and are always embedded within a historical moment.

More recent dialogic contributions attend to new directions of dialogue theory within the discipline. *Dialogue: Theorizing Difference in Communication Studies*, edited by Anderson, Baxter, and Cissna (2004), frames the major theories and contributors on the subject of dialogue through a wide range of communication contexts—interpersonal, organizational, societal, and political. This volume illustrates implications, connections, and new directions for dialogic research. Along with these new considerations, the authors offer a section that provides the reader with a review summary of dialogue scholarship. *Dialogic Confession: Bonhoeffer's Rhetoric of Responsibility* by Arnett (2005) is grounded within the work of Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Arnett frames a communicative ethic centered on the pragmatic importance of confession in interpersonal communication. Through this approach, he brings to the table an in-depth conversation that unites dialogue and rhetoric.

Finally, we turn to *Communication Ethics Literacy: Dialogue and Difference*, by Arnett, Janie

Harden Fritz, and Leeanne M. Bell (2008). In this text, the authors recognize that we live in an era in which there is consistent disagreement on what narrative and virtue structures should guide us. This historical moment presents itself, as Hannah Arendt (1958) declares, as an ongoing blurring of public and private communicative spheres. The convoluting of public and private life eclipses a fundamental and natural form of human protection central to the human condition: the differentiation, and thereby the nourishment, of both the public and the private spheres of communicative life. In such an era, the good no longer claims public agreement; therefore, we must frame what we tender as communication ethics as a given practice and not a presupposed public good. One then discerns the ethical, or becomes ethically literate, by attending to the practices, which one protects and promotes, that frame a given good situated in a particular and necessarily limited standpoint. Recognizing the lack of universal agreement on a public christening of a given good or set of goods, this work moves communication ethics into the realm of learning from difference as the “first principle” (Arnett, Fritz, & Bell, 2008). The pragmatic enactment of dialogue in an era of narrative and virtue contention recognizes an era undergoing enrichment of the public sphere driven by multiplicity, not uniformity.

Highlighting these books matters for creating the foundation for this literature review of key works in dialogue scholarship because it discloses three elements: (1) dialogic theory within the primary texts and collections of essays in the communication discipline; (2) the way in which dialogue scholarship has shaped interpersonal communication studies; and (3) the application of dialogic theory to the important ideas within interpersonal communication texts. These explorations in and expansions of dialogue theory are furthered by numerous articles published within the discipline of communication.

C. *Disciplinary Articles*

Understanding the ground of dialogue scholarship necessitates understanding the interplay of ideas and scholars within this framework. In order to complete such a task, we engaged in an extensive review of scholarly journal publications for the years 1918–2008. The search focused on the field of communication, spanning regional, national, and international boundaries. We contend that, in order to engage in public discourse from a philosophical perspective, the data matter. We recognize the importance of accumulating suf-

ficient public evidence—or providing a road map of accountability of ideas. Therefore, we include a survey of works published in disciplinary journals from the earliest year of publication access to 2008. The primary guidelines for selection of articles were the inclusion of “dialogue,” “dialogic,” or “dialogical” in the title as well as a theoretical engagement or summary of dialogic scholarship. To identify journal articles, we entered the key search terms into multiple academic search engines (i.e. Proquest, Communication Institute for Online Scholarship [CIOS] Index, JSTOR, EBSCO Communication and Mass Media Complete, and CommAbstracts). To include sources predating electronic databases, we used print and microfilm resources in order to ensure full coverage of material.

Table 1 on page 12 illustrates the results of this comprehensive review of disciplinary articles. In total, we found 50 articles that met the research criteria of including “dialogue,” “dialogic,” or “dialogical” in the title. The disciplinary journals publishing the greatest quantity of articles about dialogue are *Communication Theory* with 15 articles and *Southern Communication Journal* with 15 articles, both of which published special editions on dialogue. It is important to note that the periods from 2000–2008 yielded the most hits in terms of articles matching the research criteria. The most significant portion of articles with “dialogue,” “dialogic,” or “dialogical” in the title published during this time was found in the Winter 2000 issue of *Southern Communication Journal*, with almost the entire publication devoted to the topic, and the February 2008 *Communication Theory* special issue on dialogue with all nine articles addressing this area of study.

In addition to this table, we offer a comprehensive list of all journals surveyed within this study. See Appendix A for the additional journals examined which did not yield search any results of essays with the terms “dialogue,” “dialogic,” or “dialogical” in the title.

The articles included in this review vary in scope and focus. Dialogue scholarship encompasses both theory and application, both the abstract and the concrete. We found several major trends of dialogue scholarship, including engagement of the works of one or more dialogue theorists, social science applications of dialogue, ethical implications of dialogic encounters, interdisciplinary contributions to general dialogue theory, and praxis approaches to dialogue. From this survey of dialogue scholarship, this essay now turns to a theoretical engagement of these voices within the discipline using the dialogic principles of key theorists—Buber,

National Publications		Years of Publication			
Affiliation	Journal Title	1971-1981	1982-1992	1993-1999	2000-2008
International Communication Association	<i>Communication Theory</i>	—	1	2	12
	<i>Communication Yearbook</i>	—	—	3	1
	<i>Communication Monographs</i>	—	1	—	—
National Communication Association	<i>Critical Studies in Media Communication</i>	—	1	—	—
	<i>Quarterly Journal of Speech</i>	2	1	—	1
	<i>Review of Communication</i>	—	—	—	1
Regional and Organizational Publications		Years of Publication			
Affiliation	Journal Title	1971-1981	1982-1992	1993-1999	2000-2008
Central States Communication Association	<i>Communication Studies (formerly Central States Speech Journal)</i>	—	1	—	—
Eastern Communication Association	<i>Communication Quarterly</i>	—	—	—	1
Southern States Communication Association	<i>Southern Journal of Communication</i>	—	—	1	14
Western States Communication Association	<i>Western Journal of Communication</i>	2	2	1	—
Pennsylvania State University	<i>Philosophy and Rhetoric</i>	—	2	—	—

Table 1. Number of articles published with the words “dialogue,” “dialogic,” or “dialogical” within the title categorized by year. (NOTE: Only those years and publications which yielded search results are shown within this table.)

Bakhtin, Gadamer, and Habermas—as hermeneutical frameworks.

D. Temporal Assessment:

An Ongoing Conversation

In order to offer theoretical engagement of these contributions to dialogue scholarship, we briefly sketch

which understanding of dialogue the recent publications presuppose and attend to. Like Buber (1947, 1958) in his approach to dialogic theory, we presuppose that the nature of the theoretical should be embedded in the practical. Therefore, the engagement of dialogue scholarship should acknowledge intention and bias. This essay frames dialogue theory with the recog-

nition of prejudice that situates ground (Gadamer, 1975). Theory is a hermeneutic entrance announced by three key elements: one's bias, an emergent question, and a primary text. Accordingly, we categorized the entire collection of articles by way of the guiding questions of each work's attention, including a supplemental list of references organized by way of the major schools of dialogic theory (see Appendix B).

Following Anderson and Cissna's model of categorizing traditions of dialogue (2008; with Arnett, 1994; with Hammond, 2003; with Baxter, 2004), we contend that four major dialogic philosophers—Buber, Bakhtin, Habermas, and Gadamer—give a voice for this material to be heard within the discipline by providing theoretical ground for engagement. This section discloses the hermeneutic entrance of each of the major dialogic theorists discussed in this essay by asking the question: "To what does dialogue attend?" We contend that each of these theorists attends to dialogue with a distinct theoretical bias or question. In Buber's *I and Thou* (1958) and *Between Man and Man* (1947), dialogue attends to the revelatory moment. Bakhtin's work, including *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* (1981) and *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (1986), addresses how dialogue is attentive to the "third." Gadamer, in *Philosophical Hermeneutics* (1976) and *Truth and Method* (1975), raises the question of how one attends respectfully to a text while stretching its horizons in order to disclose the unseen and the rarely noticed. For Habermas in *Theory of Communicative Action, Volumes 1 and 2* (1984/1987), the concern is how one can attend to a dialogue that brings attentiveness to a public discussion of truth no longer tainted by interests of domination. These four philosophies of dialogue create a guiding hermeneutic for understanding the application and extensions of dialogic theory within the discipline. We now turn to a temporal assessment of the disciplinary articles that remains attentive to the emergent questions of each work.

The key essays discussed above, published between 1971 and 1981, begin the disciplinary conversation on dialogue. These works published within the first decade of our review of dialogue scholarship respond to the disciplinary call of moving communication studies into the realm of dialogic theory, articulate the philosophical and phenomenological origins of dialogue scholarship, and offer traditionally-accepted psychological or humanistic renderings of dialogue. These essays are philosophically construct-

ed largely within the tradition of Buber's dialogic theory; however, the readings of Buber manifest considerable philosophical and practical differences emerging in phenomenological and psychological understandings of Buber's work. Argument or dialogic contention begins with the discovery of such differences, reflecting not the bias of Buber alone, but the prejudice brought forth by his interpreters. Through engaging Buber's works, Johannesen (1971), Poulakos (1974), Stewart (1978), and Arnett (1981) unite philosophy and communication in a way unique to their particular moment, providing a public accounting of why dialogue matters to the discipline.

The next decade of our review includes those works published between 1982 and 1992. Anderson (1982) responds to Arnett (1981) by advancing Rogers's and Maslow's psychological or ethnographic contributions to dialogic scholarship. Their exchanges mark the emergence of different schools of thought of dialogic theory. Smith (1985) continues the phenomenological, in this case the existential phenomenological, underpinnings of dialogue by describing Heidegger's concept of "authentic discourse," linking this experience to a dialogic encounter with the nature of Being. Further continuation of this work manifests itself in Roochnik (1986), which emphasizes the alterity inherent in philosophical discourse, countering Richard Rorty's claim that one can find "common ground" through a dialogic hermeneutic.

Kelly (1989) makes an explicit turn towards the ethical. His work explores the nature of ethical reflection and claims that its dialectical structure lends itself to dialogic implications. The significance of this work is that it foreshadows the increasing connection between dialogue and ethics that marks the passage into the first decade of the 21st century. Fiske (1991) continues the ethnographic approach by offering a connection between dialogue theory and discourse. He renders ethnography as a dialogic encounter, pointing to the embedded practices of discourse among individuals. We can understand the work of Maslow and Rogers as preliminary markers for what becomes interpersonal ethnographic dialogical reflection. Baxter (1992) once again picks up the philosophical dialogue by utilizing Bakhtin's dialogism as a dialogic alternative to the study of interpersonal communication strategies. Finally, Bavelas and Coates's (1992) work continues to point toward an ethnographic move within dialogic scholarship that has a descriptive dimension of cognition and conversation theory.

The above authors contribute to a dialogic conversation by offering general extensions of dialogic theory from a phenomenological and existential phenomenological perspective, a psychological orientation, and a multifaceted understanding that links ethnographic inquiry with dialogue. Additionally, this scholarship offers a glimpse of dialogue and the ethical turn. This scholarship augments the voices of Buber, central to the scholarship of a number of early dialogic theorists, and that of Gadamer, perhaps most explicitly introduced by Stewart (1978). Bakhtin's voice begins to emerge as dialogue scholars consider the role dialogue plays in relating within a dyadic world of speech events. In these essays, a shift emerges from understanding the origins and components of dialogue to understanding how dialogue allows for an emergent consciousness of self and others with increased emphasis on the "third," or what might be called in more colloquial terms, the "neighbor," and, as stated above, foreshadows an explicit ethical turn in dialogic theory.

The next movement of dialogue scholarship includes works published between 1993 and 1999. This moment heightens the question of applicability, or how dialogue is brought into communication practices—interpersonal, organizational, and democratic. Geist and Dreyer (1993) apply dialogic theory to the patient-physician encounter by paying critical attention to the role that each party's perspective of the communicative experience plays in relation to the other. Neumann (1994) draws upon Bakhtin's dialogic theory to examine the multiple voices of cultural and ethnographic representation within the study of communities. Eisenberg (1994) likewise explores cultural and hierarchical systems shaped by language, offering dialogue as a needed practice of democratic organizations. Willmott (1994) recaptures the dialogic rationality of social construction theory that focuses neither solely on the subjective nor on the objective planes of meaning formation and enactment. Cissna and Anderson (1998) examine the potential places of commonality in the Buber's and Rogers's renderings of dialogue, while Kellet (1999) examines dialogue and dialectics in organizations by offering a case study of how managed organizational change includes both dialectical and dialogic-based processes and feedback systems. Finally, Hawes (1999) utilizes Bakhtin's work on speech genres, Nietzsche's genealogical philosophy and theory of power and will, and Bateson's work on cybernetics to sketch the embodied practices of dialogic encounters that illus-

trate self-organizing systems of mediation. Many of these authors engage social science approaches to dialogic and communication studies, move dialogue scholarship into the space of everyday discourse, and attend to the implications of conversation. We recognize the influences of Bakhtin, Habermas, and Buber within the works of these dialogic theorists. While Buber's dialogic theory continues to provide a foundation for engaging dialogue scholarship, the works of Bakhtin and other critical perspectives continue to open up the conversation to cultural and discursive implications of dialogue within public and private spaces. The application of dialogic theory characterizes this particular moment of scholarship.

The 21st century scholarship on dialogue does not, however, break new ground paradigmatically. One can find essays that foreshadow the insights that now guide us to illustrative and important material in dialogue scholarship. What was once novel within the discipline has now become normative practice. We no longer simply divide dialogue among four different theorists. Differences within dialogue practices themselves begin to emerge, not only theoretically within the works of given theorists, but also by way of the context and reshaping of our understanding of dialogue theory. For instance, the winter 2000 issue of *The Southern Communication Journal* includes several works by dialogic theorists. Mifsud and Johnson (2000) reflect upon the study of dialogue within the discipline. They conclude that there must be a meeting between dialogic, dialectical, and rhetorical theories in order to understand the full scope of human dialogue. Shotter (2000) explores the work of Bakhtin in relation to Goethe and Wittgenstein in pointing to the participatory and dialogic reality of communicative theory and practices. Murray (2000) brings Levinas's ethic as first philosophy into conversation with Bakhtin's dialogic answerability in order to expound upon the importance of responsibility in the dialogic encounter. Johannesen (2000) likewise moves toward the ethical in dialogue by connecting Noddings's "relational ethic" and "ethic of care" to Buber's fundamental dialogic principles. Pearce and Pearce (2000a) develop the concept of "dialogic virtuosity" in order to distinguish dialogue from other communicative theories and practices. Kristiansen and Bloch-Poulsen (2000) discuss the public implications of dialogic encounter by presenting a model for understanding the conditions of dialogue within organizations. Likewise, Zoller (2000) explores the dialogic relations within a community, moving dia-

logue into the realm of social change and public discourse. Hyde and Bineham (2000) discern the difference between debate and dialogue within the public sphere, pointing to the value of adopting a “pedagogy of dialogue.” Finally, Stewart and Zediker (2000) proclaim “dialogue as tensional, ethical practice,” thus differentiating their hermeneutic from descriptive renderings of dialogic scholarship. Through the assessment of this particular publication, we would like to note the advancing ethical turn that dialogue scholarship takes at the beginning of this decade, pointing to an emergent concern for the rhetorical, or the public, implications of dialogic encounters.

In addition to the winter 2000 issue of *The Southern Communication Journal*, other significant contributions to dialogue scholarship appear in this decade. Pearce and Pearce (2000b; 2001) also continue the conversation about dialogue in other publications by exploring the coordination and managing of meaning through dialogic encounters within the public sphere. Czubaroff (2000) grounds Buber’s philosophy of dialogue within rhetoric, elaborating on what she terms “dialogical rhetoric” as a unique avenue for dialogic scholarship by bringing the instrumental and dialogical conceptions of the rhetorical situation and the rhetor to the foreground of discussion. Arnett (2001) frames “dialogic civility” as an interpersonal metaphor for the public domain, focusing dialogic scholarship on action and agency within the public sphere. Artz (2001) explores the opportunities for dialogue and social justice within student-run service-learning projects. Boyd (2001) argues against the public/private dichotomy defining internal corporate rhetoric and instead encourages scholars to engage organizational “private” discourse as a necessary participant of a “public” dialogue. Murray (2003a, 2004) continues the ethical concern for dialogic scholarship by penning a two-part article entitled “The Face in Dialogue.” Here, he again utilizes Levinas’s dialogic theory to articulate the connection between rhetoric and dialogic ethics through the metaphors of disruption, supplication, and asymmetry. Finally, DeTurk (2006) offers a phenomenological rendering of intergroup dialogue, diversity, and social change within intercultural and interpersonal communication. Within these articles, we continue to see the support for the ethical and the practical within dialogue scholarship. Additionally, issues of alterity, power, and justice begin to inform how dialogue theorists explore the philosophies of individual and group communicative practices.

The final assessment of the conversation on dialogic scholarship continues with a recent issue from *Communication Theory*. Cissna and Anderson (2008), guest editors of this volume, open the conversation to “fresh perspectives on dialogue theory” within the postmodern moment, reminding the readers of differing traditions of dialogic scholarship and the implications that these traditions hold for the engagement of dialogic theory and practices. White (2008) draws from Habermas’s theory of communicative action in order to illustrate the strategic within the dialogic, or how alterity and sociality direct individual attention to group concerns. Heidlebaugh (2008) examines dialogue in the context of public deliberation and reintroduces the implications of the sophistic notions of *apatê* and *kairos* in public dialogue. Kim and Kim (2008) also draw on Habermas’s theory of communicative action, as well as Giddens’s theory of structuration, to explore the dialogic dimension of practical political discourse. Herrmann (2008) situates Kierkegaard within the tradition of dialogue scholarship by highlighting his distinction between the communication of knowledge and the communication of capability. Black (2008) explores the connection between personal storytelling, group deliberation, and dialogic moments by offering this dynamic as a way individuals work through the tensions of the self and the other within a communicative encounter. Poulos (2008) furthers Buber’s emphasis on dialogue as revelatory with his metaphor “accidental dialogue,” pointing to the importance of cultivating imagination, courage, and consciousness within the practical. Simpson (2008) examines how dialogue opens up the articulation of biases across boundaries of race and ethnicity, warning scholars and practitioners against the danger of the discourse of “color blindness.” Finally, Smith (2008) engages a picture of dialogic practice within contexts of social, political, and economic oppression which encompasses narrative, poetic, and deliberative forms. Along with these contributions, we especially note the pronounced extensions of Habermas’s dialogic and communicative theory within this volume. These theorists reinforce the public, strategic dimensions of dialogue. They suggest that within the historical moment, dialogue becomes not only a way of acknowledging difference within the public sphere, but also a hermeneutic entrance into individual and group communicative practices. This reflection allows for a self to remain accountable to the revelation of responsibility toward the historical moment and the other.

Dialogue scholarship continues to engage the marketplace of ideas—the everyday of human discourse—by offering new frameworks for understanding the public sphere, philosophy, marketing and advertising, social science, organizational studies, ethnography, and ethics.

This chronological review of recent published articles in dialogic theory suggests the presence of ongoing conversation. Initiated with theory contributed by Buber and textured with emerging schools of dialogic theory, including the voices of Gadamer, Bakhtin, Habermas, and Levinas, dialogic scholarship finds places of application both empirically and phenomenologically—empirically in organizational and interpersonal engagement and phenomenologically in the realm of ethics. Finally, dialogue, with its emphases on meeting and ethics, has entered the conversation in the 21st century of difference and diversity.

We support the need for accountability that comes with engaging an idea of ethical import such as “dialogue.” While a variety of interpretations of dialogue and its practice is unquestionably necessary and healthy

for the discipline, we also recognize the temptation to equate the ethical and phenomenological space of dialogue with other moments of discourse such as “conversation” or “debate.” Even in everyday life, using the word “dialogue” has become commonplace, and its meaning, we suggest, often remains unreflective and unfortunately misused. In response to Buber’s *Between Man and Man* (1947), we recognize the modern temptation to force dialogue within a collectivity of individuals rather than letting it emerge among a community of persons (pp. 50-51). The question of this moment stands: How do we remain accountable to dialogue scholarship within the discipline as it engages the demands of the historical moment? We note that dialogue is not *just* responsive to *other people*, but it has an *environmental ethic* implicit in it, being ever so responsive to the historical moment. We suggest that this contribution from Gadamer not be lost, for this school of dialogue does not begin with humanistic assumptions, but rather environmental assumptions framed with the language of historicity or historical moment (Arnett, Fritz, & Holba, 2007).

4. Conclusion

We remain accountable to dialogue scholarship by providing a review of its “artifacts of dialogic storytelling,” following Arnett, Arneson, and Holba’s (2008) work in “*Bridges Not Walls: The Communicative Enactment of Dialogic Storytelling.*” In this essay, Arnett, Arneson, and Holba provide an account of Stewart’s (1973) work and its relevance to dialogic studies within the existential phenomenological tradition of philosophical hermeneutics. Grounded in the works of both Gadamer and Paul Ricoeur, Arnett, Arneson, and Holba’s interpretive essay situates *Bridges Not Walls* as an “artifact of dialogic storytelling,” for “the editions of his work both shape and exhibit a shift in emphasis from transactional, to humanistic, to dialogic interpersonal communication” (p. 217). In like manner, we situate all of the communicative artifacts of our review—key essays, books, and disciplinary articles—as pointing to the emergent traditions of study within dialogic scholarship. Each text engages the question, “Why dialogue?” in reflection and response to each historical moment, acknowledging the demand of dialogic theory with distinct theoretical biases.

We first determined that there appear to be four schools of dialogue, following Anderson and Cissna’s (2008; with Arnett, 1994; with Hammond, 2003; with Baxter, 2004) framework by highlighting the works of Buber, Bakhtin, Gadamer, and Habermas. These four schools tend to agree on the following points: (1) each school attends to dialogue with a distinct theoretical bias or question; (2) each school is attentive to dialogue as beginning with a meeting with an understanding of meeting; and (3) each school recognizes that dialogue cannot be demanded. The schools differ significantly on the following topics: (1) the nature of the relationship between the self and the dialogic moment; (2) the hermeneutic entrance that it announces; and (3) what is being called into responsibility within the dialogic encounter. To this distinction of four schools we add the possibility of a fifth; a school attentive to alterity, difference, and learning, perhaps guided most explicitly by the dialogic theory of Emmanuel Levinas (1969; 1985; 1998). Numerous scholars have explored Levinas and his theory’s implications for communicative and dialogic studies—for example, Arnett (2003, 2004, 2008a), Esken (2000), Hyde (2001, 2005), Lipari

(2004), and Murray (2000, 2003a, 2003b, 2004). By remaining accountable to the philosophical origins and emergent traditions of dialogic scholarship, this school rejects the modern temptation of “telling”; such an emphasis moves dialogue out of practical technique and into the pragmatic reality of meeting others. This understanding of dialogue leads to implications for scholarship of a different kind by acknowledging that dialogic research may be driven more by the differences of schools than their similarities. It is in difference that dialogue prospers.

We began our review with Johannesen (1971), recognizing the international, national, and regional trends of scholarly publications. We continue the conversation even now by recognizing the importance of turning back to disciplinary artifacts of dialogue scholarship and engaging in temporary mono-

logic discourse for the sake of remembering. One dialogic theorist emphasizes the importance of revisiting the notion of monologue. Arnett (2006, 2008b) claims that to be able to articulate without privileging the importance of monologue, the importance of lecture, the reality of speaking to one another, we move dialogic communication into the realm of demand, which, ironically, sends dialogue back into silence. The authors avoided “telling” about dialogue within this essay by engaging in communicative remembering of dialogic theories, biases, and questions. Despite dialogic theory’s significant contribution to the discipline of communication, this essay concludes with the presupposition that dialogue is but *one* form of communication, not *the* form of communication in an era of narrative and virtue contention.

5. Dialogic Engagement as an “Enlarged Communicative Mentality”

This essay introduced the interpretive engagement of dialogic scholarship with a connection between dialogue as both a “how” and a “why” for the human condition. This final section engages the dialogic “why”: “Why dialogue?” Our presumptive bias is that it invites an “enlarged communicative mentality.” Dialogue begins with engagement of the other. It presupposes critical knowledge of one’s own ground or position and requires a willingness to be a constant learner. Dialogue presupposes that the I is not static but ever expansive in the meeting of what is not yet normative in one’s own communicative life. It is the act of meeting alterity, extreme Otherness, and in the process learning more precisely about one’s own position. This essay ends not with a dialogic scholar but with a scholar who textures dialogic understanding in a postmodern age, Hannah Arendt. Arendt repeatedly stressed a term first put forth by Immanuel Kant (1792), an “enlarged mentality.” Such a term requires two basic communicative gestures: (1) knowing one’s own position and (2) meeting positions contrary or alien to one’s own. In fact, it is the “enlarged mentality” that is at the heart of what Arendt calls the public domain—it is a place where you and I are guests, not owners. It is a place where you and I find ourselves more akin to strangers than proprietors of our own dwelling. It is a sphere where the world is bigger than me and you and our

individual perspectives together. Arendt talks about the courage to engage this public space and the pragmatic necessity of the “enlarged mentality” that knowingly takes upon itself the status of outsider, the status of learner, the status of humility propelled by a pragmatic recognition: “There is so much to know that I do not yet understand.”

Arendt frames this position most keenly in *Between Past and Future* (1968), calling attention to Kant’s *Critique of Judgment*, in which a different way of thinking is required in the engagement of critique; it is a critique that invites learning and that turns on reason itself, specifically one’s own reasoning. In the chapter entitled “The Crisis in Culture,” Arendt points to Kant’s implicit political philosophy, specifically in the context of authority and judgment in the public sphere. She states, “In the *Critique of Judgment*, however, Kant insisted upon a different way of thinking, for which it would not be enough to be in agreement with one’s own self, but which consisted of being able to ‘think in the place of everybody else’ and which he therefore called an ‘enlarged mentality’” (Arendt, 1968, p. 220). Arendt then discusses how an “enlarged mentality” is a pragmatic transcendental learning from subjective limitations that invites one to think otherwise than convention.

For Arendt the act of judging presupposes that there is a standard outside the self that situates judg-

ment and agreement; such a standard, however, is not a code but a public space where diversity of ideas meet. Judgment, then, must operate both as person and as the embodiment of ideas. It is this capacity to judge that allows for political activity and public discourse. Arendt (1968) claims that the “enlarged mentality” of judgment allows an individual to “orient himself in the public realm, in the common world” (p. 221). This public space invites a common world not of agreement, but of difference, permitting what the Greeks called “insight” and what Thomas Paine attended to later as “common sense” (Arendt, 1968, p. 221). This common sense does not presuppose uniform agreement, but calls forth the public nurturing of difference from which an “enlarged mentality” emerges.

Arendt and Kant point to Buber’s understanding of human growth and becoming. The metaphor of the “between” is a place of growth, not situated within me or the Other, but in the public distance between us. An “enlarged mentality” requires, at its basic level, that a human being look at the world otherwise than convention, otherwise than routine. Such an approach is reflected in a story that rests at the center of *Dialogic Education* (Arnett 1992), which works within the spirit of Buber’s commitment to Hasidic tales. The story was offered again at a commencement speech for non-traditional students given by Arnett at Duquesne University in 1996. Interestingly enough, Buber was once a lecturer at a Jewish center for adult education called *Freies jüdisches Lehrhaus in Frankfurt* (Zank, 2007). The Hasidic tale is as follows:

There was a young man who very much wanted to find a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. He looked everywhere for a rainbow that might have the prize he wanted. One afternoon after the clearing of the rain he stopped and walked to the rainbow that emerged that afternoon. As always, he hoped that this rainbow would have a pot of gold at its tip. This time he was correct and found a large golden container. But to his surprise there was nothing in this golden kettle—it was empty. In great discouragement the young man went home and for years continued to look for the “right” rainbow. One day when feeling utterly empty about his life the young man met an older gentleman. They walked together and talked often. During one of the walks the young man saw a rainbow and said, “That is it. That is the same rainbow with the empty pot of gold.” The two walked together to

the rainbow and the young man looked inside the golden pot, finding nothing as he did before. The young man went back again scanning the large kettle. This time, however, the kettle that had previously seemed so empty had on its vast floor a yellowed and old rolled up message. The message simply said: *Your task is not to find a pot of gold, but to help fill this kettle. For some, significance is given by birth, but for most, including you and me, meaningful significance can only be found in service to the other.* (Arnett 1996, pp. 136-137)

Our service is to encourage an “enlarged communicative mentality” within the discipline that is responsive to the Other of this moment. Sometimes merely having another remind one to pick up a piece of paper and write, or, in the context of this essay, to remember the questions and biases that came before us, opens up “the mud of everyday life” in unexpected ways (Arnett, Fritz, & Bell, 2008). Perhaps the pragmatic necessity of dialogue in a postmodern age of narrative and virtue contention is its relentless demand for communicators to engage in an “enlarged communicative mentality” not as tellers, but as learners.

References

- Anderson, R. (1982). Phenomenological dialogue, humanistic psychology, and pseudo-walls: A response and extension. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 46*, 344-357.
- Anderson, R., Baxter, L. A., & Cissna, K. N. (Eds.). (2004). *Dialogue: Theorizing difference in communication studies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Anderson, R., & Cissna, K. N. (2008). Fresh perspectives in dialogue theory. *Communication Theory, 18*, 1-4.
- Anderson, R., Cissna, K. N., & Arnett, R. C. (Eds.). (1994). *The reach of dialogue: Confirmation, voice, and community*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Anderson, R., Cissna, K. N., & Clune, M. K. (2003). The rhetoric of public dialogue. *Communication Research Trends, 22*(1), 1-37.
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Arendt, H. (1968). *Between past and future: Eight exercises in political thought*. New York: Viking Press.
- Arnett, R. C. (1981). Toward a phenomenological dialogue. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 45*, 201-212.
- Arnett, R. C. (1986). *Communication and community: Implications of Martin Buber's dialogue*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

- Arnett, R.C. (1992). *Dialogic education: Conversation about ideas and between people*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Arnett, R. C. (2001). Dialogic civility as pragmatic ethical praxis: An interpersonal metaphor for the public domain. *Communication Theory*, 11, 315-338.
- Arnett, R. C. (2003). The responsive "I": Levinas' derivative argument. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 40, 39-50.
- Arnett, R. C. (2004). A dialogic ethic "between" Buber and Levinas—A responsive ethical "I". In R. Anderson, L. Baxter and K. N. Cissna (Eds.), *Dialogue: Theorizing difference in communication studies* (pp. 75-90). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Arnett, R.C. (2005). *Dialogic confession: Bonhoeffer's rhetoric of responsibility*. Carbondale: University of Southern Illinois Press.
- Arnett, R. C. (2006). Through a glass, darkly. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 29, 1-17.
- Arnett, R. C. (2008a). Provinciality and the face of the other: Levinas on communication ethics, terrorism—Otherwise than origination agency. In K. Glenister Roberts & R. C. Arnett (Eds.), *Communication ethics: Between cosmopolitanism and provinciality*. (pp. 69-88). New York: Peter Lang.
- Arnett, R. C. (2008b, June). *Communication ethics as Janus at the gates: Responding to postmodernity and the normativity of crisis*. Paper presented at the 10th Annual Communication Ethics Conference, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Arnett, R. C., & Arneson, P. (1999). *Dialogic civility in a cynical age: Community, hope, and interpersonal relationships*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Arnett, R. C., Arneson, P., & Holba, A. (2008). *Bridges not walls: The communicative enactment of dialogic storytelling*. *Review of Communication*, 8(3), 217-234.
- Arnett, R. C., Harden Fritz, J., & Bell, L. (2008). *Communication ethics literacy: Dialogue and difference*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Arnett, R. C., Harden Fritz, J. M., & Holba, A. (2007). The rhetorical turn to Otherness: Otherwise than humanism. *Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy*, 3, 115-133.
- Artz, L. (2001). Critical ethnography for communication studies: Dialogue and social justice in service-learning. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 66, 239-250.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Ed., C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Eds., V. W. McGee, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bavelas, J. B., & Coates, L. (1992). How do we account for the mindfulness of face-to-face dialogue? *Communication Monographs*, 59, 301-305.
- Baxter, L. A. (1992). Interpersonal communication as dialogue: A response to the "social approaches" forum. *Communication Theory*, 2, 330-337.
- Baxter, L. A., & Montgomery, B. M. (1996). *Relating: Dialogues and dialectics*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Black, L. W. (2008). Deliberation, storytelling, and dialogic moments. *Communication Theory*, 18, 93-116.
- Boyd, J. (2001). Corporate rhetoric participates in public dialogue: A solution to the public/private conundrum. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 66, 279-292.
- Brown C. T., & Keller, P. W. (1979). *Monologue to dialogue: An exploration of interpersonal communication*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Buber, M. (1947). *Between man and man* (R. G. Smith, Trans.). London: Collins Clear-Type Press.
- Buber, M. (1955). *The legend of the Baal-Shem* (M. Friedman, Trans.). New York: Harper (Original work published 1907)
- Buber, M. (1958). *I and Thou* (2nd rev. ed., R. G. Smith, Trans.). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Buber, M. (1965). *Daniel: Dialogues on realization* (M. Friedman, Trans.). New York: McGraw-Hill. (Original work published 1913)
- Buber, M. (2002). The history of the dialogical principle. In *Between man and man* (pp. 249-63, R. G. Smith, Trans.). New York: Routledge. (Original work published 1965)
- Christians, C. (1988). Dialogic communication theory and cultural studies. In N. Denzin (Ed.), *Studies in symbolic interaction* (Vol. 9, pp. 3-31). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Cissna, K. N., & Anderson, R. (1994). Communication and the ground of dialogue. In R. Anderson, K. N. Cissna, & R. C. Arnett (Eds.), *The reach of dialogue: Confirmation, voice and community*. (pp. 9-30). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Cissna, K. N., & Anderson, R. (1998). Theorizing about dialogic moments: The Buber-Rogers position and post-modern themes. *Communication Theory*, 8, 63-104.
- Czubaroff, J. (2000). Dialogical rhetoric: An application of Martin Buber's philosophy of dialogue. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 86, 168-189.
- DeTurk, S. (2006). Power of dialogue: Consequences of intergroup dialogue and their implications for agency and alliance building. *Communication Quarterly*, 54, 33-51.
- Eisenberg, E. M. (1994). Dialogue as democratic discourse: Affirming Harrison. *Communication Yearbook*, 17, 275- 284.
- Esken, M. (2000). *Ethics and dialogue in the works of Levinas, Bakhtin, Mandel'shtam, and Celan*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fiske, J. (1991). Writing ethnographies: Contribution to a dialogue. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 77, 330-335.

- Gadamer, H.-G. (1975). *Truth and method*. New York: The Seabury Press. (Original work published 1960)
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1976). *Philosophical hermeneutics* (D. E. Linge, Trans.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Geist, P., & Dreyer, J. (1993). The demise of dialogue: A critique of the medical encounter. *Western Journal of Communication*, 57, 233-246.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *Theory of communicative action: Vol. 1. Reason and the rationalization of society* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *Theory of communicative action: Vol. 2. Life world and the system: A critique of functionalist reason* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hammond, S. C., Anderson, R., & Cissna, K. N. (2003). The problematics of dialogue and power. *Communication Yearbook*, 27, 125-157.
- Hawes, L. C. (1999). The dialogics of conversation: Power, control, vulnerability. *Communication Theory*, 9(3), 229-264.
- Heidlebaugh, N. J. (2008). Invention and public dialogue: Lessons from rhetorical theorists. *Communication Theory*, 18, 27-50.
- Herrmann, A. F. (2008). Kierkegaard and dialogue: The communication of capability. *Communication Theory*, 18, 71-92.
- Howe, R. L. (1963). *The miracle of dialogue*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Hyde, B., & Bineham, J. L. (2000). From debate to dialogue: Toward a pedagogy of nonpolarized public discourse. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 208-223.
- Hyde, M. J. (2001). *The call of conscience: Heidegger and Levinas, rhetoric and the euthanasia debate*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Hyde, M. J. (2005). *The life-giving gift of acknowledgment*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.
- Jaspers, K. (1956). *Philosophie*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag. (Original work published 1932)
- Johannesen, R. (1971). The emerging concept of communication as dialogue. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 57, 373-382.
- Johannesen, R. (2000). Nel Nodding's use of Martin Buber's philosophy of dialogue. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 151-160.
- Kant, I. (1892). *Critique of judgment* (J. H. Bernard, Trans.). London; New York: Macmillan & Co.
- Kellet, P. M. (1999). Dialogue and dialectics in managing organizational change: The case of a mission-based transformation. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 64, 211-231.
- Kelly, M. (1989). The dialectical/dialogical structure of ethical reflection. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 22(3), 174-193.
- Kim, J., & Kim, E. J. (2008). Theorizing dialogic deliberation: Everyday political talk as communicative action and dialogue. *Communication Theory*, 18, 51-70.
- Kristiansen, M., & Bloch-Poulsen, J. (2000). The challenge of the unspoken in organizations: Caring container as a dialogic answer? *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 176-190.
- Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1985). *Ethics and infinity* (P. Nemo, Trans.). Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1998). *Otherwise than being, or beyond essence* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Lipari, L. (2004). Listening for the Other: Ethical implications of the Buber-Levinas encounter. *Communication Theory*, 14, 122-141.
- Maranhão, T. (1990). *The interpretation of dialogue*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marcel, G. (1927). *Journal métaphysique*. Paris: N.R.F.
- Matson, F. W., & Montagu, A. (Eds.). (1967). *The human dialogue: Perspectives on communication*. New York: Free Press.
- Mifsud, M. L., & Johnson, S. D. (2000). Dialogic, dialectic, and rhetoric: Exploring human dialogue across the discipline. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 91-104.
- Murray, J. W. (2000). Bakhtinian answerability and Levinasian responsibility: Forging a fuller dialogical communicative ethics. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 133-150.
- Murray, J. W. (2003a). The face in dialogue: Emmanuel Levinas and rhetorics of disruption and supplication. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 68, 250-266.
- Murray, J. W. (2003b). *Face to face in dialogue: Emmanuel Levinas and the communication of ethics*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Co.
- Murray, J. W. (2004). The face in dialogue, part II: Invitational rhetoric, direct moral suasion, and the asymmetry of dialogue. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 69, 333-347.
- Newcomb, H. M. (1984). On the dialogic aspects of mass communication. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 1, 34-50.
- Neumann, M. (1994). The contested spaces of cultural dialogue. *Communication Yearbook*, 17, 148-158.
- Pearce, K. A., & W. B. Pearce. (2001). The public dialogue consortium's school-wide process: A communication approach to develop citizenship skills and enhance school climate. *Communication Theory*, 11, 105-123.
- Pearce, W. B., & Pearce, K. A. (2000a). Combining passions and abilities: Toward dialogic virtuosity. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 161-175.

- Pearce, W. B., & Pearce, K. A. (2000b). Extending the theory of the Coordinated Management of Meaning (CMM) through a community dialogue process. *Communication Theory, 10*, 405-423.
- Poulakos, J. (1974). The components of dialogue. *Western Speech, 38*, 199-212.
- Poulos, C. (2008). Accidental dialogue. *Communication Theory, 18*, 117-138.
- Roochnik, D. L. (1986). The impossibility of philosophical dialogue. *Philosophy and Rhetoric, 19*, 147-165.
- Shotter, J. (2000). Inside dialogical realities: From an abstract-systematic to a participatory-wholistic understanding of communication. *The Southern Communication Journal, 65*, 119-132.
- Simpson, J. L. (2008). The color-blind double bind: Whiteness and (im)possibility of dialogue. *Communication Theory, 18*, 139-159.
- Smith, A. R. (2008). Dialogue in agony: The problem of communication in authoritarian regimes. *Communication Theory, 18*, 160-185.
- Smith, C. R. (1985). Martin Heidegger and the dialogue with Being. *Central States Speech Journal, 36*, 256-269.
- Soukup, P. (1992). Interpersonal communication. *Communication Research Trends, 12*(3), 1-33.
- Stewart, J. (1973). *Bridges, not walls: A book about interpersonal communication*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Stewart, J. (1978). Foundations of dialogic communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 64*, 183-201.

APPENDIX A
Journals Included in Literature Review

International Journals		
Journal title	Affiliation	Years Searched
<i>Canadian Journal of Communication</i>	Canadian Centre for Studies in Publishing	1974-2008
<i>Communicatio: South African Journal for Communication Theory and Research</i>	University of South Africa	1999-2008
<i>Conflict and Communication Online</i>	Regener Publishing House, Germany	2002-2008
<i>Corporate Communications: An International Journal</i>	Emerald Group Publishing House, United Kingdom	1996-2008
<i>Discourse Analysis Online</i>	DAOL Team, Sheffield University, United Kingdom	2002-2008
<i>Estudos em Comunicação / Communication Studies</i>	Labcom, University of Beira International, Portugal	2007-2008
<i>Javnost—The Public: Journal for the European Institute for Communication and Culture</i>	The European Institute for Communication and Culture (EURICOM), University of Ljubljana, Slovenia	1994-2008
<i>Journal of Global Communication Research Association</i>	Global Communication Research Association and United Arab Emirates University	2004-2008
<i>Journal of Intercultural Communication</i>	NIC, Nordic Network for International Communication, Sweden	1999-2008
<i>Keio Communication Review</i>	Institute for Media and Communications Research, Keio University, Japan	1979-2008
<i>Nordicom Review: Nordic Research on Media and Communication</i>	Nordicom, Göteborg University, Sweden	1981-2008
<i>Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture</i>	The Communication and Media Research Institute, University of Westminster, United Kingdom	2004-2008

Stewart, J., & K. Zediker. (2000). Dialogue as tensional, ethical practice. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65(2/3), 224-242.

White, W. J. (2008). The interlocutor's dilemma: The place of strategy in dialogic theory. *Communication Theory*, 18, 5-26.

Willmott, H. (1994). Social constructionism and communication studies: Hearing the conversation but losing the dialogue. *Communication Yearbook*, 17, 42-54.

Wold, A. H. (Ed.). (1992). *The dialogical alternative: Towards a theory of language and mind*. London: Scandinavian University Press.

Zank, M. (2007). Martin Buber. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. (Spring 2007 Edition). Retrieved August 26, 2008 from <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2007/entries/buber/>.

Zoller, H. M. (2000). "A place you haven't visited before": Creating the conditions for community dialogue. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 191-207.

Appendix A, continued: National Journals		
<i>Communication, Culture, and Critique</i>	International Communication Association, U.S.A	2008
<i>Communication Theory</i>		1991-2008
<i>Communication Yearbook</i>		1975-2008
<i>Human Communication Research</i>		1974-2008
<i>Journal of Communication</i>		1951-2008
<i>Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies</i>	National Communication Association	2004-2008
<i>Communication Education</i>		1976-2008
<i>Communication Monographs</i>		1977-2008
<i>Communication Teacher</i>		1952-2008
<i>Journal of Applied Communication Research</i>		1981-2008
<i>Quarterly Journal of Speech</i>		1918-2008
<i>Review of Communication</i>		1995-2008
<i>American Communication Journal</i>	American Communication Association	1997-2008
<i>Communication Studies</i>	Central Communication Association	1970-2008
<i>Communication Quarterly</i>	Eastern Communication Association	1975-2008
<i>Communication Research Reports</i>		1984-2008
<i>Qualitative Research Reports in Communication</i>		2000-2008
<i>Southern Communication Journal</i>	Southern Communication Association	1970-2008
<i>Communication Reports</i>	Western Communication Association	1988-2008
<i>Western Journal of Communication</i>		1970-2008
<i>International Journal of Communication</i>	University of Southern California	2007-2008
<i>Philosophy and Rhetoric</i>	Pennsylvania State University	1968-2008

APPENDIX B
Disciplinary Articles Categorized by Emergent
Theoretical Biases

Mikhail Bakhtin—Dialogue as a dialectical, linguistic
attention to the “third”

- Anderson, R., & Cissna, K. N. (2008). Fresh perspectives in dialogue theory. *Communication Theory, 18*, 1-4.
- Artz, L. (2001). Critical ethnography for communication studies: Dialogue and social justice in service-learning. *The Southern Communication Journal, 66*, 239-250.
- Bavelas, J. B., & Coates, L. (1992). How do we account for the mindfulness of face-to-face dialogue? *Communication Monographs, 59*, 301-305.
- Baxter, L. A. (1992). Interpersonal communication as dialogue: A response to the “social approaches” forum. *Communication Theory, 2*, 330-337.
- Black, L. W. (2008). Deliberation, storytelling, and dialogic moments. *Communication Theory, 18*, 93-116.
- Fiske, J. (1991). Writing ethnographies: Contribution to a dialogue. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 77*, 330-335.
- Geist, P. & Dreyer, J. (1993). The demise of dialogue: A critique of the medical encounter. *Western Journal of Communication, 57*, 233-246.
- Hammond, S. C., Anderson, R., & Cissna, K. N. (2003). The problematics of dialogue and power. *Communication Yearbook, 27*, 125-157.
- Hawes, L. C. (1999). The dialogics of conversation: Power, control, vulnerability. *Communication Theory, 9*(3), 229-264.
- Herrmann, A. F. (2008). Kierkegaard and dialogue: The communication of capability. *Communication Theory, 18*, 71-92.
- Kellet, P. M. (1999). Dialogue and dialectics in managing organizational change: The case of a mission-based transformation. *The Southern Communication Journal, 64*, 211-231.
- Mifsud, M. L., & Johnson, S. D. (2000). Dialogic, dialectic, and rhetoric: Exploring human dialogue across the discipline. *The Southern Communication Journal, 65*, 91-104.
- Murray, J. W. (2000). Bakhtinian answerability and Levinasian responsibility: Forging a fuller dialogical communicative ethics. *The Southern Communication Journal, 65*, 133-150.
- Neumann, M. (1994). The contested spaces of cultural dialogue. *Communication Yearbook, 17*, 148-158.
- Newcomb, H. M. (1984). On the dialogic aspects of mass communication. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 1*, 34-50.
- Shotter, J. (2000). Inside dialogical realities: From an abstract-systematic to a participatory-wholistic understanding of communication. *The Southern Communication Journal, 65*, 119-132.
- Simpson, J. L. (2008). The color-blind double bind: Whiteness and (im)possibility of dialogue. *Communication Theory, 18*, 139-159.
- Smith, A. R. (2008). Dialogue in agony: The problem of communication in authoritarian regimes. *Communication Theory, 18*, 160-185.
- Stewart, J., & Zediker, K. (2000). Dialogue as tensional, ethical practice. *The Southern Communication Journal, 65*(2/3), 224-242.
- Willmott, H. (1994). Social constructionism and communication studies: Hearing the conversation but losing the dialogue. *Communication Yearbook, 17*, 42-54.

Martin Buber—Dialogue as a revelatory moment
characterized by the “between”

- Anderson, R. (1982). Phenomenological dialogue, humanistic psychology, and pseudo-walls: A response and extension. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 46*, 344-357.
- Anderson, R., & Cissna, K. N. (2008). Fresh perspectives in dialogue theory. *Communication Theory, 18*, 1-4.
- Arnett, R.C. (1981). Toward a phenomenological dialogue. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 45*, 201-212.
- Arnett, R. C. (2001). Dialogic civility as pragmatic ethical praxis: An interpersonal metaphor for the public domain. *Communication Theory, 11*, 315-338.
- Black, L. W. (2008). Deliberation, storytelling, and dialogic moments. *Communication Theory, 18*, 93-116.
- Cissna, K.N., & Anderson, R. (1990). The contributions of Carl Rogers to a philosophical praxis of dialogue. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 54*, 125-147.
- Cissna, K. N., & Anderson, R. (1998). Theorizing about dialogic moments: The Buber-Rogers position and post-modern themes. *Communication Theory, 8*, 63-104.
- Czubaroff, J. (2000). Dialogical rhetoric: An application of Martin Buber’s philosophy of dialogue. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 86*, 168-189.
- Hammond, S. C., Anderson, R., & Cissna, K. N. (2003). The problematics of dialogue and power. *Communication Yearbook, 27*, 125-157.
- Herrmann, A. F. (2008). Kierkegaard and dialogue: The communication of capability. *Communication Theory, 18*, 71-92.
- Hyde, B., & Bineham, J. L. (2000). From debate to dialogue: Toward a pedagogy of nonpolarized public discourse. *The Southern Communication Journal, 65*, 208-223.
- Johannesen, R. (1971). The emerging concept of communication as dialogue. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 57*, 373-382.

- Johannesen, R. (2000). Nel Nodding's use of Martin Buber's philosophy of dialogue. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 151-160.
- Kim, J., & Kim, E. J. (2008). Theorizing dialogic deliberation: Everyday political talk as communicative action and dialogue. *Communication Theory*, 18, 51-70.
- Kristiansen, M., & Bloch-Poulsen, J. (2000). The challenge of the unspoken in organizations: Caring container as a dialogic answer? *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 176-190.
- Mifsud, M. L., & Johnson, S. D. (2000). Dialogic, dialectic, and rhetoric: Exploring human dialogue across the discipline. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 91-104.
- Murray, J. W. (2003). The face in dialogue: Emmanuel Levinas and rhetorics of disruption and supplication. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 68, 250-266.
- Murray, J. W. (2004). The face in dialogue, part II: Invitational rhetoric, direct moral suasion, and the asymmetry of dialogue. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 69, 333-347.
- Pearce, W. B., & Pearce, K. A. (2000a). Combining passions and abilities: Toward dialogic virtuosity. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 161-175.
- Poulakos, J. (1974). The components of dialogue. *Western Speech*, 38, 199-212.
- Poulos, C. (2008). Accidental dialogue. *Communication Theory*, 18, 117-138.
- Smith, C. R. (1985). Martin Heidegger and the dialogue with Being. *Central States Speech Journal*, 36, 256-269.
- Stewart, J. (1978). Foundations of dialogic communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 64, 183-201.
- Stewart, J., & Zediker, K. (2000). Dialogue as tensional, ethical practice. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 224-242.
- Hans-Georg Gadamer—Dialogue as a “fusion of horizons” of acknowledged biases**
- Anderson, R., & Cissna, K. N. (2008). Fresh perspectives in dialogue theory. *Communication Theory*, 18, 1-4.
- Arnett, R. C., Arneson, P., & Holba, A. (2008). *Bridges not walls: The communicative enactment of dialogic storytelling*. *Review of Communication*, 8(3), 217-234.
- Gordon, R. D. (2000). Karl Jaspers: Existential philosopher of dialogical communication. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 105-118.
- Hammond, S. C., Anderson, R., & Cissna, K. N. (2003). The problematics of dialogue and power. *Communication Yearbook*, 27, 125-157.
- Kelly, M. (1989). The dialectical/dialogical structure of ethical reflection. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 22(3), 174-193.
- Roochnik, D. L. (1986). The impossibility of philosophical dialogue. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 19, 147-165.
- Smith, C. R. (1985). Martin Heidegger and the dialogue with Being. *Central States Speech Journal*, 36, 256-269.
- Stewart, J. (1978). Foundations of dialogic communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 64, 183-201.
- Willmott, H. (1994). Social constructionism and communication studies: Hearing the conversation but losing the dialogue. *Communication Yearbook*, 17, 42-54.
- Jürgen Habermas—Dialogue as attentive to the structures of public discourse**
- Anderson, R., & Cissna, K. N. (2008). Fresh perspectives in dialogue theory. *Communication Theory*, 18, 1-4.
- Artz, L. (2001). Critical ethnography for communication studies: Dialogue and social justice in service-learning. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 66, 239-250.
- Bavelas, J. B., & Coates, L. (1992). How do we account for the mindfulness of face-to-face dialogue? *Communication Monographs*, 59, 301-305.
- Boyd, J. (2001). Corporate rhetoric participates in public dialogue: A solution to the public/private conundrum. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 66, 279-292.
- DeTurk, S. (2006). Power of dialogue: Consequences of intergroup dialogue and their implications for agency and alliance building. *Communication Quarterly*, 54, 33-51.
- Eisenberg, E. M. (1994). Dialogue as democratic discourse: Affirming Harrison. *Communication Yearbook*, 17, 275-284.
- Hammond, S. C., Anderson, R., & Cissna, K. N. (2003). The problematics of dialogue and power. *Communication Yearbook*, 27, 125-157.
- Heidlebaugh, N. J. (2008). Invention and public dialogue: Lessons from rhetorical theorists. *Communication Theory*, 18, 27-50.
- Hyde, B., & Bineham, J. L. (2000). From debate to dialogue: Toward a pedagogy of nonpolarized public discourse. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 208-223.
- Kim, J., & Kim, E. J. (2008). Theorizing dialogic deliberation: Everyday political talk as communicative action and dialogue. *Communication Theory*, 18, 51-70.
- Kristiansen, M., & Bloch-Poulsen, J. (2000). The challenge of the unspoken in organizations: Caring container as a dialogic answer? *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 176-190.
- Newcomb, H. M. (1984). On the dialogic aspects of mass communication. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 1, 34-50.
- Pearce, K. A., & Pearce, W. B. (2001). The public dialogue consortium's school-wide process: A communication approach to develop citizenship skills and enhance school climate. *Communication Theory*, 11, 105-123.
- Pearce, W. B., & Pearce, K. A. (2000b). Extending the theory of the Coordinated Management of Meaning

- (CMM) through a community dialogue process. *Communication Theory*, 10, 405-423.
- Simpson, J. L. (2008). The color-blind double bind: Whiteness and (im)possibility of dialogue. *Communication Theory*, 18, 139-159.
- White, W. J. (2008). The interlocutor's dilemma: The place of strategy in dialogic theory. *Communication Theory*, 18, 5-26.
- Willmott, H. (1994). Social constructionism and communication studies: Hearing the conversation but losing the dialogue. *Communication Yearbook*, 17, 42-54.
- Zoller, H. M. (2000). "A place you haven't visited before": Creating the conditions for community dialogue. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 191-207.

Emmanuel Levinas—Dialogue as a pragmatic learning from alterity

- Anderson, R., & Cissna, K. N. (2008). Fresh perspectives in dialogue theory. *Communication Theory*, 18, 1-4.
- Arnett, R. C. (2001). Dialogic civility as pragmatic ethical praxis: An interpersonal metaphor for the public domain. *Communication Theory*, 11, 315-338.
- Artz, L. (2001). Critical ethnography for communication studies: Dialogue and social justice in service-learning. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 66, 239-250.
- Hermann, A. F. (2008). Kierkegaard and dialogue: The communication of capability. *Communication Theory*, 18, 71-92.
- Kristiansen, M., & Bloch-Poulsen, J. (2000). The challenge of the unspoken in organizations: Caring container as a dialogic answer? *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 176-190.
- Murray, J. W. (2000). Bakhtinian answerability and Levinasian responsibility: Forging a fuller dialogical communicative ethics. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 133-150.
- Murray, J. W. (2003a). The face in dialogue: Emmanuel Levinas and rhetorics of disruption and supplication. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 68, 250-266.
- Murray, J. W. (2004). The face in dialogue, part II: Invitational rhetoric, direct moral suasion, and the asymmetry of dialogue. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 69(4), 333-347.
- Neumann, M. (1994). The contested spaces of cultural dialogue. *Communication Yearbook*, 17, 148-158.
- Poulos, C. (2008). Accidental dialogue. *Communication Theory*, 18, 117-138.
- Simpson, J. L. (2008). The color-blind double bind: Whiteness and (im)possibility of dialogue. *Communication Theory*, 18, 139-159.
- Stewart, J., & Zediker, K. (2000). Dialogue as tensional, ethical practice. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65(2/3), 224-242.

- Zoller, H. M. (2000). "A place you haven't visited before": Creating the conditions for community dialogue. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 65(2/3), 191-207.

Book Reviews

Belasen, Alan T. *The Theory and Practice of Corporate Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 2008. Pp. xxvii, 271. ISBN 978-1-4129-5035-0 (pb). \$59.95.

When I started a job in corporate communications, I looked for a suitable reference to guide me through this new field but never found one. However, the information about persuasion, diffusion of innovation, and audience behavior that I had absorbed in a graduate course in mass communication theory proved invaluable. I came to see effective PR as applied communication theory in action.

Unfortunately when I began teaching undergrad PR classes 10 years later, I could not find a book written from this perspective so I based my lectures on my grad theory course and explained to students how to use these theories in developing and implementing PR strategies.

When I picked up this book, I hoped it would be this long sought text linking theory and praxis. Despite Belasen's attempt to give corporate communication a solid theoretical basis that can be linked with practice, I'm still looking for a text that would work.

At the conclusion of this book, Belasen states that "existing textbooks simply do not integrate diverse corporate communication into a coherent theoretical framework," a statement with which I agree. He attempts to fill this niche by offering a "competing values framework for corporate communication" in addition to practical tips and case studies.

He hopes that readers will engage this framework and better understand not only what they do in corporate communication but how their work fits into a "much bigger and intellectually stimulating frame" (p. 238). This is an ambitious goal that sadly I felt the book failed to achieve.

My favorite mass communication theories involve understanding audience behavior. The first rules of communicating with audiences is that they must be able to understand you easily. This is where this book falls down badly. Belasen develops a complex framework for corporate communication, then explains it in highly academic language that the undergrads and practitioners I know would never "engage."

I can't see many practitioners making it through the first scholarly chapters on the need for a theoretical perspective in corporate communication even though they contain some excellent insights. The chapter that explains the distinction between external image and internal identity is one of the best in the book.

There's no problem using scholarly language if your audience is other scholars but the remainder of the book is clearly aimed at non-scholars.

The next sections are a sort of guidebook through the career field with some information on how professionals work. Belasen explains how media relations, government relations, employee relations, marketing communication, corporate advertising, financial communication, and managerial communication function and how these functions relate to each other. Numerous diagrams and matrixes illustrate his conceptualization of the framework. The final sections analyze stakeholders, communication audits, and crisis communication.

Nearly every chapter includes relevant case studies and discussion questions. Most of the case studies are located at the ends of the chapters although some are integrated into the body of chapters as box inserts.

There's a striking difference in the way the case studies and theoretical portions of the chapters are written. The theoretical portions are dense and read like they were composed for journal articles, as possibly some of them were. The case studies are written in journalistic English and any undergrad could breeze through them and find them informative. They include many PR classic cases such as Johnson and Johnson (the handling of Tylenol), Enron, Arthur Andersen, etc. I almost wondered if the same person wrote both portions.

This book might be useful for a PR case studies course even at the undergrad level if the instructor focused mostly on the cases. It might also be used in a graduate course in communication where the scholarly language would not be much of a barrier.

I believe that PR courses and texts too often lack the strong theoretical base that would increase their academic viability and credibility. Students need to have an underlying framework and rationale for understanding how communication works in order to apply it to corporate communications, PR, or work for nonprofits. Too many texts omit any underlying theoretical base.

I applaud Belasen for attempting to supply such a basis but wish he had executed it better. Hopefully this work will encourage others to look at the linkage between theory and practice in corporate communication. There's a need for such a text, especially if it were

written simply and practically enough to be marketed to practitioners.

This book includes an index and an extensive bibliography.

—Eileen Wirth
Creighton University

Chapman, Jane. *Documentary in Practice: Filmmakers and Production Choices*. Malden, MA: Polity Press. 2007. Pp. xv, 166. ISBN 13: 978-07456-3611-5 (hbk.) \$69.95; 978-07456-3612-2 (pb.) \$26.95.

Veteran filmmaker Jane Chapman learned that success doesn't guarantee work. Her documentary *Cider People* drew the season's highest prime time ratings for a British broadcaster, yet the station never again hired her. Chapman's offense? Her humorous, offbeat juxtaposed portrayal of a beverage company didn't amuse its multinational parent corporation—a rumored shareholder in the television station.

While negative, the incident at least served as a murky type of client feedback, which Chapman says is notoriously difficult to obtain. Typically, silence awaits the producer who delivers a successful film on time and on budget. When Chapman's career film *It's Your Choice* won an international best-of-the-year award, congratulations from the corporate client "were muted." And, in contrast to enduring viewer accolades for Nancy Platt's *Venkatamma's Story*, client comment amounted to a single word, "subtle."

In *Documentary in Practice*, Chapman examines the artistic, technical, and financial pitfalls facing the independent filmmaker. She organizes documentary filmmaking into six sequential stages, giving each a chapter: creative thinking, funding, shooting, editing, screening, and publicizing. But *Documentary in Practice* is more than a "how-to" manual; it's also an enticing introduction to a stylistically varied group of relatively unknown contemporary filmmakers whose works and words Chapman copiously cites. Chief among these are William Raban, an English avant-garde painter who turned to experimental filmmaking, and Anand Patwardhan, an unabashed activist who attempts to provoke outrage at social injustice in India.

Of particular interest is each filmmaker's narrative intent and shooting philosophy. Raban believes that "making films is about showing people things, not telling them how to interpret the world" (p. 8). Raban's poetic *Thames Film* (1986) documents the history of the interpenetration of the city of London and the river:

“This fearful force, this subliminal spirit of nature that in the past had acted as a spine for so much human energy. . . . The remnants of past glory still lay buried amongst the decaying brown dereliction of waterfront wharfs and warehouses.” Raban managed to capture these images just prior to their erasure by redevelopment.

Raban examines how one looks at things. His mantra is a Thomas Aquinas maxim: “Art imitates Nature not through mere appearances, but in her manner of operation” (p. 9). Hence, in *Thames Film* Raban tried “to shoot the point of view of the river itself” by using a small boat—camera close to the water—that ebbed and flowed with the tides; thereby creating “the impression of a huge living organism with its own force, whilst also capturing ‘giant shapes and structures that fill the mind with awe’” (p. 91).

Raban’s “naturalistic” approach eschews postproduction effects such as fades and wipes. Rather, he prefers full length shots, listening to the camera shutter’s metronomic flicker to find a natural cutting point (p. 92). By thus mimicking nature’s “manner of operation,” Raban’s camera fulfills *Thames Film*’s narrative intent: a meditation on time and change showing “time regulated by the effects of tide, daylight, and seasonal change” (p. 134).

Unlike Raban, who frames nature’s “kinetic structure,” Anand Patwardhan films people. “You ask them what they think and they tell you. You get on film what is happening—the reality of the moment as it is.” He claims his idiosyncratic “one-man-band” approach to documentaries is simple: no scripts, no arduous meetings, “You just film the truth” (p. 107).

Patwardhan’s truth, however, is highly subjective. He uses his camera to expose squalor and oppression, likening his filmmaking to visual pamphleteering—but “more exciting than the usual fare”—using images to “overcome the shackles of illiteracy” (p. 6). All filmmaking, says Patwardhan, is fundamentally manipulative, as when juxtaposition is used to “manufacture” controversy between protagonists. “Even the famous jump cut is merely a statement. It’s the director’s way of saying: ‘I’m trying to manipulate you.’” A film’s ultimate truth, he says, doesn’t depend on formalistic techniques, “but lies in a realm between the filmmaker and his conscience” (p. 138).

In the Name of God (1992), shot just prior to the destruction of a 16th century sacred mosque in Northern India by Hindu fundamentalists, displays Patwardhan’s editorializing style. As soon as he gets “the punch-line, the nasty bit that they’ve said”—such as joy over the

“traitor” Gandhi’s death—Patwardhan rapidly cuts away from people he dislikes, juxtaposing the shot to something else. But, if the person is sympathetic, the camera tends to linger (p. 132). Patwardhan’s subjectivity has drawn fire: “Sometimes the viewer does not know who is conducting the interviews, on what basis the interview questions have been constructed, and whether the interviewees are willing or unwilling subjects” (p. 133). Patwardhan, however, says he plays fair, never splicing together disembodied statements to create a meaning the subject didn’t intend. Nonetheless, he has been called “India’s answer to Michael Moore.”

Moore’s place in *Documentary in Practice* is ambiguous. While his box office success, beginning with *Roger and Me* (1989), helped spur the recent interest in documentaries, Chapman finds his interviewing ethically questionable. For example, the way Moore films a woman who raises and slaughters rabbits “emphasizes the grotesque and detracts from the context which would provide the real reason why this should be so” (p. 108). The book’s ample commentary on *Roger and Me*—a crazy quilt of clips surrounding Moore’s on-camera attempts to interview GM’s chairman—functions to delineate the ethical parameters in a highly subjective art. Clearly, Moore’s “cheap shot strategy,” his premeditated misrepresentations of people and events are out of bounds.

But where are the boundaries? Unlike “objective” television journalism, which aims to present two-sided stories, Chapman suggests “the documentary maker has an obligation not to be objective: we are interpreters of the world rather than objective recorders of reality” (p. 11). She argues that cinema verite and direct cinema—which aimed at a more “truthful” cinema—may be seen as a reaction to stilted “objective” television documentaries with their voice-of-God style of narration. Nevertheless, Chapman believes the documentarian also has an obligation towards objectivity. Therefore, the ethical filmmaker must find a way of straddling objectivity and subjectivity, which *Documentary in Practice* manages with lucidity and candor.

—Tony Osborne
Gonzaga University

Communicative Theology Research Group. *Communicative Theology: Reflections on the Culture of our Practice of Theology.* [German title: *Kommunikative Theologie: Selbstvergewisserung unserer Kulture des Theologietreibens.*] Vienna and Berlin: LIT Verlag,

2007. Pp. 148. ISBN 3-7000-0573-3 (Austria); 3-8258-9493-2 (Germany) (pb.) \$29.90 (Distributed in North America by Transaction Publishers, Piscataway, NJ, orders@transactionpub.com).

The Communicative Theology Research group, an international circle of theologians, traces its roots to conversational meetings between theological scholars and the Ruth Cohn Institute for TCI International in 1991 and 1994. Theme-centered interaction (TCI) stems from the approach to psychoanalysis developed by Ruth Cohn; it draws heavily from psychological approaches to interpersonal communication and group processes. This sets the group apart from most others doing work in the area of theology and communication, as many scholars tend to begin with, or primarily attend to, media studies. This inaugural volume lays out the rationale and scope of the group's work. Though numbered first in the Communicative Theology—Interdisciplinary Studies series published by LIT Verlag, it actually has appeared subsequent to Volume 6 in order to provide an up-to-date orientation to the series, an orientation based on the concrete directions of the series itself.

In many ways this resembles the methodology of Communicative Theology itself, which prefers reflection on experience. Communicative Theology has its roots in the experience of practical theology; not theory-driven, it develops inductively from the experiences of people reflecting on and expressing their faith, whether in catechetical or pastoral settings. These become the "loci theologici," or "places" where one finds material for theological reflection and arguments for theological conclusions. The group very consciously wishes to overcome a common divide in academic theology between "scientific" (or academic) reflection and the day-to-day experience and communication of faith (p. 89).

Choosing an interpersonal/group model of communication justifies this approach to theology as a lived experience in church settings. "Communicative theology . . . originated in various attempts to apply fruitfully R. C. Cohn's model of Theme-Centered Interaction in programs of theological formation and ongoing education, in programs of pastoral activity in the churches and in programs of religious education in the schools" (p. 27). Cohn's TCI consists of four dimensions (I, WE, IT, and GLOBE) and describes a kind of group dynamics in which members consciously take into account the topic of discussion (IT) as well as individual (I) and group (WE) attitudes and perspectives, within a wider context (GLOBE) (p. 19). Over its

years of development, Cohn's model has grown to include a number of axioms, geared to promoting better interaction. As reformulated for theology by G. Werner, the axioms appear in this way:

1. Each human being is created as a unity of body and soul. Each is formally, unconditionally free and autonomous. Nevertheless, as a free being, he/she is unconditionally referred to other free beings. Human beings realize their freedom in symbols of recognition, which initiate, already in the here and now, processes, which they themselves cannot bring to completion.
2. The freedom of fellow beings must be unconditionally acknowledged. In the acknowledgment of the freedom of others, what is specifically human is confirmed. This conditions all appraising decisions.
3. Each human being experiences and lives out his/her formal unconditional freedom in activities that are materially conditioned. He/she can widen many of the limitations imposed by material conditions. Ethically, he/she is obliged to modify those boundaries that inhibit freedom. (p. 95, n. 2)

In addition TCI includes several postulates: "Be your own chairperson," a statement that encourages group members to take personal responsibility for themselves, and "Disturbances and passionate involvements take precedence," a statement fostering honest discussion of conflicts in the group process (pp. 33-35). In addition, as indicated earlier, Communicative Theology desires to remain closely connected to its real-world grounding. "Communicative Theology is based on the conviction that every act of scientific-theological reflection is fundamentally related to its concrete social context and to the world as a whole" (p. 71).

This short book provides a comprehensive overview of Communicative Theology and its project. It sketches an introduction to Cohn's TCI and then a summary of the research group's understanding of communication. This is important, particularly for those familiar with the North American tradition of communication studies, which theorizes interpersonal communication somewhat differently. Those new to discussions of communication and theology will find the multiple charts and step-by-step descriptions of the dimensions and levels of Communicative Theology valuable. Four basic dimensions (personal experience of living and believing, experience of church and other forms of community, biblical testimony in living transmission, and the social context) intersect with three levels of theological work (immediate involvement,

experience and interpretation, and academic/scientific reflection). This framework provides a guide to all manner of theological topics, always giving a preference to relationships—indeed the relationship of God to the world provides a constant foundation for Communicative Theology.

Some of the theological themes fitting into this framework include humans in relationship (with one another and with God), freedom, creation, God's universal will of salvation, the option for the poor, contemplation and mystagogy, and hope. Before the book concludes with a list of "open questions" for Communicative Theology, it reviews the methods of the members of the research group. The volume has a list of suggested readings and online resources, but no index. (However, the detailed table of contents functions in some ways as an index.) The publication contains both the original German text as well as the English translation, printed on facing pages.

Those responsible for the drafting of this proposal include 22 people from five countries, the majority drawn from Austria and Germany.

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

Devereux, Eoin. *Media Studies: Key issues & debates.* London, Thousand Oaks, CA, New Delhi, Singapore: Sage Publications, 2007. Pp. xvi, 416. ISBN 978-1-4129-2983-7 (pb). £20.99, \$44.95.

This textbook aimed to undergraduate students of media brings together a rich and resourceful collection of essays that introduces theoretical perspectives across media studies in a very accessible way. The articles are preceded by a foreword from the renowned communication scholar Denis McQuail that traces the development of research and teaching in media studies in the last three decades and the rise of its profile despite the resistance to "attempts at clear delineation and boundary drawing" (p. xvi).

The publication mixes well-established scholars and related fields of enquiry with emerging scholars that bring in new perspectives of areas that are not often featured in textbooks at this level. Kevin Howley's analysis of Community Media and their relation with public spheres, as well as de Kloet and Van Zoonen's piece on Fan Culture are two of the examples featured here (Chapters 14 and 15). The diverse nature of the subjects discussed in the book are reflected in the variety of academic disciplines and approaches of the

authors, ranging from Cultural Studies and Sociology to Marxism and Feminism.

Each contribution is clearly structured and includes key definitions analyzed in depth in the articles, historical perspectives, and key quotes from scholars in the related areas of study. Throughout the main text, a series of boxes give a further insight on particular approaches and/or case studies. After the concluding remarks, the final part includes a summary of the article, a list of further readings, very useful suggestions for student activities in the classroom, and the full list of cited references.

The book's editor, Limerick-based sociologist Eoin Devereux, has successfully brought together chapters that investigate the media in their social context and that focus either on the production, content, or reception of media texts, a theme already elaborated in a previous publication, *Understanding the Media* (second edition re-published by Sage in 2007).

In the first chapter, Natalie Fenton highlights the importance of appreciating the relation between "individual autonomy, freedom, and rational action" and the "social construction of identity and behavior," suggesting that a society needs to be considered in its entirety to understand mass media's role in it (p. 26).

David Croteau and William Hoynes discuss structures and strategies in the media industry, touching on questions of media power, cultural imperialism, and the quality of newsmaking in for-profit media and asking if the future will "see the explosion of truly independent media challenging the traditional players" (p. 52). Mass media and new media technologies are then analysed by Michael J. Breen, who encourages students to reflect on the interests behind the promotion of new media and the related "political, economic, and social costs" (p. 74).

Discourse analysis is the focus of Chapters 4 and 5 with articles from Philippa Smith and Allan Bell, and Greg Philo, showing the structures and inequalities behind the construction of media texts. The following chapter by Jenny Kitzinger discusses the uses of frame analysis to analyze media content, where "Text and Textual Analysis" is reviewed later on in the book by Peter Hughes in Chapter 11.

The study of representations of ethnicity and "race" in the media, by Amanda Haynes, looks at both production processes and the significance of under-representation in the media; it also considers the impact of media content on audiences and is partly linked with the discussions taking place in Karim's concluding

piece on “Media and Diaspora,” which notes “a growing absorption of ethnic media in existing conglomerates” (p. 185). Representation from a gender perspective is then elaborated upon by Joke Hermes, who urges the need “to understand how media representations are not only in themselves constructions of particular realities but they are decoded by others in other ways than we would” when used in different contexts from their origin (p. 207).

The relationship between media and politics remains high on the research agenda and in Chapter 9 John Corner focuses on four factors of change in this area: (1) the changing character of political publicity and news management; (2) the changing profile and tone in political journalism; (3) the way people relate to their rights and obligations in the political system and how they use the media; and (4) the consequences of new communication technologies like the Internet (p. 216). Journalism and newsmaking processes are also discussed in the following article by Shoemaker, Lee, Han, and Cohen, that elaborates on the uses of proximity as a news value.

Television is then the focus of Akass and McCabe who analyse fictional genres in Chapter 12 and Sonia Livingstone who identifies and analyzes the shifts in media consumption caused by changes in the model of family life in the following article, suggesting the emergence of a “bedroom culture,” seen also as a “new opportunity for targeted advertising and marketing” and “a key site for the increasing commercialization of childhood and youth” (p. 316).

This book promises to be a very valuable tool for colleagues teaching introductory courses at the undergraduate level and includes a variety of viewpoints and approaches that might stimulate discussion in the classroom, also thanks to the selection of further readings and student activities attached at the end of each piece.

Bibliographical references are included at the end of each article and an overall subject index is also included in the final part of the book.

— Salvatore Scifo

Communication and Media Research Institute
University of Westminster, London

Fitzwalter, Raymond. *The Dream that Died: The Rise and Fall of ITV.* Leicester: Matador, 2008. Pp, xviii, 286. ISBN 978-1906221-874 (hbk.), £19.99; 978-1906221-836 (pb.), £14.99.

Fitzwalter writes that television in Britain has been “the central cultural experience of our age. British

television has been distinctive, appreciated, even loved, because of the quality, range, and diversity of its programming—a service unmatched in most other societies” (p. ix). He writes through his own personal experiences—he worked for independent television for 23 years, on the flagship documentary series *World in Action* and for the last five of those years as Head of Current Affairs—and through more than 90 interviews with key players (those who were involved in television, with a hand on money or power) and who saw the change from a high quality public service broadcaster to a much more commercial organization that aims at ratings rather than quality and which undermines the BBC and Channel 4.

When independent television began in the UK in 1955, it was not a recipient of license funding, like the BBC, but had to draw its income from advertising. It was also heavily regulated and it was regional. Regulation had divided London into two parts, under different broadcasting companies, so that London did not overpower the regions. Many of those companies who gained the franchises were headed by impresarios, like Lew (later Lord) Grade. The new companies were independent and innovative and this, in turn, changed the BBC’s own programming as its programs became less patronizing and braver. Even accents in British broadcasting changed—one has only to listen to newscasters now and to news broadcasters then to understand this. We now have a variety of regional accents on both radio and television rather than the “Received BBC” accent which was the norm in pre-ITV days.

Perhaps one of the strongest of the independent companies that made up the network was Granada, a pioneering company that produced new kinds of current affairs programs, drama documentaries, political coverage of elections, and soap operas like *Coronation Street*, which started in 1960 and continues to run today. Many new faces were seen on its programming, new writers from the North were encouraged. It became the major independent TV company and sold its programs worldwide.

The book traces the history of the network, which now only has regional companies in Scotland, Ulster, and the Channel Islands. For Fitzwalter, there is now one characterless ITV—based in London. He says that its programming ranges, on the whole, from bland to blander, with few high points (p. x). Exceptional programs are fewer and Fitzwalter says that with the passing years the programming standard is lower “when, with the passage of time, it might have been higher” (p. x).

Fitzwalter suggests that this decline, which has also seen viewing figures drop, has been caused by governments who have had little courage or vision and by the taking over of the companies by those with financial interests rather than a passion for television. For Fitzwalter, the *coup de grace* was the October 1991 round of franchise applications. While Granada kept their franchise, others like Thames Television in London would be cursorily broken up. TVS and TSW had lost their franchises, as had TVAM—a breakfast time broadcaster. Yorkshire Television had put in such a large bid in order to retain its franchise that it was on the brink of bankruptcy. The bids relied not just on the amount of money that was bid, but on the proposals that had been put forward for the future. Granada hoped to keep its position as the most distinctive producer of programming, but within three months David Plowright, its Head, who had said “I have served my purpose” when the franchise was gained, was fired. Fitzwalter suggests that what he describes as “the hollowing out” of Granada meant that it had lost distinctive talent, commitment to staff, common purpose, and a sense of public service (p. 265).

Between the 1980s and 1990s, due—Fitzwalter suggests—to the carelessness of politicians and the weaknesses of broadcasters (p. 269), ITV changed to an organization that was concerned with corporatism. Companies were used for other reasons: after the 1990 Act, Robinson used the takeover of ITV companies, cut back greatly, to boost share price, raise money on the shares, and then buy other businesses with the proceeds (like the hoteliers Forte). Robinson did not believe that television differed from any other business. Changes in technology meant that governments, in order to continue with the public service ethic, would have to regulate in order to make Murdoch’s BSKyB and Channel 5 (a newer terrestrial channel) carry public service broadcasting. Had the Thatcher and Blair governments done this, then BBC, ITV, and Channel 4 would not also have had to change. However, he shows that these governments were not prepared to do this. Murdoch was described by Lance Price, who was a media advisor to Tony Blair when he was Prime Minister, as a “voice [that] was rarely heard but whose presence was always felt. No big decision could ever be made inside No.10 without taking account of the likely reaction of three men—Gordon Brown, John Prescott, and Rupert Murdoch” (p. 273).

For those of us who believe in the public service broadcasting ethic, this is very worrying. Why should

one man, unelected, have so much power worldwide to effectively control what our media tell us?

On his final page, Fitzwalter quotes from Ed Murrow, who said of television:

This instrument can teach; it can illuminate; yes, it can even inspire. But it can only do so to the extent that humans are determined to use it to those ends. Otherwise it is merely wires and lights in a box.

I have used this quotation when teaching television students. We might gather from this that we get the television that we deserve. Fitzwalter concludes that ITV no longer inspires the viewer who, despite greater choice, seems to be less excited by what is on offer on TV. In the UK, we still have the BBC and Channel 4, as he says, but their public service broadcasting role is being eaten away at by the changes he describes. However, he adds, while they exist in their present form, they form a base from which visionary broadcasters can rebuild.

While Fitzwalter is obviously passionate and depressed by these changes, there are probably those who think that change is always happening and this is just a development. Fitzwalter writes well and this is an informative book that should be a salutary warning to academic, student, and industry professional alike. The book has an index.

—Maria Way

Communication and Media Research Institute
University of Westminster, London.

Hills, Jill. *Telecommunications and Empire*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2007. Pp. xii, 291. ISBN-13 978-0-252-03258-5 (hbk.) \$45.00.

This is a follow up volume to Jill Hills 2002 book on global communications from 1840–1940 (Hills, 2002). The first book focused on the global communication power of Great Britain to the sunset of empire as WWII began. This volume shines a light on the imperial power of the United States in telecommunication after the war to the beginning of the new millennium. What Hills calls attention to is not the content of the quickly expanding communications power of the U.S., but the expansion and control of the networks that carried the content. The ‘Empire’ to which Hills refers in regards to U.S. power is different from that of military occupation and control of colonies of previous epochs. She says: “We use the term ‘empire’ to denote a system of international relations that puts the United States at the center of a web of international lines of communication, public

and private, from which it is intended that the U.S. economy and favorite companies shall benefit” (p. 23).

Hills, however, takes a nuanced approach. Rather than a simple denunciation of empire, the author argues for hegemony that does not always get its way.

The contention of this book . . . is that U.S. strategy of enforcing liberalization of worldwide national telecommunication markets so that U.S. companies might operate end-to-end control has only partially been successful. Its defeat has come from opposing international alliances and conflicts of interest . . . its attempts to restructure, bypass, and create international institutions directly under its control have had only limited success. Nevertheless, the book argues that the U.S. “Empire project” is still ongoing. (p. 19)

The strength of the book is that Hills works carefully as an historian to detail the sources by which she traces a series of efforts by the U.S. to advance its interests in domestic and international institutions and through international and bilateral trade agreements. In painting the picture of influence in global communications, she includes a number of historical periods and the struggles among national interests of the U.S. and the rest of the world.

“Opening up the British Empire” is the provocative first chapter of this book. Instead of dramatic onslaughts of the rising U.S. telecommunications power on a crumbling empire, the chapter focuses primarily on the struggle within the U.S. for power over the likes of AT&T nationally and ITT internationally between the Congress and the FCC. ITT was being challenged by old and newly formed states who were beginning to nationalize their domestic telecommunication systems. During these first years after WWII, the U.S. decided that the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) was a body that it would join and try to influence. But the British empire and allies in Europe as well as newly liberated colonies were able to limit U.S. influence so that state-to-state models (government control of telecoms) rather than what Hills calls the Western Union model prevailed. Still, the desire of so many countries to enter the U.S. market through its telecommunication networks during the 1950s meant that the U.S. maintained a balance of power while a new technology was waiting its dramatic development.

The British had succeeded in keeping control of submarine cable after the war by its introduction of coaxial technology and keeping its global system, not

of empire, but of the Commonwealth Countries. But the hegemony was quickly challenged by the introduction of communication satellites in the 1960s. This technology would eventually take a good deal of traffic from submarine cable in the 1970s but the split in regulation between the ITU and the interests of U.S. companies like AT&T resulted in overexpansion of capacity and a swing back to submarine cable which had switched to fiber optics in the meantime. The facts that AT&T had dictated both satellite and cable technologies and that the U.S. remained the center of global communication traffic meant that the U.S. regulations of national operators had the effect of controlling what everyone else did. As Hills puts it: “In effect, by virtue of U.S. operation of the eastern end of the most used and profitable route, the FCC became an unacknowledged global international regulator” (p. 90).

The remaining chapters can be detailed more quickly. In Chapters 4 and 5 Hills tells the story of the ITU and its diminished power as private and newly privatized telecommunications companies have made state-to-state models (where national PTOs ran telecommunication systems) obsolete. Still, the author argues, setting international standards and national rate systems have kept the ITU in the game. The World Bank in the 1980s and 1990s has helped the U.S. cause of privatization of telecommunications and promotion of U.S. companies’ interests. However, as Hills argues, the results may not always favor U.S. interests: “. . . although the World Bank may have adopted the private investment mantra . . . its impact was to strengthen the state-to-state [national] system” (p. 174). Such are the contradictions of empire.

The last substantive chapter in the book introduces the World Trade Organization (WTO) as the latest institution that the U.S. tries to co-opt to its interests. The story again has a mixed outcome. The strategy for getting its way in the WTO blocked by international opposition, the U.S. reverted to bi-lateral trade agreements like NAFTA. Hills argues that

NAFTA achieved what the WTO did not. It not only enforced the structure of the U.S. markets on Canada and Mexico, but also ensured that those countries’ domestic regulators could not regulate VAN [private U.S.] operators except in the most limited circumstances. (p. 215)

This set of arrangements in turn set standards for the rest of the world. The one victory that the U.S. won outright in the 1990s is to have kept the regulation of the Internet within its control through ICANN [Internet

Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers]. But even here international pressure has begun to force the private company to agree to an opening up of the assigning procedure.

This book with its companion volume is the best single source for tracing much of the global communication developments of the last 170 years. To understand this system is to grasp what helped create our modern phenomenon of globalization. But it is a complicated history, and Jill Hills manages to make sense of this complexity. Added value of the book lies in its extensive glossary, extensive end notes, bibliography, and index.

—Emile McAnany
Santa Clara University

Reference

Hills, J. (2002). *The struggle for control of global communication: The formative century*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Kramer, Michael W. *Managing Uncertainty in Organizational Communication*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004, Pp. 240. ISBN 0-8058-4920-3 (hbk.) \$59.95.

Living in an age of uncertainty and with the need to manage at least some degree of that uncertainty, Kramer delivers upon an ambitious goal of reviewing and reconceptualizing Berger and Calabrese's (1975) uncertainty reduction theory (URT) by offering his own model for a theory of managing uncertainty (TMU). Drawing upon qualitative, quantitative, and textual analyses, *Managing Uncertainty in Organizational Communication* bridges the interpersonal and organizational contextual divide throughout the book and proffers three goals for this theoretical work: (1) examine the major research conducted using URT; (2) propose a reconceptualization of URT, applied more specifically to the organizational setting in the form of TMU; and (3) present initial findings from three new studies that confirm the TMU model.

In a detailed and extensive review of literature (the book contains 12 pages of references), Kramer begins with the initial conceptualizations of URT, to include explication of the seven axioms and 21 theorems for initial interpersonal interactions, and elaborates on three extensions made by Berger in 1979 to the original (interpersonal) theory: first, he recognized there were different types of uncertainty (e.g., cognitive, behavioral); second, he described three different communication strategies for reducing uncertainty (i.e., passive, active, and interactive); and finally, he recog-

nized that not all situations create the same concern for uncertainty reduction. In 1982, Berger and Bradac further extended the theory by delineating three levels of knowledge that individuals may have about themselves, other people, or their relationship to each other instead of just cognitive and behavioral uncertainty; the three levels are descriptive, predictive, and explanatory. Most recently, Gudykunst (1995) clarified the role of motivation in uncertainty reduction by suggesting that individuals have minimum and maximum thresholds for motivation to reduce uncertainty. Following an extensive review of the URT literature, Kramer concludes, "Although much of the literature finds support for the basic concepts of URT, a number of criticisms have been advanced . . . providing evidence that further development of the theory is needed" (p. 32).

An examination of the applicability of uncertainty in group and organizational contexts precedes the model's developmental explanation. Bridging the URT interpersonal literature and the individual and organizational levels of analyses found within group and organizational communication, Kramer identifies two main concepts that focus the TMU model's development: current understanding of the uncertainty reduction processes recognizes that uncertainty reduction processes and communication processes are not the same, and recognition that multiple motives influence communication interaction and information seeking in interpersonal and organizational settings (pp. 65-66). The TMU model contains six major components: (1) experience of uncertainty (via a trigger event); (2) cognitive attempts at uncertainty reduction; (3) motivation to reduce uncertainty; (4) competing motives; (5) communication behaviors; and (6) impact on uncertainty (which may be closely related to experience of uncertainty as the process continues in a somewhat cyclical manner). In the detailed chapter that unfolds, each of the six elements is further explained and illustrated, drawing upon analysis and research examples at both the individual and group and organizational levels of analyses.

The two underlying concepts of the TMU model are further developed and explored through three separate studies (detailed in chapters five through seven). A qualitative study of car salespeople (Chapter 5) "provided an excellent context for examining the cognitive and behavioral aspects of managing uncertainty in organizational settings" (p. 115). Specifically, the study examined three issues related to TMU: cognitive processes that car salespeople have that work to preclude or prevent the experience of uncertainty in their

interactions with customers; cognitive processes that car salespeople use to reduce the uncertainty they experience when they do meet customers, especially new customers; and communicative behaviors that car salespeople use to reduce uncertainty in their interactions with the customers. Through a series of interviews, the scripts and schemas that are used to reduce and prevent the experience of uncertainty are illuminated as are other cognitive processes (denying, tolerating, or assimilating uncertainty) that produce a variety of behavioral strategies for managing these feelings of uncertainty. Chapter 6 explores the secondary concept of the influence of competing motives on managing uncertainty. In this quantitative study, 80 adults, employed full-time, completed a questionnaire which included a number of scenarios. Despite relying on anticipated rather than actual responses, factor analysis results identified five overall motives: uncertainty reduction, inquisitiveness, negative impacts, incompetence, and impression management. Four sets of subsequent analyses focused on differences in motives to seek information; “taken as a whole, the results support TMU by indicating that there is no simple relationship between uncertainty reduction and information seeking because other motives influence communication behaviors” (p. 168). Finally, to further evaluate TMU’s usefulness as a theoretical perspective, a textual analysis of a previously analyzed (interpretive and critical analyses) story was conducted (i.e., the Lucille Burger story). This analysis considered the dilemmas the participants faced due to the uncertainty created by the events of the story, the communication of each of the parties, and how each resolved the issue (p. 185). The story further suggests an elaboration of the proposed TMU model: the importance of the environmental context as part of the experience of uncertainty for individuals and decision makers in organizations.

The theory of managing uncertainty (model) is to be “considered a work in progress, not a finalized version of a model or theory” (p. 190); a figure (Figure 8.1) details the elaboration of the model. Drawing upon the original six dimensions as bounded by contextual factors, Kramer concludes with seven (new) axioms of TMU: (1) faced with uncertainty in a situation, individuals (or groups of individuals) will experience less uncertainty when they have a process script for managing the uncertainty in the situation than when they have no process script; (2) when individuals (or groups of individuals) can use internal cognitive processes to reduce uncertainty in a situation, they will be unmoti-

vated to seek additional information; (3) in the absence of competing motives, high levels of uncertainty cause increases in information-seeking behavior, and as uncertainty levels decline, information-seeking behavior decreases; (4) motives other than uncertainty reduction, such as social appropriateness and job requirements, can be the primary motivation for information seeking; (5) complementary motives, especially inquisitiveness, increase the motivation to seek information caused by high levels of uncertainty, whereas contrary motives, such as fear of negative impacts, decrease motivation to seek information; (6) although direct inquiry is often the preferred method of seeking information in many situations, individuals (or groups of individuals) rely heavily on other methods of gathering information in other situations; and (7) the positive or negative valence of the information gained in reducing uncertainty determines whether information gained increases or decreases liking. Future research should further explore these qualities within a variety of organizational topics: role negotiation and evaluation, organizational culture, communication networks, and power and influence concerns.

“Uncertainty is the most recognizable of our common interests” and “should be a foundational universal focus of communication theory” (Brabrow, 2001a, p. 453, in Kramer, p. 218). In an era where the communication discipline in general and organizational communication in particular are criticized for a lack of theory-building work, Kramer offers a comprehensive review of a rich body of literature, drawn from a variety of research methodologies, as he constructs a new theory for managing our uncertainty.

—Mary Ann Danielson
Creighton University

Oliver, Kelly and Benigno Trigo. *Noir Anxiety*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003. Pp. xxxv, 297. ISBN 0-8166-4109-9, ISBN-13: 978-0-8166-4109-3 (hbk.) \$67.50; 0-8166-4110-2, ISBN-13: 978-0-8166-4110-9 (pb.) \$22.50.

“Film studies” provides a wondrously broad canopy for approaches to film, not all of them familiar or even congenial with communication studies. *Noir Anxiety* uses a genre identified decades ago by film critics—a certain “dark” style and mood (p. 1)—in quite original ways, in order to provide an interpretive or, better, stylistic anchor for a series of essays exploring the dark side of the film experience: representations and

denials of race, gender, desire, femininity, evil, passion, and a host of other shadowy experiences and emotions. To discuss these, Oliver and Trigo need a wide canvas, so they keep the chronological boundaries of noir flexible; though they generally accept its origins in the 1940s and early '50s, they include films like *Chinatown* (1974), *Devil in a Blue Dress* (1995), and *Bound* (1996), ignoring the usual terminus dates for noir.

They also chart territory quite different by choosing psychoanalytic (largely Freudian) and feminist approaches in order to cast some light on the darker corners of the films they choose to study. And herein lies a difficulty: their discussions of the films work quite well within, for example, their self-defined psychoanalytic world, but how much this world overlaps with the world of the film viewer (or writer or director or other critic) remains an open question. That, of course, is the point of it all: to see things we'd rather not see or rather not admit. The ultimate darkness is the darkness within each of us. Still, their analysis fascinates but leaves a vague discomfort: exegesis or eisegesis?

Eight film analyses and two framing chapters (which themselves take the reader through multiple films in pursuit of a theme) make up the book. An introduction identifies and briefly defines key psychoanalytic concepts (many drawn from Freud's *The Interpretation of Dreams* or the work of Melanie Klein and Julie Kristeva), including condensation, displacement, ambivalence, and abjection. The first chapter applies these tools to questions of race, examining the ongoing theme of race in dozens of classical noir films. Race in 1940s America provides a perfect Freudian ground: present but hidden, mesmerizing but denied.

The next eight chapters provide readings of eight individual films. *Murder, My Sweet* (1944) connects femininity and evil, highlighting the threat of femininity in men and the ambiguity of (male) homosexuality. Race plays a role, but only a minor one in this analysis. The Orson Welles' film *The Lady from Shanghai* (1948) introduces questions of "the ambivalent process of subject formation through which we produce cultural narratives and social and psychic identity" (p. 49). Fritz Lang's 1948 noir *The Secret Beyond the Door* is a psychoanalyst's dream: the absent mother, repression, mirrored images, death, gender reversal. Not surprisingly, Hitchcock's work makes an appearance as Oliver and Trigo find obsession and madness in *Vertigo* (1958). They claim in this chapter that Hitchcock takes the film viewer to the very limits of noir—madness. Chapter 6 returns to Welles. *Touch of Evil* (1958)

moves to the borderlands between Mexico and the U.S. and portrays the blindness that arises from denial; it has roots, or at least manifestations, in sexuality and identity formation. Roman Polanski's *Chinatown* (1974) moves the analysis to jokes, with all of their connections to the unconscious. Jokes provide perfect condensation symbols; true to Oliver and Trigo's past discussion, these reveal the hidden race and sex of Los Angeles's growth and power. Carl Franklin's *Devil in a Blue Dress* (1995) introduces a noir revival, one that foregrounds racial issues hidden in the 1940s films. But the key issues of (racial and sexual) identity formations remain. Finally, the most recent film, *Bound* (1996), another part of the noir revival, presents female protagonists just as *Devil in a Blue Dress* presented African-American ones. Both films subvert the noir framework, but both continue the aesthetic and the psychoanalytic themes. The concluding chapter summarizes what Oliver and Trigo see as the key noir theme of identity formation, across a range of neo-noir films.

Noir Anxiety provides a challenging read of noir films and an introduction to a certain kind of psychoanalytic process. Not all will agree or accept it, but the book informs. The volume also provides a counterpoint to more traditional, communication-studies approaches to film. The authors provide extensive footnotes, a works cited list, a filmography, and an index.

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

Palakeel, Joseph. (Ed.). *The Bible and the Technologies of the Word*. Bangalore, India: Asian Trading Corporation, 2007. Pp. viii, 310. ISBN 81-7086-427-7 (pb.) Rs. 150.00 (www.atcbooks.net)

Those interested in exploring connections between communication and theology find a good starting point in the Bible—not so much in the biblical texts, but, as the title of this book has it, in the technologies of the word. Millennia of experience in communicating the Bible through oral recitation, writing, printing, art, and just about any other means of human communication has led to rich reflections on how communication serves the Word of God and how communication affects that Word. Set in the South Asian context, this volume of essays explores both concepts. The essays themselves grew out of a 2005 conference, "Communicating the Gospel," at the Ruhalya Theological College, Ujjain, India, sponsored by the College and by the Commission for Social Communication of the Catholic Bishops' Conference of India.

Organized into three parts, the volume examines in Part 1, the Bible in a communication perspective; in Part 2, communication in the Bible; and, in Part 3, communication of the Bible.

In Part 1, Patrick Meagher provides a survey of multimedia interpretation and communication of the Bible, examining texts, art, and other expression with an eye to developing an interpretive theory. In the second chapter, Joseph Palakeel, the book's editor, proposes a theological framework, "God's Word in human words." Here he looks at the theological tradition of God's Word, the oral and the written word, word as event, word as address, and word as self-communication. Only then does he turn to an historical overview of the various "transformations of the word"—voice and sound, written or printed text, audiovisual expression, and the digital word. The next three chapters in the section move to communication itself. Gaston Roberge gives a multimedia (here, text, page design, and art) examination of "revelation as symbolic self-communication of God" (p. 39) by exploring images of shepherd and rock. Within it, he wrestles with the functionality of symbols and a symbolic communication that transcends particular texts.

In an important chapter, David Rhodes introduces what he calls "performance criticism" (p. 59), that is the interpretation of the biblical texts through performance—the attempt to recreate the hearing of the Scriptures that would have constituted the experience of most generations of Jews and Christians. Each biblical text forms a "performance text" and more likely than not presents "stage directions" for the reader/performer of, say, the Gospels. Within this overarching framework, he introduces the various kinds of biblical criticism: historical criticism, narrative criticism, reader-response criticism, rhetorical criticism, orality criticism, linguistic criticism, ideological criticism, and theatrical performance. The chapter offers a wonderful introduction to very old yet, for most literates, very new way to experience the Bible. The first section then concludes with a well-researched account of "Biblical storytelling and biblical scholarship" (p. 86) by Thomas Boomershine, based on over 35 years of experience. In addition to reviewing storytelling techniques, he presents research on the biblical audience, biblical meaning, and biblical characterization.

Part 2, on communication in the Bible, though grounded in the biblical text, seems more theoretical. Sebastian Kizakkeyil examines the prophetic books and, through careful textual analysis, identifies 61

characteristics of prophetic discourse. From these he draws out 17 principal prophetic techniques tied to a dozen prophetic actions. He supports each with illustrative texts from the Hebrew prophets. Basilio Monteiro does a similar analysis of St. Paul: "how did he say what he said?" (p. 153). Here he situates Paul's communication strategies in terms of his audiences and content. Henry D'Souza follows with an extended gloss on *Communio et Progressio's* characterization of Jesus as the perfect communicator. What makes Jesus this perfect communicator (p. 170)? His exploration identifies 16 characteristics, from Jesus's effective use of human language (p. 172) to a communication full of celebration (p. 181). The section closes with Paul Savio Pudussery's examination of the parables of Jesus as a communication strategy.

Part 3, Communication of the Bible, stays the closest to the South Asian experience. Chapters examine images of the Bible (P. Solomon Raj), biblical films (Frank Brady), audiovisual efforts to communicate the Bible in India (John Edappally), the Bible in (South Asian) songs and lyrics (Pushpanjali Paul), and the Bible in group media (Fr. Anand). This last section makes one long to have attended the conference, as the written presentations in the book merely describe what some of the authors actually did: sing, dance, show images, and so on.

The Bible and the Technologies of the Word has several audiences, with its chief one consisting of seminary faculty. A continual source of surprise to communication practitioners lies in the resistance of many seminary professors and religious workers to communication. Yet, as this volume so well illustrates, such communication lies at the very heart of Christianity. How can one even consider any kind of ministry without embracing the most effective communication of God's word?

Father Palakeel must be commended for bringing together an all-star collection of scholars with a passion for communicating the Bible. Would that a CD or DVD accompanied this volume!

Chapters feature their own bibliography and the book as a whole provides a bibliography, together with a section about the contributors, and an index.

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

Perrotta, Marta, with a Preface by **Giorgio de Vincenti** and Introduction by **Enrico Menduni**. *Il format televisivo: Caratteristiche, circolazione internazionale, usi e abusi* [*The television format:*

Characteristics, international circulation, uses, and abuses J. Urbino: Edizioni Quattro Venti, 2007. Pp. 207/ ISBN 978-88-392-0808-8 (pb.) €20.

This new book by Marta Perrotta, who works in the Department of Communication at the University of Rome 3, is divided into six sections, over and above the introduction by the noted communication scholar, Enrico Menduni, and the preface by Giorgio di Vincenti. These sections study the international television flow; the international market for formats; the places where these prototypes are created; the ways in which the formats are adapted; and, amongst other things, the variables that must be considered in the adaptations of formats and the ways in which these formats are transformed.

Perrotta points out that comparative analysis on formats is at one and the same time a great opportunity and a great problem (p. 128); from the academic debate on such topics there is a general feeling that such research can only be carried out with the advantages offered by an international team of researchers who can consider all of the variables that she puts forward:

- The specific characteristics of the television systems of each country involved, the number and type of television networks, and the standard of development of television in that country, in terms, for instance, of digital television
- The prevalence of strategic choices as to whether to make or buy programming
- The licensees and producers for the format and their agreements with other producers
- The logical putting together of programming and the conventions that relate to every context of the production and broadcasting of television broadcasting (how programs are put together, the ways in which they are broadcast, in or out of a studio, strip programming or a set time slot, live or recorded programming)
- The thematic implications of the program's content and how this is reconsidered by whoever it is who wants to use the format (p. 128).

The use of an international team would avoid mistakes caused by a lack of knowledge of these variables and also a lack of linguistic skills. As she points out, without such a team, any research of this nature may run the risk of being only superficial.

As a practical example, she uses the Swedish program *Farmen*, which in Great Britain was broadcast (in an English language version) as *The Farm*. This format

was utilized in 18 countries as far apart as Chile and Saudi Arabia, Iraq and the Baltic States. In Britain it caused some controversy when one of the celebrities who took part in this "reality" TV program (a young woman who had previously been involved in a scandal) was asked, as part of her task on the show, to masturbate a pig in order to obtain semen that could be used for artificial insemination. Perrotta explains that of the 18 versions of the program, she was able to obtain footage of only 13 versions and she details the ways in which she analysed this footage (pp. 130 ff.).

While she points out that the buying of formats is not new—*\$64,000 Question* was seen in various versions and languages worldwide in the 1950s, for instance—she shows how formats have changed from being reality shows to becoming reality television.

A useful addition to the Italian books that consider this territory and try to understand the ways in which the format market works, this adds to the work of Professor Michele Sorice (2002, 2005) in this area. De Vincenti (p. 8) points to the possibilities that such formats offer for a powerful form of deterritorialization, but also for the use of local customs in the regional or national versions of a format. This, to me, is the very essence of the term that has so widely been used recently—the "glocal."

Format sales are here to stay. On 26th May, 2008, William G. Stewart, who owns his own production company and has himself either developed or bought the formats of many shows, said in an interview on BBC Radio 4 (www.bbc.co.uk/Radio4) that many struggle to stay in business to make programs that fit in with the ideals that they wish to put forward, but if they owned the format for only one quiz that sold worldwide, that would fund the rests of their activities. He speaks from experience. Since, as we so often forget, the media are in fact a business—a very profitable business, in some cases—as long as there is money to be made from producing and selling formats, locally or globally, then businesses will develop them.

The book has a bibliography which has an extensive, international list of books that relate to television formats—this would be useful to anyone, at what ever stage in their academic career, who is interested in this area.

Dr. Perrotta is to be congratulated on such a thorough overview of a timely topic.

—Maria Way
Communication and Media Research Institute
University of Westminster, London

References

- Sorice, M. (2002). *Lo specchio magico. Linguaggi, formati, generi, pubblici della televisione italiana*. [The magic mirror: Languages, formats, genres and publics of Italian television]. Roma: Editori Riuniti.
- Sorice, M. (Ed.). (2005). *Programmi in scatola. Il format nella TV globale*. [Programmes in a box. The format in global television]. Cantalupa, Torino: Effatà Editrice.

Raphael, Chad. *Investigated Reporting: Muckrakers, Regulators and the Struggle over Television Documentary*. Urban/Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2005. Pp. 320. ISBN: 0-252-03010-9 (hbk.) \$45.00.

Television documentaries are, in many ways, seen as the jewels in television's crown. In this book Chad Raphael considers the ways in which investigative reporting spread on American television in the 1960s and 1970s. He also considers the backlash that such documentaries drew from the American government. That government, he suggests, began to investigate the fairness and accuracy of the "muckraking" reports of TV documentaries "more often and more extensively than at any time in television's history" (p. 1). Journalists' roles and those of officials, he believes, were more interesting and more complicated than we might expect from received liberal theory.

Outside the USA, knowledge of television documentaries produced in the USA is limited—for many of the younger generation, their only knowledge of such documentaries comes from the George Clooney film, *Good Night, and Good Luck*, but that was focused on the McCarthy era of the 1950s. Many of the documentaries of that time resulted in historical, uncritical documentaries assembled from archive film. Networks and documentary producers struggled against each other for a variety of reasons: the industry's desire to placate regulators after quiz-show scandals, perhaps a desire to "stave off antitrust investigations by pleasing congressional overseers" (p. 2), a felt need to revitalize television, "democracy, and America's role in the world" (p. 2). Documentary, it was hoped by the USIA (the United States Information Agency) would enhance America's influence in the cultural and economic spheres, gaining the approbation of citizens of other countries, whilst producing a more informed citizenry at home. Against the normal 15 minute news broadcasts, the documentary format meant that TV journalists felt that they could give their stories more time and so increase their own prestige to a level similar to that enjoyed by the print journalists.

A muckraking story will generally win an audience, and journalists began to investigate such stories, but this drew criticism from some of the public, from the government, and from the media themselves. There were complaints about fairness and accuracy and the House Committee held no less than four lengthy enquiries between 1968 and 1971. Officials under the Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon governments held their own investigations, and there were various attempts to regulate documentaries more closely. Raphael examines investigative reports undertaken by networks and later investigated by the government during the 1960 to 1975 period, from the start of the muckraking documentary to the point where regulators began to move away from scrutiny of news content. He has chosen those cases that engendered the longest enquiries by FCC, Congress, or the White House. As he shows, these cases drew extensive print reports and he believes that they may thus have influenced the viewpoints of both politicians and the public on such reporting of the muckraking type of story.

For most of the public, investigative reporting is what they consider reporting to be, so it is perhaps surprising that so little has been published on TV documentaries of this type during this period—especially as the three American networks, ABC, NBC, and CBS, together produced 447 reports in 1962 alone, although this was the height of the boom in such programming. For Raphael, it is particularly surprising that so little work has been undertaken on the effects these documentaries had on media/state relations. He points particularly to the foundation of watchdog groups, like Accuracy in Media, to the pressures from liberal groups (that included churches, civil rights groups, etc.), to demands for more citizen access to electronic mass media, and to the criticism and scrutiny of the media by the state—one thinks particularly here of the Watergate scandal and the ensuing problems caused to both media and state. Some politicians, notably Agnew and Moynihan, believed that journalists were out of step with mainstream America, being more liberal and desirous of criticizing government. Journalists were, according to Agnew, "a closed fraternity" who had not been elected and who should be accountable to regulation (p. 5). Journalists had become part of what is now called "the knowledge society," but an elite part of it, along with academics, professionals, and philanthropists. They were seen to be quite dangerous and to have an ability to undermine all that society in the USA stood on. Many journalists, however, saw themselves

in the role almost of advocacy—telling what the powerful did not want to have told to those who had no power and who ought to know about it. Due to their adversarial roles, the media were considered to be to the left of the politics of most Americans—although Raphael demonstrates that research does not bear this out nor does it show how the views of journalists are reflected in the products they produce. Those who criticized the media for undermining business and the economy are also shown to be wrong, since the media need their patrons and audiences.

This book tests many of the claims that were and have since been made about documentaries and news, using a combination methodology comprising Daniel Hallin's three concentric sphere theory—where there are spheres of consensus, legitimate controversy, and deviance, but where actors may move from one sphere to another over time; of the notion of indexing that has a special place for official voices, but which Raphael shows may also have indices drawn from others outside this elite group. Since the cases he uses are quite old, he has been able to access both archival material and secondary literature that helps to clarify the events and the views shown towards them at the time.

Investigative reporting is considered important for the wrongdoings and injustices that it brings to light, but also because it causes citizens to ask for correction and it causes politicians to put reforms in place. Raphael, however, believes that it is important because it can change the thinking of elite groups, rather than those of the public. Watergate, for instance, did not bring great pressure from the public for Nixon to resign or to be impeached. Raphael shows that such programming may not affect policy as much as has been assumed and programs may or may not affect public opinion. Indeed, some regulatory change has gone against the public reaction generated by a documentary. Sometimes, of course, governments have been involved with the journalists in bringing wrongdoers to documentary attention. The impact of investigative programming can be checked by political backlashes. The author offers what he believes is the “first systematic study of media response to controversial investigative reports” (p. 11), and he disagrees with previous findings, demonstrating how critics can draw attention away from charges made, focusing it instead on issues relating to media ethics.

The seventh chapter looks at the results that media-state clashes have had on news regulation to discern whether the public were better served in the 1960s

or today. The deregulation of the field is better understood, Raphael believes, as being “privatized regulation” where disputes are often settled in court between the private plaintiff and the muckrakers, while the program's makers have to battle also with the interests of the advertisers and media owners, who would prefer the makers to develop programs in their own interest rather than for the interests of the public.

The final chapter draws conclusions for news theory, summarizing the notion of the media's adversarial attitudes to government. Raphael forms a model that assists in developing an understanding of how “muckraking” programs are put together and how their legitimacy can be undermined by criticism.

The book is well-referenced and researched and could be usefully added to reading on courses in both media studies and journalism. It would also be interesting to those who study 20th century history.

—Maria Way

Communication and Media Research Institute
University of Westminster, London

Ruddock, Andy. *Investigating Audiences.* Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore: Sage, 2007. Pp. viii, 185. ISBN 978-1-4129-2270-8 (pb.) \$39.95.

Midway through a career studying and teaching about audiences, Andy Ruddock readily admits that he still has much to learn. Rather than updating his 2001 *Understanding Audiences*—an investigation into media power and audience resistance—he has chosen to write a new book, so much has his outlook changed. His key approaches have not: *Investigating Audiences* still examines audiences from the perspective of power and negotiated meaning, from the privileging of qualitative methods to get at audience identity and practice. But *Investigating Audiences* appears less willing to cede media power, more willing to take a micro-level view, and even to admit quantitative studies and a good dose of uncertainty.

Ruddock takes the role of a tour guide here, leading the reader through a complex forest of studies. The method becomes a bit frustrating at times, leaving the reader to wonder just why and how Ruddock brings in so many studies (why can't he just tell us the conclusion?). But ultimately this method proves valuable—if only because Ruddock is such a good guide to audience studies. More than once I found myself saying, “Why didn't that occur to me before? Of course, this makes lots of sense.” And Ruddock himself admits at the very beginning that the frustration with audience studies

comes from the very scope of the project: He notes that Bryant and Miron (2004) have tallied 576 studies referring to “a staggering 604 theories” (p. 9). No wonder researchers have trouble with explaining audiences.

This exploration of audience studies tracks six major areas of investigation, one per chapter. Each chapter follows a similar organizational structure: an introduction to the topic, the recommendation of a key article whose findings raise or illustrate the issues, and the presentation of the material. The latter does not always take the expected path, demanding an attentive reader—always a good thing, but in a book about audiences and audience power, presuming nonetheless a strong text and an authoritative voice. The television, film, or online audience presumably has greater scope in creating messages than does the student population or the universe of academic readers.

After a first orienting chapter in which he introduces the methods and history of audience study, Ruddock begins a review of news and public information in Chapter 2. News and public information matter a great deal, not least because of their central role in the political processes of western democracies. They also matter to communication research, judging from the very number of studies conducted, dating from the 1940s. Theories here include what most of us learned in a first graduate seminar: diffusion of information, agenda setting, cultivation analysis, the spiral of silence, and framing (p. 40). But we also meet critical audience research, questioning the audience (where are these audiences? Who are they?), and the ways public understanding shifts with weak frames.

Chapter 3 takes us through what Ruddock calls “the meaning of the meaningless” (p. 54)—entertainment television, popular shows from *The Simpsons* to the *Eurovision Song Contest*. Why do audiences seem to derive such pleasure from such ephemeral fare? This puts us into the territory of uses and gratifications research (with its dangers of determinism) and of the cultural studies approaches (and the introduction of questions of power). Audiences do a lot with television and the researcher stance may well come with a good bit of elitism and bias. When a researcher concludes that something lacks meaning, s/he has probably missed out on audience concerns ranging from identity, ethnicity, and the nuanced reality of the diaspora in a rapidly globalizing world.

Fans dominate Chapter 4. Understanding audiences as semi-independent actors shifts the centers of power in the programming-democratic society-creative work-community equations. Fan politics most definitely

exists; understanding its role moves fans into larger social and sociological wholes. This move also allows for a new understanding of program content and political power—and it provides a good corrective to the reification of government.

Perhaps the greatest challenges and insights in *Investigating Audiences* comes with Chapter 5 and its investigation into objectionable content. We meet again the classic pair of sex and violence, but Ruddock asks us to re-examine our presuppositions: just why do we (or audience members) find these problematic? The question takes on more weight when we realize the popularity of programming that many (most?) respondents term objectionable. The disconnect asks for a fresh look at what (p. 102) and where (p. 104) is the objectionable. The third-person effect comes in handy here, but there’s more to it. People’s opinions and evaluations change and so in these contexts researchers should ask “Who wants to know?” (p. 112) along with other research questions.

We return to the popular in Chapter 6: reality shows, media celebrity, and games. This chapter moves a bit away from audiences to the shows themselves (just what is the reality of a reality show?), but returns to how audience members construct these programs. They would not work without the audience embrace and, even if scholars struggle with placing the genre, audiences do not. The situation becomes quite serious indeed when Ruddock invites communication researchers to notice the political power created when politicians co-opt the forms of reality television.

Finally, the tour through audiences turns more explicitly to young people and technology. The media effects question has historical prominence, but may well not be the most important question to ask. Instead, this (young) audience creates political power from its use of new media. It also forms a site of political contest through media education and other ways that teachers and parents have tried to re-frame the youth audience. As he does in each previous chapter, Ruddock recounts an experience of his own research, this time showing how getting it wrong allowed the audience to take on an identity that did not much resemble that of an audience. This, of course, describes the key problem in studying audiences: Just what constitutes an audience? How much does the audience emerge from the research paradigm (either qualitative or quantitative)? How should communication researchers investigate them?

Despite some quibbles, *Investigating Audiences* repays the reader: It is a strong book and a welcome addi-

tion to the literature on audiences, either as a first introduction or as a particular reading of the tradition for those more familiar with it. Ruddock presents himself as a very human but also very trustworthy guide, one well worth following. The book features a 16-page reference list and an index.

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

Reference

Bryant, J., & Miron, D. (2004). Theory and research in mass communication. *Journal of Communication*, 54, 662-704.

Sullivan, Graeme. *Art Practice as Research: Inquiry in the Visual Arts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2005. Pp. xxii, 265. ISBN 1-4129-0536-2 (pb.) \$54.95.

Graeme Sullivan's book, *Art Practice As Research*, is a comprehensive resource. Sullivan clearly discusses historical context, contemporary issues, and future directions of visual arts in higher education. He overviews methods of inquiry in the sciences and what cognitive science offers visual art research. Overall, Sullivan contends that art practices are as much a form of research as what currently counts as research, and beyond this, art practices as research have transformative potential to reshape traditional iterative pursuits of knowledge. The book could be useful in upper division undergraduate courses but ideal for beginning graduate studies in disciplines of visual communication.

Sullivan begins with contexts and argues that, historically and culturally, visual arts have been shuffled into different configurations in higher education. *Art Practice* moves through a description of accepted methods of research in the sciences. A person interested in art research would be well-served by the foundation Sullivan provides. However, his interest extends beyond situating art research within this foundation. In his words: "To continue to merely borrow research methods from other fields denies the intellectual maturity of art practice as a plausible basis for raising significant theoretical questions and as a viable site for applying important cultural and educational ideas" (p. 72). Studio artists, art writers, art educators, and those interested in the study of art, in Sullivan's clear argument, have important roles to play in the practice of art research for the future of knowledge itself. Sullivan's book inspires possibilities and proceeds to give practical direction to accomplish the goals of art inquiry.

The second section in Sullivan's book offers an orienting framework. It is necessarily flexible for research in visual arts. The framework sets art practice

in relation to empirical, interpretive, and critical paradigms; it includes discursive, dialectical, and deconstructionist inquiry and responsive practices (understanding, reflexive, post-discipline, and visual systems). Visual systems include descriptions of complexity theory, self-similarity, scale-free networks, and perspectivalism—all positioned in what Sullivan calls the theoretically transformative, braided relationship of art practice as research. Sullivan illustrates ways the framework can be used by suggesting and describing possible combinations available within it.

Sullivan creates three more frameworks. One involves visual arts knowing, which is comprised of visual cognition from the cognitive sciences and the role of context in that domain. The phrasing on the visual cognition framework for conceptualizing cognition involves thinking in a medium, thinking in a language, and thinking in a setting. Another framework Sullivan creates for those who wish to design art research projects includes ideas and agency, forms and structure, and situations and action. Within these ends of the continuum of the framework are making in communities, making in systems, and making in cultures. All are situated in relationship to artist as theorist. For the final framework—ideas and agency, forms and structure, situations and action—are still used to define the structure. However, the framework is used for visual arts research projects and includes ways to make use of the previous frameworks. According to Sullivan, "[by] taking on the challenge of research within the framework of the academy, and doing so according to the integrity of visual arts practice, perhaps the artist-theorist can claim the right to create and critique issues of human significance on arts' terms" (p. 221).

Sullivan uses the work of artists to accompany his written descriptions about theory and research. In so doing, the reader experiences what Sullivan argues should happen in the practice of art research, expanding what is available to know. The volume includes a reference list and an index.

—Heather Crandall
Gonzaga University

Ter Haar, Gerrie and Yoshio Tsuruoka. (Eds.). *Religion and Society: An Agenda for the 21st Century. Volume 5 in the International Studies in Religion and Society Series*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007. Pp. xviii, 306. ISBN 978-90-04-16123-8 (pb.) €79.00, \$ 99.00

I do not usually like books that are formed from a collection of conference papers, but this is one that I

enjoyed very much. This book is made up of revised versions of selected papers from the 19th World Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions (IAHR) in Tokyo in 2005. Religion has come back onto the academic agenda recently and this increased interest is shown by the 1800 researchers from 62 countries who attended the conference, many of whom came from Asia and Africa. These attendees were present at the 350 panels, symposia, round tables, and special sessions that made up the Congress.

In addition to a Foreword and short introduction, it has six multi-chaptered sections: The Religious Dimensions of War and Peace; Technology, Life, and Death; Global Religions and Local Cultures; Boundaries and Segregations; Method and Theory in the Study of Religion; and, since the Congress was in Japan, Study of Religion in that country. In some cases there are initial papers with responses to them.

Research into religion is often attempted by writers who feel strongly for or against a particular faith. Balance is thus often lacking. Rosalind Hackett suggests here that researchers must consider “not just facts, but values” because of issues raised by religious conflict. She points to Herzfeld, who wrote that “‘disinterested scholarship,’ as well as ‘cultural relativism’ are limited sources of refuge with their own problematic theodicies” (cited on p. 6 from Herzfeld, 2001, p. 238). Papers in this book are both balanced and well researched and deal with issues coming from a number of beliefs. These papers often have a new slant, for instance the paper on Islamic Studies in Japan, about which I have previously read nothing, or the paper on Christianity in Japanese religious studies. Tsuchiya notes that in Japan “being a Christian is rather an exceptional state of affairs, requiring personal initiation” (p. 252). Despite this, Japanese scholars of Christianity have traditionally adopted Western theology without questioning cultural differences.

Part 3, which has four chapters, written by P. Pratap Kumar, Talal Asad, Vasudha Narayanan, and Pablo Write, suggests that far from a move to secularism in the world, we may be in a period of religious revival. Asad (p. 83) has written a chapter on Islam in Egypt and the Arab countries, but says that Christianity is the globally pre-eminent religion, its believers making up a third of the people of the world, while what he describes as a “mere fifth” (p. 83) are Muslim. In the last two centuries, Asad writes, Islam has grown far less dramatically than Christianity, which is something that seems to have escaped media attention in the West.

Technological advances have given cause for concern to many in society as they have raised questions that previously did not need to be asked. Section 2 (on Technology, Life, and Death) notes that some of these advances have begun to destroy indigenous religious knowledge systems and have caused environmental or ethical problems. Professor Ebrahim Moosa, who was one of the keynote speakers at the Congress, writes on “Neuropolitics and the Body” (pp. 43-59), considering this from the viewpoint of Islam, and asking, among other things: “When is a person actually dead?” In the West, ethical problems of this nature are often presented as being problematic only to Roman Catholics (abortion, for instance) and so this chapter gave me several more reasons for seeking similarities rather than differences in faiths.

The book concludes (p. xvii) that the 21st century will still have religion as one of its major forces, and in addition to the wide-ranging and interesting chapters it suggests future study possibilities. The interdisciplinary approach means that there are feminist critiques of religious topics as well as ethical, political, and medical ones. Section 5 puts forward some suggestions for methods and theory in religion, several of them coming from non-Western writers, which is a refreshing change. The editors believe that religion is one of the major issues of our time and this book, which is well-referenced and indexed, will interest those who study in many fields of academia.

—Maria Way

Communication and Media Research Institute
University of Westminster, London

References

Herzfeld, M. (2001). *Anthropology: Theoretical practice in culture and society*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wolf, Maryanne. *Proust and the Squid: The Story and Science of the Reading Brain*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2007. Pp. xi, 308. ISBN 978-0-06-018639-5 (hbk.) \$25.95.

As a form of communication, reading depends on a technology, writing, arguably the first communication technology. The experience of reading brings us into an artificial world—not only the artifice of the imagination or the arrangement of data, but the artifice of unnatural uses of our brains. Sight and hearing remain oriented to the natural world, but reading harnesses them to take advantage of decoding symbols for phonemes, for reconstituting language, and for sharing ideas.

Maryanne Wolf directs the Center for Reading and Language Research in the Eliot-Pearson Department of Child Development at Tufts University. She writes this book as a guide to what we know about reading, primarily for a popular audience but with enough scholarly material and apparatus to satisfy the communication researcher. Anyone interested in communication development in children, in reading, or in reading difficulties will greatly benefit from reading Wolf's work. *Proust and the Squid* tells the story of reading and opens up what exists as a background process for most of us to more conscious examination.

Part 1, "How the Brain Learned to Read," offers an historical summary, using archeological and textual evidence to piece together the human development of symbolic representation. Evidence from ancient Sumeria and Egypt, for example, lets Wolf offer an hypothesis on how the human brain adapted to a new skill, how it learned or re-tooled visual recognition centers to examine artificial markings. She draws on similar evidence to tell us, again for example, "how Sumerians taught their children to read" (pp. 37–40). These early stories of writing systems lead her into the alphabet. Its key quality as a writing system—describing sounds—calls upon new orientations for the reading brain: connecting visual marks with auditory information, demanding that the brain connect visual and auditory processing centers. Drawing on a wide variety of work (including that of Eric Havelock and Walter Ong, S.J.), Wolf examines key claims about whether the alphabet "builds a different brain" (pp. 60–69): the efficiency of the alphabet, the alphabet's ability to stimulate thought, and the alphabet's role in increasing awareness of speech.

Part 2 of the book examines "how the brain learns to read over time," presenting research on the stages of child reading development. Here we learn that children's reading actually starts much earlier, with their awareness of oral language and the sounds of language. A child's ability to differentiate sounds, recognize rhymes, and engage in word play can strongly predict later reading ability. Wolf joins this research to other, neurological work on the structure of the reading brain and the absolute necessity for the myelination of brain neurons in the angular gyrus region before a child can really learn to read. For most children this occurs between the ages of five to seven years; before then, the brain simply cannot easily "integrate visual, verbal, and auditory information rapidly" (p. 95)—a necessity for reading.

Wolf adds helpful information for parents wanting to aid their children's reading. She contrasts reading in

different geographical regions and languages: the orthography of a language does matter. No surprise here, but the difficulties of English spelling make it harder for children to learn to read English than for children to learn to read a more predictably spelled language like German. Throughout this second part of the book, Wolf takes pains to point out what children's brains have to do in order to become expert readers, supporting her narrative with illustrations of the brain and the various regions involved in reading. We learn about the wonder of 500 milliseconds, the time it takes the brain to understand a written word, from attention to pattern recognition to sound connection to phonology to vocabulary denotation and connotation (pp. 145–55).

In Part 3 Wolf directs our attention to problems with reading: "when the brain can't learn to read." Under the general term dyslexia we have grouped many different reading difficulties, from inability to recognize letters to reversal of letters, from timing disorders (those 500 milliseconds) to auditory ones, and so on. Wolf argues that reading difficulties can enter in at any one or any combination of five general areas: behaviors; perceptual motor, conceptual, or linguistic processes; neural structures; neurons; or genetic foundations (p. 169). Research into dyslexia has examined all of them and a number of different theories attempt to integrate the findings. Generally researchers have offered four kinds of theoretical principles to explain reading difficulties: "a flaw in the older structures" of the brain; "a failure to achieve automaticity"; "an impediment in the circuit connections among the structures" of the brain; and "a different circuit for reading" in which children with reading problems use completely different areas of the brain than their peers for processing reading (pp. 170–83). The research and the views of the brain are wonderful.

Even more wonderful are Wolf's explorations of the genetic evidence. Often children with reading difficulties excel in other tasks, so she asks why—from a genetic perspective—would these different brains be passed from generation to generation through DNA encoding. It's a humbling meditation on human difference and one well worth considering.

Proust and the Squid repays its reading Communication researchers and teachers, even those not working specifically in literacy studies, will learn a lot from this book. It's accessible enough for undergraduate use. The book includes fairly extensive notes and an index.

—Paul A. Soukup, S.J.

- Dialogue - questioning : the ability to self-determination regarding the information received ; Ability to formulate the problematic issues that support dialogue ; ability to build a communicative expedient strategy and tactics of verbal behavior . [3].

References. 1. Golub IB Art of rhetoric . Manual for eloquence. Rostov n / a : Phoenix, 2005 . (Series "Empire of Success"). Communication is defined as the exchange of information signs (language, gestures, facial expression, movements and etc). It is the process to exchange the information and the speaker assumes that his interlocutor does not know what he wants to share [1]. It means that communication is always directed to the other " to the listener, it is always an interaction between a group or two individuals, it is a common mindset when one informs and others are informed. It is natural that depending on the number of entities of social communication it can be a single, group or mass. It is important to und Dialogue as an "enlarged communicative mentality": Review, assessment and ongoing difference. R. C. Arnett. C. Grayson.Â Instructors presented dialogue as a way of communicating that enables groups to think together, which is consistent with Bohm's epistemological approach. However, organizational members described profound meaningful experiences of connection, otherness, and spirituality during the workshop. These themes, which are consistent with Martin Buber's ontological notion of dialogue, occurred as by-products of the Bohmian training.