

## Division considers long-range issues

*Items for discussion include reviewing papers and ensuring long-term health*

BOB TRUMPBOUR, PENNSYLVANIA STATE ALTOONA

*During the past year, a discussion emerged on the division listserv about how research papers submitted to the division are reviewed. Such an issue coincides with additional ones regarding the need for the division to maintain continuity from year to year. Bob Trumpbour reflects on these issues in the piece below. See as well the contribution by*

*former division heads Frank Durham and Ralph Beliveau on page 5. We hope including these thoughts in the newsletter will help spur division members to lend their efforts to ensuring the health of the division—Eds.*



**See inside for details about the schedule for CCS events at the convention.**

implications of policy decisions, and how power plays itself out on a broader scale. As such, we are experts at endlessly debating policy.

Our scholarly conclusions tend to strongly advocate inclusion and application of democratic principles. How we handle manuscript reviews should be no different. In short, whatever the Cultural and Critical Studies division decides to do in the future should be predicated on input from all division members and strive to be fair. To achieve such a goal requires a dose of humility for leaders within the division. Those of us in the trenches must step back and realize that we are merely stewards of the process; we are not the policy makers, nor should we be. Ultimately, that role belongs to you, the membership.

**W**HEN I ACCEPTED THE JOB of research co-chair, I did so with trepidation, as it is a task that requires a great deal of organization and co-operation from colleagues. What I did not expect was that policy issues would become central to how the job would be performed.

### Policy and critical approaches

There is a touch of irony to a critical scholar's immersion in policy implementation. After all, much of what we do is intended to challenge policy, the underlying assumptions of policy, the deeper

### Origins of present policy

The present review policy has been shaped over years of lively debate. It invites all full-time faculty members of  
(see **REVIEWING**, p. 4)

### Inside this issue

- Headnote address.....2
- Conference special events.....4
- Keep CCS moving forward.....5
- Sessions and papers.....6

## Be sure you're on the listservs

**A**re you on the e-mail listservs? If you haven't been receiving notices from division officers, now's the time to check to see.

If you would like to participate in division discussions of issues related to our field, please send an email to Ralph Beliveau at [beliveau@ou.edu](mailto:beliveau@ou.edu) and ask him to add you to the Yahoo!-based list.

If you would like to receive key division information via our second listserv, contact Jay Hamilton at [hamilton@uga.edu](mailto:hamilton@uga.edu) to be added to our primary listserve. Please note that this list is only for division officers to send division news and notices. ❖

Headnote

# Members need to take charge

ALISON PLESSINGER, SLIPPERY ROCK UNIVERSITY

As we prepare for a fabulous San Antonio convention, it is with a somewhat heavy heart that I write this final piece as division head of Cultural and Critical Studies. I have been a CCS officer for the past six years, and I have found my tenure as division head both enormously challenging and fulfilling. I thank you all for the opportunity to have served you.



Alison Plessinger

research on industry, popular culture, literature, politics, diversity, academia and

I began working with CCS as a graduate student, when then vice-head Frank Durham encouraged me to become involved. Since that time, I have worked on the professional freedom and responsibility committee, served as research chair, vice-head, and division head for the past two years.

The work has been hard, but very rewarding. I saw some of the most interesting research and realized just how broadly we could define our sense of what our division does. People sometimes still think about CCS as being about methodology (from our former time as the Qualitative Studies division), but our work is about so much more than method. Our members contribute

teaching, among other topics.

We are in many ways an incredibly strong division, and one that, from our membership numbers, appears to have strong support. We have been among the top five divisions in terms of membership numbers for the past three years.

But we are in a crisis—a crisis of leadership. For the past few years, our annual membership meetings have seen fewer and fewer members attending. And fewer people have been willing to take on the work needed to keep the division strong. We have had numerous people leave their leadership roles, either during their term or prior to moving up the leadership chain, for a variety of reasons. We are not seeing people willing to step up.

I agreed last year to stay on for one final year to see the division through its AEJMC assessment. We will not have another such assessment for five years. But in the meantime, something has to change.

If the division is going to continue to grow and prosper, its members need to be willing to participate. For a number of years now, junior faculty have been shouldering that load. We need some relief. We need some of the more senior members of the division to step up and show everyone how to get things done. Junior faculty and grad students still need to be involved and in leadership positions, but they need help.

We need everyone to be at membership meetings to vote on important issues (the bylaws for one, and the judging process, for another)—not just to speak up on the listserve and in private conversations, but to participate in resolving issues and coming up with solutions to longstanding problems and questions.

I have truly enjoyed my time with CCS, and plan to continue to be

## Cultural & Critical Studies Division 2004-2005

**Head**

ALISON PLESSINGER  
Slippery Rock University

**Vice-head and program chair**

JENNIFER TIERNAN  
Univ. of Oklahoma

**Secretary**

CAROLINA ACOSTA-ALZURU  
University of Georgia

**Research chairs**

BOB TRUMPBOUR  
Penn State Altoona  
  
KAREN KLINE  
Lock Haven Univ. of Penn.

**Graduate student liaison**

AMANDA HALL  
University of Georgia

**Teaching standards**

CAROLYN BRONSTEIN  
DePaul University

**Professional freedom and responsibility**

JEANNE CRISWELL  
University of Indianapolis

**Newsletter editors**

JAY HAMILTON  
University of Georgia  
  
ALISON PLESSINGER  
Slippery Rock University

Division web site <http://aejmc.net/ccs/>

involved. But as of now, we have no division head for next year. Jennifer Tiernan, for personal reasons, is unable to step into that role. I cannot serve again—I have some rather daunting assignments in my job and need to focus my energies there in the coming year (I am taking on advising both the student newspaper and the yearbook this year).

I urge everyone in the division, whether you are a new member or a longstanding one, to consider running for a position on the executive slate this year.

At this point, vice head, secretary, PF&R chair, teaching chair, research chair(s), and newsletter editors are all on the table (Carolina Acosta-Alzuru, University of Georgia is currently sec-

retary and will automatically become the division head in the coming year). Contact me at [alison.plessinger@sru.edu](mailto:alison.plessinger@sru.edu) if you are interested, and I would be more than happy to talk to you about the details of the various roles.

Again, I thank you all for allowing me to serve you for the past six years. It has been a great pleasure. ❖

**(REVIEWING, cont. from p. 1)**  
the division to review papers, with the caveat that individuals who are submitting papers will be placed in a separate pool that reviews student submissions.

SEVERAL DIVISION MEMBERS challenged whether the new split system is best for the future of our division. After all, a number of journals allow those submitting manuscripts to blind-review colleagues. One individual offered the example of another organization which permits manuscript review of colleagues when simultaneously submitting for their conference.

Those involved in the discussion raised excellent points, many of them grounded in superb reasoning. Among the most compelling for me, personally, was the notion that we should be able to rise above self-interest and act professionally, and we should be able to trust our colleagues to do the same.

Another argument was that colleagues who know the nature of each other's work might somehow skew the blind-review process by giving preference to those scholars with whom they may be familiar, possibly challenging the integrity of the process itself. In some cases, it was argued, that this could create a sort

of covert agreement to accept the work of familiar colleagues, at the potential expense of better scholarship.

If you've been involved in scholarship for a while, you know where this might head. When submitting a manuscript to a publisher not long ago, I received a blind critique of my work. I knew exactly who produced the critique based on the nature of the feedback I received. Despite an attempt to keep the process "blind," in this case it wasn't, but my reviewer had nothing to gain or lose when doing the review.

#### Considering changes

I don't have a major problem with changing the policy back to what it was or to modify it in some other way. But, before making modifications, we need to think about why our policy has evolved into its present form.

One issue of concern for our previous manuscript review policy was that it did not allow those submitting to simultaneously serve as reviewers. In that regard, the new policy is a step in the right direction. "Conflict of interest" was the rationale I was offered for this long-standing policy. The policy was in place before I was ever involved with CCS. It was changed last year to reflect membership desires.

For those who would prefer a fully open policy, I'd ask that you consider

the potential ramifications and the possible downside of such a policy. I don't believe the logic behind our earlier policy was to curtail a "tit-for-tat" agreement to accept papers by some reviewers (the blind review process, if properly done, should make that extremely difficult), but rather to limit the incentive of someone to downgrade papers slightly since it could, in theory, raise a submitter's chance for acceptance if the margin was very close.

While I would anticipate that the vast majority of CCS folks would be thoroughly honest in the evaluation process, even when submitting their own scholarship, if only one of ten reviewers scored papers based on self-interest, it has the ability to exclude one or two borderline papers that might otherwise get in.

If the new system prevents that and allows good folks to review who would otherwise sit on the sidelines, I am all for it. If we sense that the change we made for this year makes no difference whatsoever or is counterproductive in some other ways, we might be wise to adjust our policy.

#### Evaluating changes

I am not sure how the new review system will play out this year, but I (see **REVIEWING, p.4**)

## Contribute to the C&CS newsletter

Have an issue to present? A point to make? A call for scholarly contributions? If you would like it printed in *CCS News*, please send it to Jay Hamilton at [hamilton@uga.edu](mailto:hamilton@uga.edu). The next deadline for submissions is Sept. 15, 2005. ❖

(REVIEWING, *cont. from p. 3*) sincerely hope it does not result in a decline in individual participation, as we need all the good reviewers we can get. I was among those who voted for this compromise, but I am a firm believer in keeping an open mind about the entire process. If it works this year, I'd vote to continue it.

However, if there are bugs and philosophic problems that prompt introspection and possible revision, I'd like everyone involved to consider what those issues and problems might be so that we can lay all the cards on the table and creatively adjust the policy so that it best serves the entire CCS membership. Ultimately, the member-

ship determines how the policy should evolve. The research chairs are merely facilitators of that policy. I am comfortable with that as long as no one is excluded from the opportunity to air out their concerns before an important policy vote takes place.

AS FOR THE REVIEW POLICY ITSELF, I won't know how successful it is until I've had a year under my belt to see how it functions.

One concern I'd like to raise at our annual meeting is ensuring that civility is a part of our review process. While criticism may be necessary, my hope is that the most searing criticisms can be laid out in a sufficiently professional

fashion to encourage those who may fall short to continue their work and to want to develop further as scholars.

If anyone has an issue or concern related to any aspect of manuscript review that you would like to discuss with me and/or Karen Kline, my research co-chair colleague, we'll do our best to make sure your ideas are included in the dialogue, even if you can't be at the CCS division meeting later this year. Your direct involvement and participation is also welcomed at our division meeting in San Antonio. ❖

Reach Bob Trumbour  
at rct4@psu.edu or (814) 949-5769.

# Special division events

## “Setting an Agenda:

### News Blogs, Moblogs and their Discontents”

*Wednesday, August 10, 1:30-3:00 p.m.*

Panel discussion sponsored by Cultural & Critical Studies and Civic Journalism Interest Group.

The 2004 presidential election turned the spotlight on a new form of citizen-powered media blogs. The sting potential of bloggers is embellished by the technology of Moblogs, by which users can post images, text and video from their camera phones instantly to the Web. The panel will discuss the implications of such blogs.

Panelists:

- Mike Martinez, Knight Ridder
- Keven Ann Willey, *Dallas Morning News*
- Brian Stelter, blogger for Media Bistro
- Glenn Reynolds, law professor at University of Tennessee and blogger.

## Division meeting

*Thursday, August 11, 8:30 p.m.*

Among other business, the division bylaws are up for a vote at this meeting. Download the proposed bylaws from the CCS website at: <http://aejmc.net/ccs/>.

## Division member social off-site

This begins Thursday immediately following the division meeting and lasts until ?

## Top paper session

*Friday, August 12, 1:30-3:30 p.m.*

Hear the presentations of the CCS division top papers: Janice Peck (University of Colorado at Boulder), “The Blindspot in the Political Economy vs. Cultural Studies Debate” (top faculty paper and James E. Murphy Memorial Award winner), and Thomas Hove (University of Wisconsin-Madison), “Normative Aims for Journalistic Art Criticism” (top student paper).

## CCS Professional Freedom and Responsibility Award Presentation

*Friday, August 12, 5:00-6:15 p.m.*

The Cultural and Critical Studies Division will present its PF&R Award to Ronnie Dugger—writer, reporter, editor, and social activist.

Dugger is founding editor of *The Texas Observer*, an award-winning weekly newspaper dedicated to covering neglected public interest issues and to initiating discussion that “promotes democratic participation and open government.”

He also is co-founder of the Alliance for Democracy, which seeks “to end corporate domination, to establish true political democracy, and to build a just society with a sustainable, equitable economy.”

Dugger has written numerous articles for periodicals including *The Atlantic Monthly*, *Harper's*, *The Nation*, *The New Yorker*, and *The Progressive*. ❖

# Keep CCS moving forward

FRANK DURHAM, UNIVERSITY OF IOWA  
RALPH BELIVEAU, UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

THE CCS DIVISION has grown up, in parallel with the progress of the kind of work that we find intellectually thought provoking and politically significant. We take the world of blogging and international signs of resistance as encouragement, presenting new opportunities for the division to expand its critical work.

But there are a couple of recent items that cause us some concern, and we urge the division to approach them out of our critical perspective.

## Review process

The review process is a problem. Separating faculty and student papers to eliminate the possibility of dishonest reviews by either represents a waste of our collective efforts, if not just an insult to our integrity. Without stopping to argue what a paper acceptance is worth to any given individual, our sense of a scholarly community should be worth more.

Collegiality should be the hallmark of an academic conference division, especially one with our history. It's not clear whether there was a particular episode that provoked the change in the review procedure, but reacting against the possibility is clearly unnecessary, given our experience with the review process.

## Place of CCS in AEJMC

This also happens against a redefinition of our place in the larger organization. An early part of our division's history was predicated on our being the only division that was both "qualitative" and critical. In this light, the reviewing issue is a distraction from bigger problems these days, because we are not the only interpretive kids on the block anymore.

Apart from the Communication

Theory and Methodology, and History divisions, most other divisions and interest groups invite qualitative research.

At last check, CCS was the second or third choice for members who join more than one division. We should be conscious of developing our franchise within the conference, rather than dividing the house over non-existent threats to review integrity.

## Encouraging collaboration

Dividing CCS by student or faculty status works in the opposite direction of where we ought to be moving. Rather than getting trapped in procedure, we ought to develop reasons for people in the division to consult each other more frequently. We could serve ourselves as a resourceful community, but only if people feel they have a stake in how CCS can offer support for parts of their scholarly lives.

We could certainly develop ways to enhance participation in the conference meetings, including facilitating refereed sessions. The business meeting, or members' meeting should offer an opportunity to instigate the development of our community.

We have the tools that would allow us to contribute to each other's work and teaching, such as through this newsletter, through the listserv (somewhere on the internet), in possibly developing more creative approaches to our sessions at the conference, or considering the possibility of some other event that CCS could offer at some other point in the year.

The discussions about the role of the Professional Freedom and Responsibility Award were encouraging, demonstrating how we can draw on both enthusiasm and past experience to move forward.

## Ensuring continuity

More generally, we should be looking at recruiting members and officers to the division. In previous years, we have engaged in positive initiatives by affiliating with the *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, moving to offer a syllabus repository so we can see what is happening in our various classrooms, and using the newsletter for interim ballots on issues such as the JCI contract and the name change from Qualitative Studies. We should do more like this to make it possible to participate in the division year-round.

A FINAL ISSUE IS THE RETENTION OF senior division and conference members. The leadership of the division has traditionally been taken by junior members, ourselves included. As capable as they might have been, the signal from this trend is that we in CCS and AEJMC fail to retain the interest and participation of more senior faculty members.

By focusing on the issue of who reviews whose papers as if faculty members might undercut each other to enhance their papers' standings shows a short-sightedness that ignores all of these gains.

We hope that we can set the review process right as it has traditionally been as a way to address ourselves to the issues of the division's health that will portend good things for years to come. ❖

---

Reach Frank Durham by emailing  
frank-durham@uiowa.edu  
or by calling (319) 335-3362.

Contact Ralph Beliveau by emailing  
beliveau@ou.edu  
or by calling (405) 325-4169.

# CCS at AEJMC

---

**Aug. 10, 5:00-6:30 p.m.**

“Marking and Marketing Gender”

**Jacqueline Lambiase**  
University of North Texas  
“Face-to-face Sexual Branding:  
Female Employees Discuss  
Erotic Codes Used in  
Promotional Activities”

This study analyzes the codes of sexualized dress, entertainment environments, and flirtatious behavior expected by mainstream corporations for some promotional work. Narrative interviewing of female workers, coupled with theme analysis and with theory on sexual scripts, reveals the powerful hidden directives that management issued to sexualize commercial spaces. Women became objectified employees, and sexual appeals were intentionally used hand-in-hand with more traditional, sanctioned selling behaviors to build brands and to attract attention.

**Kim Golombisky**  
University of South Florida  
“‘Anti-Aging’ Magazine Advertising  
and the War on Nature”

This essay examines “anti-aging” skincare advertising in women’s magazines to wonder about the representational politics of midlife women. If culture defines beauty as a woman’s greatest asset and defines beauty by youth, then it is no surprise that anti-aging advertising consists of a battle cry to wage a high-tech war on aging. But the impulse to counter-argue that aging is natural is no less problematic, for our understanding of nature depends on the same scientific discourses that align the feminine with nature and also position science to control both women and nature.

**Lori Henson**  
Radhika Parameswaran  
Indiana University  
“Manly Phil-osophy, Womanly  
Television; Hegemonic Masculinity  
and Dr. Phil’s ‘Tell It Like It Is’  
Talk Therapy”

This paper analyzes Dr. Philip McGraw and his popular self-help talk show, Dr. Phil, to show the discursive ways in which television’s representations of therapeutic empowerment contribute to the production of hegemonic masculinity in post-Sept. 11 America. Conducting a textual analysis of McGraw’s media performance and episodes from the talk show, we argue that Dr. Phil offers a new version of masculinity that appears to incorporate sensitivity and responsibility, but in the end, these representations only inflate the currency of traditional white masculinity. In conclusion, we situate our analysis of masculinity—both in Philip McGraw, the media celebrity, and “Dr. Phil,” the television program—within the context of other hegemonic representations of masculinity and point to future directions for research on the Dr. Phil show.

---

**Aug. 11, 8:15-9:45 a.m.**

Group #1: “Textual Constructions of Feminist Identity”

**Sumi Kim**  
University of Minnesota  
“Feminist Discourse and the  
Hegemonic Role of Mass Media:  
A Study of Newspaper Discourse  
about Two South Korean  
Television Dramas”

With various social changes, there has been a notable cultural trend in which feminist concerns have been conveyed through many popular culture texts in South Korea since the

early 1990s. In response to popular feminism, many different social groups and organizations have been engaged in the formation of feminist discourse, among them the mainstream media. The discourse in newspapers, in particular, has been related to social interests that restrict feminist concerns within the ideological boundary of the patriarchal nuclear family system. The purpose of this research is to address the role of the media in incorporating feminist discourse within the dominant

ideology in South Korea. Specifically, newspaper content relating to two television dramas—*Lovers* and *The Woman Next Door*—was studied to see how dominant ideologies of traditional gender roles, female sexuality, and the capitalist patriarchal family system may be challenged or reinscribed in newspapers.

**Fernando Paragas**  
Ohio University  
“(Dis)Empowerment in  
*Sex and the City*”

This textual analysis explored femi-

ninity as a social construct as portrayed in *Sex and the City*, and concluded that despite outward appearances of empowerment, the show's characters were ultimately disempowered individuals who, even as they found strength from each other, continued to be pawns to patriarchy. It contributes to the literature on postmodern

feminism, or on how women must realize that their purported exercise of power against the patriarchy could actually serve to strengthen it.

## Group #2: "International Explorations and Global Implications"

**Adina Schneeweis**  
**University of Minnesota**  
**"Imagining Contemporaries: The Emergence of a Global Identity"**

This study explores the way a global identity is imagined by individuals, independent of national or regional identities. Using Romanians as a case study, in-depth interviews were conducted to determine how and why these Romanians, living in their home country or abroad, come to form a global identity, if any. Among these Romanians, a global identity is increasingly experienced, through feelings of connectedness with contemporaries, sharing moral norms, increasingly similar lifestyles, beyond physical borders. They further recognize the media as a key catalyst in this process.

**Robert Peaslee**  
**University of Colorado, Boulder**  
**"The Impact of Big-Budget Cinema Production on the Aotearoa/New Zealand Film Industry: a Historical-Contemporary Discussion"**

No abstract available.

**ShaoChun Cheng**  
**Ohio University**  
**"The Author, the Text and the Genre: A Genre Analysis of Qiong Yao's *Huanzhu Gege*"**

In the Chinese world, Taiwan's cultural worker Qiong Yao is a household name, and her popularity has long been built on her romantic novels, film adaptations, and TV drama productions. Her most popular work so far is definitely the TV drama series *Huanzhu Gege* (*Huanzhu Princess*). In this paper, I try to make sense of the popularity of *Huanzhu Gege* in the

Chinese communities through analysis of the genre. I argue that in the field of cultural production, the author could employ the genre as a vehicle to conduct a dialogue between her/his works, the cultural industry and the audience. Through the analysis, I contend that even though the author/cultural producer is constrained by specific historical/social/cultural context, however, compared with the cultural industry and the audience, the author/cultural producer still occupies a more flexible and advantageous position.

**J. Patrick McGrail**  
**Susquehanna University**  
**"Sensationalism, Race and the Decline of Objectivity in the Wen Ho Lee Affair"**

No abstract available.

## Group #3: "Rituals, (In)Civility, and Identity"

**Heidi Hatfield Edwards**  
**Pennsylvania State University**  
**"Communicating Values: The Influence of Corporate Sponsorship of the 3-Day Walk for Breast Cancer"**

Between 1998 and 2002, Avon, the cosmetics company, sponsored a series of extreme fundraising events to raise money for breast cancer. This paper looks at the Avon 3-Day case as an epideictic event in which a company reaches outside its established enterprise and engages in a dialog with an active public about a social issue. The recent growth of corporate involve-

ment in social issues is a noteworthy phenomenon in today's strategic business practices. The impact of the corporate voice on how society deals with issues such as health, education, and the environment is unknown. This case study offers a glimpse into how the experience shared by Avon and a highly involved public shaped participants' perspectives on the disease and personal efficacy. The paper ends with critical concerns regarding power and corporate involvement in social issues: the potential for corporations to define policy or solutions to an issue; and the disparate results in funding when an

issue is palatable in comparison to other less popular issues.

**Gwyneth Mellinger**  
**Baker University**  
**"Members of the Club: Drawing a Boundary of Whiteness around the ASNE"**

This paper performs a discourse analysis of the way in which membership criteria inadvertently fashioned the American Society of Newspaper Editors into a racially segregated organization. Using the theoretical framework of whiteness, this project also

demonstrates how this exclusionary mechanism was maintained over time and helped to preserve the ASNE as an all-white, and later as a predominately white, organization, despite the ASNE's own efforts to diversify the newspaper industry.

**Erika Engstrom**

**University of Nevada, Las Vegas**  
**“Unraveling The Knot: Hegemony, Gender, and Weddings in Mass Media”**

This paper examines the hegemonic messages about weddings and women disseminated by The Knot, the #1 wedding website with brand extensions in magazines, books, and, with the cable

outlet *Oxygen*, the reality television program *Real Weddings* from The Knot. The author unravels the various cross-over alliances of The Knot and analyzes the program's content in terms of its promotion of wedding consumerism and a hegemony of femininity which emphasizes female beauty and role as consumer.

**Shayla Thiel**

**DePaul University**  
**“The Media Framing of the ‘Mean Girl’: Implications of the Race, Gender, and Class Constructions of Mean Girls as Explored in the Glenbrook North Hazing Incident”**

The influx of literature about “mean

girls” that culminated in a popular film of the same name has done much to further stereotypes about race, gender, and class within popular culture. This paper focuses on the infamous Glenbrook North High School shown worldwide on videotape. It uses the notion of framing to explore how the Chicago newspapers covered the incident, leading to its own readers understanding the stories through those frames and reifying the notion of the mean girl as white and wealthy.

#### Group #4: “Political Cultures and Cultural Politics”

**Karen M. Rowley**

**Louisiana State University**  
**“Statewide Public Affairs Television: Developing an Ideal Type”**

Statewide public affairs television systems now exist in 20 states. These systems provide coverage of their respective legislatures in much the same way that C-SPAN covers the U.S. Congress. However, funding mechanisms, structures, and programming vary among these systems. Using information gathered as part of previous research, this project re-examines the data pertaining to funding, structure, and programming in an effort to determine the most effective operational model for these systems.

**Mary Blue**

**Vanessa Murphree**  
**Loyola University New Orleans**  
**“‘Stoke the Joke’ and his ‘Self-Appointed White Critics’: A Clash of Values on Network Television News, 1966-1970”**

The three television networks framed the events of the civil rights movement and offered them to a nation

seeking understanding. With Stokely Carmichael, news coverage changed. Carmichael threatened established values and challenged the moderate movement. This paper is about a clash of ideologies and the values upon which they are based—black power versus television. It examines the network television news coverage of Carmichael from 1966-1970, focusing on the struggle for hegemony.

**Mark Brewin**

**University of Tulsa**  
**“The Salt River Ticket, Democratic Discourse, and Nineteenth Century American Politics”**

The topic of the paper is genre of nineteenth century campaign communication called Salt River Tickets. The tickets, which mocked the opposing side through caricature and irony, were passed out to those who supported the losing candidates in the days following Presidential elections. After tracing the history of the Salt River Ticket and exploring its distinctive features, I argue that the ticket can also help us better understand the dynamics of democratic communication, and the

often conflicting demands between liberal and populist values in our political discourse.

**Ying-Ying Chen**

**University of Texas at Austin**  
**“Amusing Ourselves to Death or Some Young Voters’ New Subculture—The Phenomena of *The Daily Show* During the 2004 Presidential Election”**

*The Daily Show*, a news satire, became a regular news source for some well-educated young voters during the 2004 U.S. presidential election. This study found a new model of political communication challenges the paradigm of mainstream news media. A subculture of young people is looming through its shared values of the show. These young people identify more dissatisfaction with political discourse than others. The phenomena of the show may imply deeper social meanings instead of just “amusing ourselves to death.”

## Aug. 11, 1:30-3:00 p.m.

**Anup Kumar**  
**University of Iowa**  
**“Bollywood Movies and the  
Diaspora: The Flip Side of  
Globalization and Hybridity in the  
Construction of Identities”**

Historically Bollywood movies have had limited audiences in countries outside India, but in the last two decades as a consequence of globalization, revolutions in ICT and significant increase in the size of the Indian diaspora, filmmakers in Bollywood have been making films keeping the diasporic audiences in mind. The paper argues that Bollywood is just symptomatic of a larger phenomenon of media organizations from India, China, and the Arab countries reaching out to émigré audiences in the West, constructing ‘deterritorialized imagined communities’ and ‘hybrid identities’, in the post-national context of globalization that is free of the geography of nation-states. The paper suggests that in a way this has flipped the binary dialectic of global/local to local/global. The paper undertakes a structuralist-semiotic textual analysis of a Bollywood movie to demonstrate the construction of ‘hybrid identities’ and the struggle for signification between the local culture and ideology as dominant and hegemonic and the global as resistant.

**Kevin Esch**  
**University of Iowa**  
**“What is Your Favorite Word?:  
Celebrity, Orality, and Memory  
*Inside The Actors Studio*”**

The talk show *Inside the Actors Studio* aspires to transcend its genre in an American media landscape dominated by banal, disposable celebrification. The show’s central contradiction, operating on multiple levels, is between its earnest, sophisticated discussions of the craft of acting and the commodification of the talk show format and film and television celebrities.

How the show and its host negotiate this conflict becomes itself a kind of historiography of American acting culture.

**Euichul Jung**  
**Rutgers University**  
**Joo-ah Ahn**  
**Dongshin University**  
**“Habitus and Symbolic Power:  
Media Representations of Africa’s  
AIDS and Medication Issue”**

No abstract available.

**Rockell A. Brown**  
**Xavier University of Louisiana**  
**Kim LeDuff**  
**Hampton University**  
**Christopher Campbell**  
**Ithaca College**  
**“Rebirth of a Nation: Race,  
Myth and the News 2005”**

This paper revisits a 1995 study that found local television news to perpetuate racist myths about people of color. The authors examined 17 hours of local news recorded in nine American cities in January, 2005. Their textual analysis argues that local TV journalism continues to reify the attitudes of contemporary racism. The authors also describe the growing body of work in Critical Race Theory and its implications for the study of race and media.

**Jennifer Rauch**  
**Long Island University**  
**“If This Were All I Knew...”; How  
Alternative-Media Users Imagine  
the Mainstream Audience”**

This discourse analysis examines how two audience groups—activists who used alternative media and non-engaged students who consumed mainstream news—constructed disparate interpretations of a network TV news program. Focused interviews

revealed that unlike the students, the activists consciously recognized the polysemy of news texts. The active, resistant readers played games of interpretation such as role-playing, inventing dialogue and using conditionals contrary to fact (e.g. “if”). They distanced their own interpretations from those of imagined normal viewers—a strategy demonstrating the third-person effect. The activists also asserted that alternative media provided resources necessary to interpret network news critically.

**Katy June-Friesen**  
**University of Missouri-Columbia**  
**“Images and Sounds as  
Representation in Print Media:  
Locating Power and Identity in  
Image-Sound Relationships”**

This paper explores how print media reflects and produces identities through relationships of images, sounds, and printed language. Visual and sonic representations are employed in media to construct concepts of race, gender, and class through social practices of seeing and hearing. Bringing together visual theories and theories of sound in culture, I argue we should look more closely at print media representations of visual and sonic culture as sites of power and inter-textual meaning making.

## Aug.12, 1:30-3:00 p.m.

**CCS DIVISION TOP FACULTY PAPER**  
**JAMES E. MURPHY MEMORIAL AWARD WINNER**

**Janice Peck**  
**University of Colorado at Boulder**  
**“The Blindspot in the Political Economy**  
**vs. Cultural Studies Debate”**

The “cultural studies vs. political economy” debate between Nicholas Garnham and Lawrence Grossberg has failed to resolve the core question dividing them—how to think the relationship between “the cultural” and “the economic”—because both conceive these as distinct areas of human activity. I propose the way beyond this dualism lies in a materialist theory of signification found in the work of Raymond Williams, Maurice Godelier and Jean-Paul Sartre.

**CCS DIVISION TOP STUDENT PAPER**

**Thomas Hove**  
**University of Wisconsin-Madison**  
**“Normative Aims for Journalistic Art Criticism”**

This paper explores political and intellectual reasons for what Elkins (2003) calls “the flight from judgment” in journalistic criticism about the visual arts. Journalists are educated and trained according to a sociological perspective that regards artistic values and aesthetic experiences with suspicion. The author argues that if future journalists are not trained to make informed judgments about artworks and to articulate subjective aesthetic responses, journalism will continue to disregard the private and social benefits of art.

## Aug.12, 3:15-4:45 p.m.

“Indelible Inscriptions: Representations of Race in News and Entertainment”

**Clay Guinn**  
**University of Houston**  
**“A Saidian Interpretation**  
**of *Hi International*”**

This study uses Edward Said’s theories to explore the cultural imperialism of *Hi International*, a glossy teen magazine funded by the U.S. State Department as an instrument of public diplomacy in the Middle East. While the publication’s goal is to expose its audience to American cultural exports, this literary analysis suggests that its language echoes a hegemonic Orientalism. *Hi* casts the Muslim world as an “Other” that desperately needs Western education and acculturation.

**Christopher N. Williams**  
**University of Texas at Austin**  
**“Invisible Cycle of Scapegoating:**  
**U.S. Media Coverage of**  
**Immigration ‘Panics,’ 1929-1994”**

This study analyzes media coverage of four 20th century immigration

“panics,” in which undocumented immigrants served as convenient scapegoats for larger social ills. The study argues that a significant and under-researched aspect of these events was the role played by the major U.S. mainstream media—including the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Los Angeles Times*, *U.S. News and World Report* and the *Saturday Evening Post*—in perpetuating this scapegoating process.

**Phillip Chidester**  
**Illinois State University**  
**“May the Circle Stay Unbroken:**  
***Friends and the ‘Presence of***  
***Absence’ as a Rhetorical***  
***Reinforcement of Whiteness.*”**

No abstract available.

**Chinedu (Ocek) Eke**  
**Elon University**  
**“C-SPAN, See White:**  
**A Critical Analysis of**  
***Washington Journal’s* Guests”**

This study critically examines C-SPAN’s *Washington Journal* for the month of June 2004. By having an overwhelming number of white males as guests on the show, C-SPAN legitimizes this group while marginalizing non-whites and women. Using cultivation analysis as a theoretical framework, this author proposes that the lack of minority or women experts on television relegates them to old stereotypes that suggest they have little or nothing to offer. This research challenges that notion.

---

## **Aug.13, 10:00-11:30 a.m.**

“Myths and Political Symbols in Death and War”

**Dennis Dunleavy**  
**San Jose State University**  
**“When Pictures Get Legs:**  
**The Search for Meaning**  
**in Iconic Images**  
**from Conventional and**  
**Unconventional**  
**News Sources in Iraq”**

This study evaluates news images, created from divergent sources, signifying visually prescribed norms in society. Semiotic analysis is used to tease out the normative function of media images. In this analysis, an image depicting a hooded Iraqi prisoner made by a combatant and an image made by embedded journalist of a soldier smoking a cigarette after battle are evaluated. Ultimately, this paper argues that news photographs confer meaning through reinforcing prescribed social, moral and cultural values.

**David Cuillier**  
**Washington State University**  
**“The New Civil (Liberties) War:**  
**John Ashcroft’s Use of the Mythic**  
**Hero Abraham Lincoln to Legitimize**  
**Government Secrecy**  
**and Reduced Civil Liberties”**

This critical discourse analysis examines the strategic and hegemonic use of a U.S. mythic hero, Abraham Lincoln, in the speeches of former U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft to justify reduced civil liberties, empowering the dominant political and social structures. This study identified four mythic hero actions that provide a source of legitimacy for U.S. policy, suggesting that using mythic national heroes in political speeches is a powerful discursive strategy to favor the powerful and subjugate the disadvantaged.

**Carolyn Kitch**  
**Temple University**  
**“Reporting on ‘A Grieving Army of**  
**Americans’: The Symbolic Role of**  
**the Ordinary Citizen in**  
**News Coverage of**  
**Ronald Reagan’s Death”**

For a week following Ronald Reagan’s death in June 2004, a series of official and vernacular rituals dominated American journalism. Through a rhetorical and narrative analysis of nearly 1,000 reports from the nation’s leading news organizations, this study explores how this coverage escalated and shifted from historical summary to nostalgia—becoming a story that focused not on the dead former President, but on “ordinary mourners” who turned out by the thousands to talk to reporters about the meaning of America. ❖