

How to Do Media and Cultural Studies

Second edition

Jane Stokes



Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC



Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC

SAGE Publications Ltd
1 Oliver's Yard
55 City Road
London EC1Y 1SP

SAGE Publications Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320

SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd
B 1/I 1 Mohan Cooperative Industrial Area
Mathura Road
New Delhi 110 044

SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte Ltd
3 Church Street
#10-04 Samsung Hub
Singapore 049483

Editor: Mila Steele
Editorial assistant: James Piper
Production editor: Imogen Roome
Copyeditor: Kate Harrison
Marketing manager: Michael Ainsley
Typeset by: C&M Digitals (P) Ltd, Chennai, India
Printed by: MPG Books Group, Bodmin,
Cornwall



Mixed Sources

Product group from well-managed
forests and other controlled sources
www.fsc.org Cert no. SA-COC-1565
© 1996 Forest Stewardship Council

© Jane Stokes 2013

First published 2013
First edition published 2002

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, this publication may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form, or by any means, only with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction, in accordance with the terms of licences issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2011945433

British Library Cataloguing in Publication data

A catalogue record for this book is available from
the British Library

ISBN 978-1-84920-785-0

ISBN 978-1-84920-786-7 (pbk)

2

WHY DO WE DO MEDIA AND CULTURAL STUDIES?

‘We *must* study the media.’ (Roger Silverstone, 1999: 12)

Aims and Objectives

- In this chapter we provide a historical overview to some of the main movements in the study of media and culture.
- We consider some of the political motivations and the transformative agenda underlying the main trends in Communication, Media and Cultural Studies research and scholarship.
- Finally, the chapter offers some suggestions for further reading.

INTRODUCTION

Why do we do media and cultural studies? There are many motivations for people to conduct research in media and cultural studies. For many of us, it is *new technology* which excites us – perhaps we are intrigued by the popularity of a new kind of phone or the CGI in the latest movie. We might be worried about the kind of ‘surveillance society’ being created when so much private information is available on databases kept by private and public organizations, on social networks or websites. It may be the enjoyment of playing games or watching television that makes us want to learn more about the *pleasure* derived from media; or it may be our appreciation of the artistry in a piece of work which drives us to learn more about the *aesthetics* of media or culture. Many of us are concerned that the media do not serve the *political* function that they should – the media are held responsible for keeping a check on our politicians and we want to ensure that they do this rigorously. Perhaps we feel horror at the media’s coverage of war seems to normalize or even glamorize armed conflict. Each reader of this book will

have their own answer to the question: 'Why study the media?' Later chapters of this book will give you some guidance and ideas about how you can conduct your own research. In this chapter we are going to consider *why* people have studied the media, looking at some of the main trends in the history of our field.

In Chapter 1 we talked about how we know anything at all and looked at some ideas and concepts which one might find across a number of different research traditions. Here I want to concentrate on the unique qualities of communication, media and cultural studies. How do researchers in these fields differ from those in any other? We can identify four main characteristics of media and culture research: the first is that the phenomena we research are the products of *human endeavour* – we are looking at cultural artifacts and these are, by definition, produced by people. There is nothing '*natural*' about the media and culture which surrounds us, and yet it often seems to us the most natural thing in the world. The first thing we have to learn about researching media and culture is that we can take nothing for granted. Indeed, it is those 'normal', 'natural' and 'taken-for-granted' elements of media and culture which are precisely the most ideologically loaded and which we must interrogate most closely. The second key characteristic is that, because we have to use *media to talk about the media*, it is self-referential. I am typing these words in my study now and you are reading them there and then – before these words can get to you I will have to send them to the publisher who will reorganize them and have them proof-read before sending them off to be printed and bound before being shipped back to the UK or Australia or wherever you are now, before you or the librarian buys the book, probably online, and my words become part of an information economy. It is a long journey, from my having these thoughts in my head to you apprehending them on the page. It is one which uses a range of methods of communication – reading, writing, word-processing, re-reading, emailing, editing, posting, printing, marketing, shipping, printing, shopping, reading – all mediated forms of communication. All media and cultural studies outputs contribute to the media and as researchers we are all, always, part of the phenomena we critique. This brings me to the third key defining characteristic of media and cultural studies: the escalating transformation of the mediated environment. The increasing mediatization of the cultural realm has been one of the prevailing themes in the history of Western culture for about the last 200 years. These changes have not gone unchronicled; people have been commenting on them, positively and negatively, since the beginning of what we have come to call 'Western civilization'. The process of the growth of media began apace during the Industrial Revolution in the mid-late-nineteenth century with the introduction of the steam press and cheap methods of printing, while advances in chemistry and physics brought us photography and the beginning of the cinema. The twentieth century witnessed the expansion of these as popular media, while radio, television and later computing

were all added to the media landscape. Since the introduction of computer and microchip technology, the rate of change has been of a different order – the language of the gigabyte and hypertext protocols are now part of the everyday vocabulary of people who formerly worked with celluloid, magnetic tape, transmissions, negatives and so on – all media technologies which are dead or dying. The revolution being wrought, still, by computer technology is unrivalled in the history of human activity. The fourth feature is one that is shared with some other academic subjects – in our field, scholars are aware of the transformative power of media and, more importantly, of a media and cultural studies education. Many kinds of education are empowering to the individual; a media education enables one to see the world in a different way: to recognize mediated messages as *constructed* and *deliberate*. One of the liberating features of media studies is that it helps people to acquire a richer understanding of the roles of media and culture in their everyday lives. This can be a very transformational process in itself. Media and cultural studies, then, is the study of something which is: a) *cultural, not natural*; b) *reflexive*; c) in a state of almost *continuous flux*; and d) *transformative*. We must study the media because in doing so we can help monitor and direct it to bring about change for the better. In this chapter we review some of the main paradigms for researching media and culture.

APPROACHES TO MEDIA AND CULTURE BEFORE MEDIA STUDIES

Media, culture and communication studies are relatively recent additions to the rostra of academic subjects taught within the formal education system. Many of the questions raised under the rubric of these apparently new subjects have antecedents which precede the establishment of these as areas for study. Questions about aesthetics, representation or the relationship between the people, the communication system and the state were all raised by the ancient Greeks and by successive philosophers throughout history.

The idea of what we can and cannot (should and should not) represent is one continuing theme in philosophy and theology as well as cultural history. Questions of representation go to the heart of all Abrahamic religions and they have often been contested. Consider the phenomenon of *iconoclasm*, or the destruction of icons. We saw examples of it when statues and images of Colonel Gaddafi of Libya were defiled and destroyed in the spring of 2011. The term *iconoclast* was first coined in reference to a Christian movement in Byzantium in about 730 when the Emperor Leo III ordered an image of Jesus Christ to be replaced with a cross at the entrance of the Great Palace of Constantinople (Gioia, 2005: 40). The first example of Muslim iconoclasm was in 630 with the destruction of idols at Mecca. In the history of Islam, Christianity and Judaism, there have also been several periods when symbols

and icons have been destroyed. One of the most shocking examples of recent times was the destruction of the Buddhas in Bamiyan in Afghanistan in 2001 as part of a campaign to undermine Buddhist culture and tradition. The site has been made a world heritage site by UNESCO (2011). *The Times of India* reported on 6 February 2010 that Hindu icons were smashed in the temple at Sree Sree Rakshakali Temple at Ashrafdi village in the Narayanganj district in Bangladesh (*Times of India*, 2010). There are hundreds of other examples of the destruction of images by people of many faiths. The relationship between religion and representation can be of incendiary importance. Within Christianity, issues of representation go to the heart of the conflict between Protestantism and Catholicism which has shaped the history of modern Europe. As our world has become more globalized – as more interaction between peoples of different faiths and ideologies grows – so ideas about media and communication (what can and cannot be said, to whom, by whom) have the potential to result in conflict.

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION, MODERNITY, MEDIA AND CULTURE

The biggest changes in the location of culture and its representation came in the period of the rise of the ‘mass media’, the time of the Industrial Revolution (about 1760–1880). Space does not permit us to do justice to the enormous impact this had for the role of media and culture in society during this period. John Thompson has written about the rise of modernity and its inexorable correlation with the rise of the mass media (Thompson, 1995). The rapid developments in transport and communication witnessed in Western society during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries made people increasingly aware of social and cultural differences. In the nineteenth century, new towns and factories were growing rapidly; people were moving from the country to the city to find work and as they did so a new social class of people was forming: the ‘working class’. The relationship we had to our livelihoods changed as we worked, not for ourselves, or as agricultural workers on the land, but for the manufacturer and the factory owner.

This changing relationship was observed, chronicled and reflected on by the writers of the day. The newspapers of that time were important media for discussion and debate of social change. One of the most important movements campaigning for social change in the nineteenth century was the Chartists who lobbied for an expansion of the right to vote. The Chartist newspaper, *The Northern Star*, launched in Leeds in 1837, rapidly reached sales figures of some 50,000, making it the biggest circulation of its time (Williams, 2010). There was a growing radical press in Britain in the eighteenth century, such as *The Poor Man’s Guardian*, which grew up to serve and reflect the interests of the nascent proletariat (Curran and Seaton, 2010; Williams, 1998;

2010). The labour movement articulated its case through the expansion of the press and the rapid spread of ideas enabled by new technologies of printing and transport.

Karl Marx (1818–83) and Friedrich Engels (1820–95) are the two authors most readily associated with the growth of political movements arguing for a greater stake in the wealth of an expanding economy. Friedrich Engels was the son of an industrialist who was sent to England to manage his father's factory in 1842; he was horrified by the poverty he found. Engels undertook a study of the 'industrial proletariat' and their relationship to the labour movement in England in 1844–5 which resulted in his treatise *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (2011 [1845]). Here Engels describes the changes wrought by industrialization and the extent to which the working classes were being politicized in response. The relationship between capital and class are crucial determinants in the shaping of history. The central critique of capitalism can be summed up in relation to the exploitation of surplus value as follows:

... the cause of the miserable condition of the working class is to be sought ... in the Capitalistic System itself. The wage-worker sells to the capitalist his labour-force for a certain daily sum. After a few hours' work he has reproduced the value of that sum; but the substance of his contract is that he has to work another series of hours to complete his working day; and the value he produces during these additional hours of surplus labour is surplus value which costs the capitalist nothing but yet goes into his pocket. That is the basis of the system which tends more and more to split up civilized society into a few Vanderbilts, the owners of all the means of production and subsistence, on the one hand, and an immense number of wage-workers, the owners of nothing but their labour-force, on the other. (Engels, 1887)

The fact that the 'surplus value' of the working class can be taken for the enrichment of the owners of the means of production remains, over 150 years later, a fundamental law of the capitalist system and an abiding source of inequality and poverty. Engels and Marx were both revolutionaries, active in the struggles to improve the lot of working people in Germany and France – they were exiled from both countries for their revolutionary acts. Both knew the importance of the media for generating ideas and bringing about change. But the power of those in authority to control and shape the media, the means by which people are able to get information, could not be underestimated. In *The German Ideology* Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels wrote:

The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e. the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. (Marx and Engels, 1974 [1845])

Dominant culture is shaped by the ruling class and it is the task of those opposed to the control and domination exercised by the ruling class to stand up and object. Marx's work summed up the ideas and attitudes of many in the labour movement in the nineteenth century, and his three-volume analysis of capitalism, simply called *Capital* (Marx, 1990 [1867]; 1992 [1885]; 1992 [1894]), is seen by many to be the foundational work of communism. Marx and Engels, and many others in the labour movement at the time, saw their goal not just as commenting on the state of the working class in England or anywhere else, but in changing it. The writings of Marx and Engels are riddled with observations and comments which are of their time and which now read as sometimes embarrassing, sometimes infuriating. Nonetheless, their work is testament to an engagement with the economic and social world and a determination to help bring about social change through the use of the media in their books, pamphlets, articles and speeches. Perhaps the most important contribution of Marxism to our field of study is that it provides us with an understanding of the media and cultural world as having an economic, *material* base. We can never ignore that our society is founded on the capitalist mode of production, nor that the ruling economic class have a vested interest in shaping the thoughts and ideas of the rest of us. Marxist scholarship provides an important strand in media and cultural studies with a long tradition of work inspired by Marx including that of Antonio Gramsci (2011), György Lukács (2000 [1923]), Louis Althusser (Althusser, 1979; 1984), Jesus Martin-Barbero, 1993 and many others (Wayne, 2003).

Since the rise of the mass media, people have commented on it, noted it and reflected on its impact for good and bad. In the nineteenth century, societies were set up for the study of art; for example, the Arundel Society used the latest media technology of chromolithography to distribute prints of the finest art from the ancient world (Griffiths, 1980). The Romantics and the Arts and Crafts Movement were two schools of art which harked back to an earlier time but used modern technology, modern industry and commerce to spread their message. They were self-consciously creating a new kind of culture; reflecting on what culture was and what it could and should be. Thinking about how to reform the world through culture was a prevailing nineteenth-century interest. This is summed up in the words of one of the leading educators of the period, Matthew Arnold (1822–88), author of *Culture and Anarchy* (2009 [1869]), who famously wrote that culture is: 'the best which has been thought and said'. Culture was the means by which differences in social class could be eradicated. As an educator he was concerned to ensure that values of high culture prevailed. He was a key player in a continuing debate about the function of education as a means of giving people what Bourdieu would call many years later, 'cultural capital' (Bourdieu, 1984). The role of media and culture was subject to a great deal of debate in private and public life at the time of the Industrial Revolution. These ideas were central concerns

to artists, academics, writers and politicians in the nineteenth century (Thompson, E.P., 2002; Thompson, J.B., 1995; Williams, 1961; 1963; 1975).

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

The nineteenth-century debates about the relationship between culture and society rang down into the early twentieth century. As the culture of working-class people came more to the attention of the upper classes, the debates about the role of culture in public life grew. The development of radio as a viable means of communication during World War I led to a series of debates about the cultural function of this new medium in the peacetime economy. In the US the technology was passed on to the Radio Corporation of America for them to commercialize more or less as they wished. Although there was a public service role for radio, and radio, was used as a community and an education broadcaster in many areas of the US, the main use was as a *commercial* system. In the UK, the public debate about radio was more circumspect; the British Broadcasting Corporation was given a monopoly over broadcasters, and any effective competition was rendered illegitimate after the BBC was made a corporation in 1926 (Curran and Seaton, 2010). Paddy Scannell and David Cardiff discuss the way the BBC gradually gained control over broadcasting in their study of early radio, which forms our case study on page 86 (Scannell and Cardiff, 1991). The role of broadcasting in raising the cultural standards of the nation was an integral part of the vision behind a national broadcasting service as envisioned by its founder, John Reith, the first Director-General of the BBC. The triple imperative to 'inform, educate and entertain' has come down to us from the progenitor of broadcasting in the UK. Reithian principles of broadcasting place a high value on culture as uplifting and edifying. The BBC was founded on such high cultural aspirations.

The discussion about the future of radio connected with debates about the role of culture in society which had been discussed by Matthew Arnold and was also the concern of a group of writers associated with the quarterly journal, *Scrutiny*, founded by F.R. Leavis in 1932. This journal, devoted mainly to literary criticism, was also putting the subject of English literature on the academic map. In so doing, it was recalibrating the relative status of the various arts in England. Most of the leading critics and writers of the day contributed, including T.S. Eliot, I.A. Richards and William Empson (Mulhern, 1979). Intellectuals of the day voiced their fears and anxieties about the rise of an increasingly 'mass' society. The most outspoken critic of the changes in cultural life was T.S. Eliot, the brilliant writer whose poem *The Wasteland* (1922) summed up everything that was cheap and tawdry and empty about the modern age. Eliot's *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* (1948) reflected the ennui of an aristocratic class unsure of how to accommodate the social and political changes around them, certain only that change was inevitable and their way of life gone forever.

In the US, too, the early part of the twentieth century was a time of much reflection on the role of the nascent mass culture and its relationship to the social world. It was in response to concerns about the potential dangers of the *cinema* that the Payne Fund Studies were commissioned in 1929.

THE PAYNE FUND STUDIES

In the US in the 1930s the role of culture, especially commercialized culture of the radio and cinema, caused much concern. The private Payne Foundation supported a series of studies to look at one aspect of this question: the impact of the cinema on young people (Jowett et al., 1996). The Payne Fund Studies comprised 13 different research projects conducted in the USA between 1928 and 1932 to provide a multi-disciplinary study of the relationship between young people and the cinema. A summary account by W.W. Charters was published in 1933 as *Motion Pictures and Youth: A Summary* (Charters, 1970 [1933]). As George Gerbner later wrote: 'The corruption of children and youth has ... been the target of choice of all great cultural debates, from Socrates to media violence' (Gerbner, 1996: xi).

One of these studies, *The Emotional Responses of Children to the Motion Picture Situation* (Dysinger and Ruckmick, 1970 [1933]), used a 'physiological approach to the study of young people's cinema-going. Dysinger and Ruckmick used monitors to measure the sweating and heartbeat of children and young people when viewing films. They found that the youngsters displayed physical responses while watching films, leading them to conclude that the movies did have an effect on young viewers. One of their findings was that adolescents of 16 years of age got more excited than children of nine during scenes involving themes of a romantic or sexual nature. They warned:

When the pictures are finally shown in color ... and when the stereoscopic effect of tridimensional perception is added ... an irresistible presentation of reality will be consummated. When, therefore, a psychoneurotic adolescent, for example, is allowed frequently to attend scenes depicting amorous and sometimes questionably romantic episodes, the resultant effects on that individual's character and development can be nothing but baneful and deplorable. (Dysinger and Ruckmick, 1970 [1933]: 119)

The technology would create an 'arousal' in young people which could be dangerous, they warned in one of the most controversial of the reports. Another of the Payne Fund Studies looked at the influence of the cinema on the social attitudes of children. Ruth Peterson and Louis Leon Thurstone wanted to see how the attitudes of high-school children towards issues such as nationality, race and crime changed as a consequence of seeing films addressing these issues (Peterson and Thurstone, 1976 [1933]). They used a

laboratory method of measuring attitudes ‘before and after’ exposure to films asking for children to fill in a survey about their attitudes to issues represented in the films. They found very little difference in children’s attitudes as a result of seeing the films with the quite notable exception of D.W. Griffith’s *The Birth of a Nation* (1915). This epic about the American Civil War shows very extreme anti-African-American sentiment. Peterson and Thurstone report:

The Birth of a Nation had the effect of making children less favorable to the Negro. ... It was interesting to find that the change in attitude was so marked that, after an interval, the attitude of the group was definitely less favorable to the Negro than before the film was seen (Peterson and Thurstone, 1976: 38).

Other studies in the series showed less dramatic results, but it was the more extreme findings of the Payne Fund research which were exaggerated and sensationalized in the press. The publication of the Payne Fund Studies resulted in public outcry at the harm young people were subjected to by the cinema. The research findings were then used to support censorship of the cinema in the USA (Jowett, Jarvie and Fuller, 1996). We can see in this example the close relationship between media research and government policy. We might observe how one of the primary objectives of much contemporary research is to support the intervention of the state into media and cultural production. It has often been claimed that new media technologies have a deleterious impact on our young people. In contemporary debates these tend to focus on worries about young people’s excessive use of social networks. Concern about the media having harmful ‘effects’ is a prevailing theme in media research, providing an important motivation for many media scholars to this day (for a good discussion of media-effects research see Barker and Petley, 2001).

‘WHY WE FIGHT’: PROPAGANDA AND WORLD WAR II

The kind of ‘before and after’ methods employed by Peterson and Thurstone, above, were frequently used in the study of the media in the mid-twentieth century. Sometimes this was with the goal of finding out how to better manipulate people, as is the case with propaganda and advertising – both instances of media being used to influence people’s behaviour or attitudes. In the early phase of American involvement in World War II, the US government was faced with high desertion rates among the ranks which, it was believed, were a consequence of soldiers having little or no idea of the reasons for the war. Frank Capra was invited to make a series of films explaining ‘*Why We Fight*’ to soldiers enlisted to fight a war for which

they had little stomach. The US government believed that if people were informed of the issues they would be persuaded to fight with more enthusiasm. In Germany, Leni Riefenstahl had made *Triumph of the Will*, a beautiful film advocating the ugliest Nazi doctrines, and Capra had evidently seen this when he made his films in the US. There were seven *Why We Fight* films, each focusing on a different issue, for example, the British campaign. A number of 'before and after' surveys were taken to see how far people's attitudes had changed as a consequence of seeing the films. The series constituted state-sponsored propaganda to encourage American men and women to enlist in a war.

THE FRANKFURT SCHOOL

The power of the media as a propaganda force was inescapable during World War II, but had been debated and discussed across Europe by intellectuals alarmed at the rise of the 'mass media' since the 1920s. Before the war, the mass political movements of fascism and communism relied on the mass media of the press, radio and cinema to create support for their philosophies of totalitarianism. In Germany in the 1930s the rise of the Third Reich and the persecution of Jews resulted in the wholesale emigration of Jewish German intellectuals to other parts of Europe or the US. A scholar who did not succeed in escape to the US, and who committed suicide at the border as he tried to escape Nazi-occupied France over the Alps to Spain, was Walter Benjamin. Benjamin's essay, 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' was written in 1936 (Benjamin, 1968) and is one of the most evocative and provocative accounts of the relationship between aesthetics and technology. Its full impact on Media and Communication Studies was not felt until much later, when Hannah Arendt published a translation of it in 1968 (Scannell, 2003).

The culture shock for intellectuals from Germany coming to the US for the first time was colossal. Many were fleeing religious persecution and intolerance. Most were Jews who had been sacked from their jobs or otherwise exiled from Germany and from German intellectual life. The differences in their responses are sometimes seen to be epitomized in the experiences of Paul Lazarsfeld on the one hand and Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer on the other (Scannell, 2007). They had much in common: both parties had social justice at the forefront of their ambitions, both were radical thinkers. Lazarsfeld chose to work within the system, taking money from the radio corporations which dominated the media scene at the time, and conducting research for them in return. Lazarsfeld defined such work as 'administrative' – 'academic work in the service of external public or private agencies' (Scannell, 2007). He did, however, believe that the money made from these projects could, and should, be

used to subsidize other work of a more critical nature, and was a supporter of Adorno and Horkheimer and their critiques of the television, radio and cinema industries. Perhaps the most renowned scholars of ideology in the media are Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, whose essay on the 'culture industries' has been frequently republished (Adorno and Horkheimer, 1993). Adorno and Horkheimer argue that the American media convey a particular ideology in support of the status quo. For Adorno, industrially produced culture represses the potential for radical change by offering individual solutions to social problems (see, for example, Adorno, 1991). Adorno and Horkheimer's anti-capitalist ideology compels them to affirm that the media should be fulfilling a role more uplifting of the human spirit, which in turn would encourage people to rise up against the system. But, because of the industrial nature of artistic production under capitalism, it is not possible for the artifacts produced to have the liberating potential Adorno and Horkheimer believed they should. They believed that art should be uplifting and provide a transcendental experience, but the kind of work they found in their new home in the US was tawdry, cheap and pandering to the lowest common denominator. One can't help but feel that the clash is as much one between high- and low-brow culture as it is between a European and an American tradition.

Paul Lazarsfeld and Paul Merton are often credited with founding media studies in the United States, and their early work on radio is considered classic (Simonson, 2010). Peter Simonson and Gabriel Weimann (2003) provide an interesting evaluation of their work at Columbia University and particularly of their essay, 'Mass Communication, Popular Taste, and Organized Social Action' (Lazarsfeld and Merton, 1948). This essay, Simonson and Weimann argue, displays a critical edge to their work which subsequent accounts have ignored in summarizing their work as 'administrative'. The work of the Columbia school in the United States was politically engaged and committed to social justice. Merton and Lazarsfeld were critical of the way the mass media kept people entertained and disengaged from political life. Merton and Lazarsfeld were resolutely 'critical' in their approach; Simonson and Weimann argue that their work on mass communication integrates the role of the mass media in upholding the capitalist system (Simonson and Weimann, 2003).

Many of the research methods which were later to become standard in the social sciences were originated at Colombia. The 'panel study' for example which interviewed the same people at different times was used by Paul Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson and Hazel Gaudet in their study of changing voter intention in the Presidential election of 1940 (Lazarsfeld et al., 1968 [1944]). They wanted to see the extent to which people were influenced by mass media messages and concentrated especially on those voters who changed their intention during the campaign. From this research they observed that if

there was any impact from the media, it was filtered through ‘opinion leaders’. Paul Lazarsfeld explains it as follows:

The mass media often reached their audiences in two phases. After opinion leaders had read newspapers or had listened to broadcasts, they would filter bits of ideas and information to the less active sectors of the population. (Lazarsfeld, 1967: vi)

It was the idea of the ‘two-step flow’ of communication which Elihu Katz and Paul Lazarsfeld were to investigate in more detail in their study of opinion formation in Decatur, Illinois (Katz and Lazarsfeld, 1955). The relationship between the media and public opinion has been an abiding theme in American communications and media studies subsequently. This early research proposed an object of analysis which is still at the heart of our subject – the relationship between the media and political behaviour.

American communications have another, less well known origin in rural sociology. In a country with such an expansive territory, it was difficult to reach remote rural communities. Communication to people across the whole country was difficult; the dissemination of information about the latest farming and agricultural techniques and technologies was stymied by the large distances information had to go to areas beyond the reach of early radio transmitters. An early example of a study which linked rural sociologists with communication theory is also a classic in the ‘diffusion of innovations’ literature: *Medical Innovation: A Diffusion Study* (Coleman et al., 1966). This paradigm was later popularized by Everett Rogers in his influential book, *Diffusion of Innovations* (Rogers, 2003 [1962]).

TECHNOLOGICAL DETERMINISM AND THE SOCIAL SHAPING OF TECHNOLOGY

In Chapter 1 we discussed the importance of the technology of literacy for writing, and considered the work of Walter Ong, who discussed the relationship between writing and oral cultures (Ong, 1982). Ong is much indebted to the work of Harold Innis (1894–1952), the Canadian economic historian who studied the relationship between technology, economy and power in different societies. Innis proposed that, at different times different ‘staples’ dominate in an economy and that the group controlling these staples comes to dominate in other realms, often with unforeseeable consequences. Thus, for example, when timber supplanted fur as the main staple for trade in Canada, this created a shift in the balance of power; greater timber production led to the production of cheap paper which, in turn, was exported to the US and contributed to the expansion of the newspaper industry in the 1830s (Innis, 2008 [1951]). His work considers the relationship between different forms of communication

and social class. In an essay published in 1945, Innis focuses on the English press in the post-war period. 'The English Press in the Nineteenth Century' describes the economic and regulatory environment in the English press and its influence on radical writing. This essay argues that the radical press was silenced by the actions of the state and the market. He concludes his essay with a prognosis for the future:

And so we entered the open seas of democracy in the twentieth century with nothing to worship but the totalitarianism of the modern state. A century of peace gave way to a century of war. (Innis, 1945: 53)

For that is how the twentieth century looked in October 1945. The idea of progress and social progress as ever-advancing looked redundant. Innis writes:

We have passed from the security and optimism which characterized the belief in progress in the nineteenth century to fear and pessimism and demands for security. (Innis, 1945: 37)

Innis's work in the area of the relationship between patterns of communication and the structures of power and authority is a (relatively) unrecognized contribution to our understanding of media and communications.

Many of the ideas which Innis proposed have come down to us through a figure more renowned in the field of media studies, his student Marshall McLuhan. When McLuhan wrote '*The medium is the message*' in 1964 he set off a train of thought which ricocheted down the years (McLuhan, 1995 [1964]). McLuhan's theories about the relationship between media technology and society have been controversial, not least because of his often contradictory exegesis. In *The Gutenberg Galaxy* (1962) McLuhan proposed that the shape of a society in the age of print, dominated by Gutenberg's invention of the printing press, is significantly different from that in the current 'electronic age' characterized by television as the primary medium of communication. McLuhan's work is often over-simplified and misrepresented as claiming that communication technologies are determinative of social phenomena in a 'technological determinism'. The hypothesis that media technologies can influence social structure is an important theme in Elizabeth Eisenstein's work on the impact of the introduction of the printing press and moveable type in the development of secular society in modern Europe (Eisenstein, 1979). The relationship between mobile phone use and the 'Arab Spring' of 2011, for example, is often cited as evidence that new technologies can result in new forms of organization and patterns of communication which can challenge the status quo. The idea that technology can somehow *determine* or *shape* society is often quite nuanced in academic writing but can be over-stated in popular formulations. It has been countered by a number of authors arguing the counter case – that society shapes technology (see, for example, MacKenzie and Wajcman, 1999).

THE FRENCH INFLUENCE AND *CAHIERS DU CINÉMA*

In France in the aftermath of World War II there was a renewed popular interest in American films after the pleasures of cinema-going had been denied to French audiences for so long during the Nazi occupation. When finally in the 1950s American films were shown once again in France, they attracted a great following. The idea that these were the output of ‘mass production’ and the propaganda machine of American corporations made in factory-like studios had engendered a dismissive attitude towards Hollywood movies. But in the early 1950s, the films of Howard Hawks, Orson Welles and John Ford, among other studio directors, were being recognized as great works of art by some writers in France. In the pages of the magazine *Cahiers du Cinéma* (launched in 1951) the writer André Bazin was one of those who argued that these directors were very much ‘authors’ of their texts, and they began to develop what has come to be called ‘*La politiques des auteurs*’ (Hillier, 1985; 1992; Bazin, 2004; Bickerton, 2011). A central claim was that these films were the work of a single organizing intelligence, despite being mass-produced in the highly industrialized Hollywood studio system. Intellectuals up to this point had often dismissed Hollywood film as made for the market and therefore not worthy of serious academic consideration. However, there was a political intent in shifting critical attention away from the work of recognized ‘geniuses’ of literature and fine art towards the unsung heroes of mass-produced movies. André Bazin and other authors could see a commonality in films by Howard Hawks or Douglas Sirk which enabled their work to rise above the constraints of genre or studio. To advance the idea that an American mass-produced popular form like the Hollywood movie could be considered ‘art’ was shocking and revolutionary, especially in France, where official orthodoxy valued national culture above any other. It was the expression of a trend in French culture to appreciate rather than deprecate the American influence on popular culture which extended also to art and jazz. Among the writers who contributed to *Cahiers du Cinéma* were Jean-Luc Godard, François Truffaut and Eric Rohmer – some of the most important directors of the ‘new wave’ of French film-making in the 1960s. The writings published in *Cahiers du Cinéma* were highly influential in film studies and the idea of the ‘auteur’ was taken up by other movements in cinema; it resonated with the Art Cinema movement in the UK which had celebrated the work of revolutionary Russian directors, such as Sergei Eisenstein and Dziga Vertov, the surrealist movement and the Italian futurists. *La politiques des auteurs* had a powerful impact on British and American intellectual life as it served to recalibrate the relationship between high and low culture, mass production and the romantic charismatic myth of the artist. This approach has a contradictory place in the history of media and cultural studies; the idea of an ‘auteur’ runs counter to many of the ideas of cultural studies because it

seems to re-inscribe the myth of the 'charismatic artist' at the heart of industrial culture, suggesting an elitism which runs counter to the celebration of mass culture at the heart of cultural studies. Yet the idea of the *auteur* resonates with popular ideology and has had a powerful influence on the work of subsequent generations of media and cultural studies scholarship.

MASS CULTURE DEBATES IN THE 1950s

In 1950s America there were heated debates about the role of 'mass culture' in society, and US intellectuals had very complex relationships to the dominant media forms of radio, cinema and publishing. C. Wright Mills' *The Power Elite* (1956), Rosenberg and White's collection *Mass Culture: The Popular Arts in America* (1957) and Norman Jacobs' *Culture for the Millions* (1961) are important contributions to the debate about the role of mass media in a culture increasingly dominated by large corporations. C. Wright Mills discusses the relationship of various groups to the social and political elites who wield the most power. He considers that a vital public is essential to the operation of a democratic society and believes that the media have an important role in informing people about political life. Mills fears that the principles of democracy and equality on which the USA was founded are under threat from the abuse of power which occurs when there is no critical and informed public. In order to maintain a balance of power, again a founding principle of the United States' constitution, it is necessary to have a plurality of 'publics' able to articulate their position and to operate as a check on the dominant class. However, in a society dominated by 'mass culture' this process is stymied. Mills argues that the mass media became markets, and public opinion subject to control and manipulation, even intimidation, by those media markets (Mills, 1956). Mills has shifted the focus of debate away from the examination of voter behaviour studied by Katz et al., towards the behaviour of the media in controlling and manipulating public life.

The work of Dwight MacDonald offered a powerful critique of mass culture which is summed up in his essay in Rosenberg and White's collection (MacDonald, 1957). For MacDonald:

Mass culture is imposed from above. It is fabricated by technicians hired by businessmen; its audience are passive consumers, their participation limited to the choice between buying and not buying. The Lords of *Kitsch*, in short, exploit the cultural need of the masses in order to make a profit and/or to maintain their class rule. (MacDonald, 1957: 55)

MacDonald's critique of mass culture was part of a bigger discussion about the role of mass culture in society which was occurring in the US during the 1950s and 1960s. The collection of essays by Rosenberg and White highlights the concern among scholars of various fields about the shifting power bases

in the US and about the force of industrialized, commercialized culture on American culture (Czitrom, 1997; Peters, 2004; Simonson, 2010). This debate has continued as a thread in public debate about the media. An interesting exegesis on, and addition to, this discussion can be found in Herbert Gans' work, *Popular Culture and High Culture* (Gans, 1974). Gans identified the putative conflict between 'popular' and 'high' culture and argues that there is much which they share, but he maintains that different groups in society necessarily have different 'tastes'. The idea of 'taste publics' is something which we find in the later work of Pierre Bourdieu (1984) – an important theorist of the relationship between 'class' and 'culture'.

THE FOUNDING OF BRITISH CULTURAL STUDIES

Three British writers are recognized as spearheading the paradigm shift which was to lead to the development of what subsequently came to be known as British cultural studies. Richard Hoggart, Raymond Williams and E.P. Thompson all wrote key books in the late 1950s and early 1960s which were to change the prevailing way of thinking about culture and its relationship to the mass media (Hoggart, 1957; Thompson, 2002 [1963]; Williams, 1961; 1963 [1958]). Each put the working class central to the story of English public life (Inglis, 1993; Turner, 1996). World War II had wreaked havoc on the economy and had thrown open to public scrutiny the horrors not only of war, but also of the British class system. The economic divide between rich and poor had long been understood and chronicled, but these authors were delineating the extent of cultural differences between sectors of society. In the 1950s, Raymond Williams was a lecturer in adult education and was building on Marxist history in Britain when he wrote *Culture and Society* (1963 [1958]) (Storey, 2009a). Raymond Williams' contribution to what was later to become cultural studies was profound (see, for example, Williams, 1983; 1989a; 1989b). Richard Hoggart explored the culture of the working class in his book *The Uses of Literacy* (1957). He discusses the particular artifacts and pleasures that working-class people enjoy. This was a foundational text in what later became known as British cultural studies, a field of study Hoggart was instrumental in founding. E.P. Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class* (2002 [1963]) enlightens us as to the history of working-class radicalism and the fight for democracy. These three writers helped to sum up a new attitude towards class and culture. Their work both promulgated and reflected a greater social consciousness of the specificity of working-class life. They helped bring 'culture' down from the elevated heights of 'the best that has been thought and said' (Arnold, 2009 [1869]) to something we could all study – culture as a 'way of life' (Williams, 1963 [1958]).

The revolutionary changes of the 1960s were expressed in the civil rights movement, in black power struggles, in the growth of the women's liberation movement and increasing calls for gay rights. These changes were necessarily

evident in the cultural realm. You could find evidence of changing social mores in the radical theatre and drama of the day, such as Joan Littlewood's Theatre Workshop and the 'kitchen sink drama' of which John Osborne's *Look Back in Anger* gave us the archetypal 'angry young man'. Shelagh Delaney's play *A Taste of Honey* (1961) was one of several made into films (dir. Tony Richardson) and contributed to a renaissance of British social realism expressed in films like *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* (dir. Karel Reisz, 1960); *The Loneliness of the Long Distance Runner* (dir. Tony Richardson, 1962) and *Up the Junction* (dir. Peter Collinson, 1968). The celebration of working-class mores and values filtered through to television, too, after the introduction of commercial (also known as independent) television after 1955. For example, the soap opera *Coronation Street*, which is still running, was launched by Granada television as a counter to the cosiness of the BBC family drama *The Lloyds*. Some radical, innovative television was aired, for example, ITV's *Armchair Theatre* (1956–68) and the BBC's *Play for Today* (1970–84) and *The Wednesday Play* (1964–70). One of the most famous of these, directed by Ken Loach, was Jeremy Sandford's *Cathy Come Home* (1966) which had a direct impact on social attitudes towards homelessness. The late 1950s and the 1960s were revolutionary times in a number of ways. Social ideas and attitudes towards issues of class and culture were changing radically. It is from such ferment that cultural studies was founded in Britain.

THE 1960s AND CULTURAL STUDIES IN ACADEMIA

The institution of 'cultural studies' as a separate discipline to be taught in universities was first proposed by Richard Hoggart when he founded the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies. He used money donated by Penguin books to establish the Centre in 1964. Apparently the publishers had given Hoggart the money in appreciation of his help at the trial of the novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover* by D.H. Lawrence (MacCabe, 1999) – both the novel and the censorship trial faced by Lawrence and the publishers are in themselves manifestations of British class conflict. The institutional establishment of something called 'cultural studies' within the academy was, as Colin MacCabe argues, 'a fundamental political task' (MacCabe, 1999: v). MacCabe compares the introduction of cultural studies with the introduction, a generation earlier, of English into the curriculum. The Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham became home to a radical centre for the research of popular culture.

American antecedents to contemporary cultural studies are typically traced back to the Columbia school and to the mass culture debates of the 1950s. There is another antecedent, however, in the study of America's indigenous people, whose culture was investigated and researched by early scholars of anthropology; the study of *popular culture* in the US has an important origin in research into *folk culture*. One key figure in the popular culture movement

in the US was Ray Browne (1922–2009) who established the first degree in popular culture anywhere in the world, at the Department of Popular Culture, Bowling Green State University, Ohio, in 1967. Browne was also a founder of two important journals, the *Journal of Popular Culture* and the *Journal of American Culture*, both of which continue to publish leading-edge scholarship. The relationship of Ray Browne's department to the rest of the American academy is quite complex and the department he set up at Bowling Green State was often controversial, by Browne's own account (Browne, 2006). Bowling Green State remains a centre for the study of popular culture and offers teaching at all levels there. The location of popular culture studies in the US, with its close links to folk studies and anthropology, was quite different to the more radical historical and literary antecedents of cultural studies which were being developed at the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Culture.

In the 1960s the focus of interest in 'mass culture' was shifting towards an understanding of working-class culture as worthy of serious study. In no small measure this was because of the influence of popular music and pop art. During the 1960s artists high and low were turning their attention to the culture of the people. Thus, when Andy Warhol said 'pop is liking things', his droll statement summed up a massive social and cultural shift in American life. Debates about mass culture which had dominated public discourse in the work of Dwight MacDonal and others were rendered old-fashioned and out-dated, while in the UK the shift from 'mass' to 'popular' culture signalled a great shift in political attitudes towards media and culture.

THE 1970s' MEDIA EDUCATION MOVEMENT

One consequence of the rise of popular culture as a serious object of study in the 1960s was an increasing desire to translate this into education and consciousness raising. The counter-cultural movement was growing against the mainstream media during the 1970s. The power of the television networks in the US and the 'cosy duopoly' of the BBC and ITV in the UK were under siege. Media systems faced criticism from women, people of colour, trades unionists and disabled people among others campaigning for greater diversity on television. David Morley worked in such a context when he wrote *The 'Nationwide' Audience*, a study of how politicized trade-union members interpreted the early evening news magazine programme in a different light to some other groups (Morley, 1980).

Throughout the 1970s academic interest in the media grew, partly in response to government debates about how access to the airwaves should be extended. In 1975 the first media studies degree was launched at the Regent Street Polytechnic, London, as Paddy Scannell recounts (Scannell, 2007: 198). Four years later, *Media, Culture and Society*, now one of the leading academic journals in media studies, was launched by a group of academics at the Polytechnic (now the University of Westminster). James Curran makes clear the

political motivation behind the study of the media in his introduction to the first issue of *Media, Culture and Society* (Curran, 1979). In this statement of intent for the new journal, he makes it clear that the very idea of media studies is to challenge hegemony. He argues that the neglect of media and cultural industries as an area of study within the university system can be accounted for by 'the snobberies of the upper reaches of the educational industry' (Curran, 1979: 1). The journal was established to challenge the hegemony of both the media industry and the educational establishment.

THE TURN TO THE READER

In the 1970s, semiotics and structuralism were trends in academia which focused on the text as the location of meaning and textual analysis provided the basis for much media studies research. The importance of Marxism and debates about ideology which sprang from the work of Louis Althusser (1979; 1984) led to a focus on the modes of production, the ideological content of texts and, to a lesser extent, the processes of production. During the 1980s, some key studies shifted the attention of media scholars away from the analysis of texts and towards the investigation of the text in the mind's eye of the reader. The idea that the meaning of texts was created in the reading began to gain currency with the impact of feminism and other civil rights issues on cultural studies: the idea that the personal was political led to work which focused on the way audiences read texts. The age of the reader emerged out of a political engagement with popular culture which was committed to empowering the users of texts. Issues of textual reception began to replace those of hermeneutics or production. The history of the changes in the way audiences have been researched has been discussed by Ien Ang (1991), David Morley (1992), Sonia Livingstone (1998) and others (see also, for example, Kitzinger, 1999).

David Morley and Ien Ang are both authors of key texts in the history of audience research. David Morley's work on how different audiences understood the news programme *Nationwide* (Morley, 1980) is a key study. Morley watched episodes of *Nationwide* with several different groups of people – evening-class students, school students, trades unionists – and noted how the meanings of the same text differed according to who was watching. His later research on how families watch television pays more attention to the location of reception by interviewing families in their own homes (Morley, 1986). The idea of focusing on the audience and the meanings and uses they put to the media may have been anticipated in the 'uses and gratifications' research of communication research, but here it became empowering, most especially for feminist researchers who took up the idea of empowerment of the audience through counter-hegemonic interpretations.

FEMINIST INTERVENTIONS

The 1960s was a time of social unrest – the civil rights movement and the women’s liberation movement were both manifestations of a cultural revolution in which wholesale discrimination against people on the grounds of race, colour or sexuality simply would not stand. There were several influential books addressing the role and representation of women in society, including Simone de Beauvoir’s *The Second Sex* (1961) and Betty Friedan’s *The Feminine Mystique* (1963). Naomi Wolf’s searing attack on the representation of women in the media, and particularly the way the magazine industry conspires to sell us ‘the beauty myth’, was a best-seller (Wolf, 1990). It is a terrifically well-researched book with a sophisticated argument but a simple message that we could all understand – the contemporary idea of ‘beauty’ is actually enslaving to women. In 1976 the first issue of the journal *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* was published, and feminists turned their attention to the role of media in reinforcing gender stereotypes and divisions (van Zoonen, 1994).

The question of the use of media by women was given more serious academic attention in the 1980s. Tania Modleski’s book *Loving with a Vengeance* (1982) was a key text in proposing the study of ‘Harlequin Romances’ novels for women. Modleski set out to explore the narrative structure and the production processes of these novels, so long derided as mass-produced escapism. Feminist research into *readership* has a powerful progenitor in Janice Radway’s *Reading the Romance* (1984) which, like Modleski’s research, explores the counter-hegemonic readings of women’s romances.

In the UK, Annette Kuhn’s *Women’s Pictures* (1994 [1984]) was influential in generating the realization that film, media and cultural studies, all of which came out of established academic disciplines, still carried with them the baggage of a kind of careless misogyny – during the 1980s a number of works challenged the hegemony of a masculine-dominated discourse. bell hooks is perhaps the most celebrated of many black feminists who directly address popular culture in her work (1987).

The 1980s were a time of radical change in the media landscape – the hegemony of the networks was being challenged in the US by the expansion of cable and satellite television. In the UK and Australia, new channels to cater to audiences not served by the majority of services grew. Independent television production companies were being supported in a new commissioning strategy at Channel 4, especially aimed at bringing a wider range of people to work in television. At the time, Jane Root worked for Cinema for Women, a feminist film-making collective, and wrote a popular book about television: *Open the Box: About Television* (Root, 1986) which sets out, for a popular audience, some of the key ideas of media studies. The history of feminist media studies is considered by Angela McRobbie (2008) and also by Liesbet van Zoonen (1994).

SEXUALITY, THE BODY AND QUEER THEORY

Michel Foucault's *History of Sexuality* (1998 [1976]) has had an important impact on media and cultural studies by virtue of both its content and its method. Foucault analyses the social construction of one of those elements of human culture which seems most innate – sexuality. Foucault's method, which has come to be labelled 'discourse analysis', deconstructs the exercise of social power and control at the heart of our social practice and language. The idea that sexuality, of any kind, may be a construct, is quite radical. The idea that we daily reinforce our own repression through the language we use is even more so. These are the areas of debate that Foucault's work has stimulated.

The impact of feminism on our area is quite well recorded, but during the 1980s there were several voices considering ideas of masculinity. Questions about the media and male sexuality began to be heard in the 1980s (see, for example, Metcalf and Humphries (eds), 1985). Issues of sexuality and the body were brought to the fore by the devastating impact of AIDS/HIV on a whole generation of young people. The 1980s saw the loss of so many young creative intellectuals as thousands of people died before their time.

The idea of gender as performance – something which we daily enact – is central to the writings of Judith Butler, whose book *Gender Trouble* (1990) has been enormously influential on subsequent writings. It was Teresa de Lauretis, however, who first coined the term 'queer theory' to describe a resistance to the constraints of gender (de Lauretis, 1991) – the term 'queer' being re-appropriated in the same way African Americans took the word 'black' and transformed it into a word signaling power and resistance rather than repression and prejudice. The study of gender and sexuality continues to be an important and abiding theme in the work of media and cultural studies.

POST-COLONIALISM, IDENTITY, RACE AND DIFFERENCE

Stuart Hall has been one of the most influential scholars in helping us to address issues of identity and race in the media. One of the first works to come out of the Birmingham Centre under his leadership was the study *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State and Law and Order* (Hall et al., 1978). This multifaceted study explored the relationship between young people and the police and looked at representations of 'muggers' – people who commit street crime. The study revealed racist attitudes on the part of the police and the press which served to control and denigrate young people of colour. The question of representation, specifically of the representation of race and ethnicity, has continued to be a key theme in Hall's own work (see, for example, Hall, 1997) and in media and cultural studies more generally. It is a theme to which we will frequently return in the course of this book.

NEW MEDIA, NEW PARADIGMS?

Throughout the history of the media, the impact of new technology has engendered new ways of thinking about the media in relation to the social, and that is no less the case today with the introduction of computing and social networking. New paradigms for investigating media production have developed with on-line ethnography and other innovations. The reconfiguration of the audience, from passive 'receivers' of media messages to active 'fans' engaging with the media products, has been a key theme in recent research. This approach has been linked with the work of Henry Jenkins (1992) who investigated the way media fans appropriate and 'poach' identities and themes from the media in new ways of conceptualizing the idea of 'fan culture'. The phenomenon of the 'fan' is one of the most recent ways of thinking about the construction of the audience (Gray, Sandvoss and Harrington, 2007; Hills, 2002; Sandvoss, 2005).

Media and cultural studies scholars are quick to respond to new trends in media content. For example, the advent of the ordinary person as 'celebrity' in television programming post-*Big Brother* has spawned a significant amount of research (Rojek, 2001; Turner, 2004). The idea of the 'celebrity' has opened up a whole new way to study television content and audiences. New media forms spawn new configurations of research paradigms. Space does not allow for a full consideration of the diversity of themes currently being addressed by scholars in our fields. Suffice to say that the transformative agenda of communications, media and cultural studies has been, and continues to be, a key organizing principle for our work.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has highlighted some of the reasons *why we do media and cultural studies*; the main impetus is what MacCabe calls: 'An emancipatory social project' (1999: *v*).

In the beginning of this chapter we considered what was unique about media and cultural studies. We noted that it is about the study of *cultural* (as opposed to natural) phenomena; that it is *reflexive* – we need to use the media to discuss the media; and that it is subject to enormous and rapid *change*. But having discussed the motivations of research in this chapter, it is clear that a fourth reason is the overriding one: we do media and cultural studies to make a difference – to make a difference to the world; to make a difference to the way we understand and think about the world; to bring about positive change. Media and cultural studies are *transformational* subjects – they are political, social and humanist subjects. We can learn from astrologers about the movement of the heavenly bodies, but if we want to learn why people ever wanted to build a telescope in the first place, then

that's a question for cultural studies. We do it because not only do we want to look at the stars, we want to know why we ever dream of reaching for them.

It is up to you to now consider how to use the information you have about scholarship of the past. You need to think about what themes or topics interest you – do not be swayed by fashion or fads or what you think your supervisor would like. In the next part of the book we present some approaches and methods that you could use to conduct your own research and we look at how you can get started on your research project. The best research project you can do is one based on your interests: What do you care about? How do you want to make a difference?

FURTHER READING

Katz, Elihu, John Durham Peters, Tamar Liebes and Avril Orloff (eds) 2003. *Canonic Texts in Media Research: Are There Any? Should There Be? How About These?* Cambridge: Polity. An interesting collection of essays proposing 13 'canonic' pieces of media research, including texts from the American communication tradition, such as Kurt and Gladys Lang (Katz and Dayan, 2003), and Europeans including Walter Benjamin, Raymond Williams, Stuart Hall and Laura Mulvey.

Murdock, Graham, 2002. Media, culture and modern times: Social scientific investigations. In Klaus Bruhn Jensen (ed.), *A Handbook of Media and Communication Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Methodologies*. London: Routledge, pp. 40–57.

Jensen, Klaus Bruhn, 2002. The social origins and uses of media and communication research. Chapter 16 in Klaus Bruhn Jensen (ed.), *A Handbook of Media and Communication Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Methodologies*. London: Routledge, pp. 273–93.

These two chapters in Klaus Bruhn Jensen's useful edited collection provide some interesting insights into the topics discussed in this chapter.

Scannell, Paddy, 2007. *Media and Communication*. London/Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. With nine chapters, each focusing on a key moment in the history of media and communication studies, this book neatly spans the British and American traditions of study and provides fascinating historical context to a range of research paradigms.

Storey, John, 2009a. *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture: An Introduction*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education.

And the companion reader:

Storey, John. *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture: A Reader*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education.

Together these two books provide an excellent history of cultural theory and the main traditions of research into popular culture in the British cultural studies tradition. There is also a companion website at www.pearsoned.co.uk/storey.