The Field of American Media Sociology: Origins, Resurrection, and Consolidation

Abstract

This contribution is written against the backdrop of the historic dispersal of early American media sociology out from the core concerns of the discipline and into various importer academic disciplines (including communication, journalism, and media studies) and an ever-growing pervasiveness of media in everyday life which is reflected by a resurgence of sociological scholarship in the United States since the early 2000s. The article divides the field in works that study media inwards—along the threefold dimensions of production and technologies, communication and discourse, reception and effects—and works that study media outwards. We argue that this latter perspective, examining broader theoretical, methodological, and substantive social implications of mass-mediated communication, is the most promising one for a mature field of American media sociology. On this basis, we conclude with some suggestions regarding possible new, and as of yet understudied, lines of inquiry for future media sociologists.

There is hardly any research subfield in American sociology that requires as much self-justification as media sociology. One of us, for instance, recalls responding to the question of a faculty member at orientation in graduate school about research interests with the word "media" and being the only one not receiving a perfunctory "interesting" or "uh-huh" but instead and incredulous "Media?!" And both of the authors of this article, despite being active in the discipline in the United States, have only ever been offered postdoctoral employment in sociology departments in other countries. Although these are but anecdotes, it would not be an overstatement to say that American sociology, narrowly construed—that is, knowledge emerging from sociology departments in the United States—has not been particularly interested in media from the 1980s up until recently. In fact, the occasional interventions in recent years calling for a renewed media sociology would suggest that lack of interest would be an understatement; inevitably, they reflect upon why "sociology abandoned communication" (Katz 2009) around that time (see also: Benson 2009; Jacobs 2009; Pooley and Katz 2008).[1]

This is in spite of the fact that the decades before *could have* easily inspired the emergence of media sociology as an institutionalized specialization: The public opinion formation studies (Katz and Lazarsfeld 1955; Lazarsfeld and Merton 1957; Lazarsfeld and Berelson 1944) at Columbia University of the mid 20th century not only laid the groundwork for empirical social research in general but also communication as a social science discipline. They were preceded and paralleled by the Chicago School's work on mass media (Park 1922; Park 1923; Park 1938; Park 1940; Park 1941; Lang and Lang 1953; Wirth 1948) that are mostly forgotten in the larger discipline and followed by the newsroom ethnographies of the 1970s (Altheide 1976; Fishman 1980; Gans 1979; Schlesinger 1978; Tuchman 1978; Tunstall 1971), which are still hugely influential in communication and media studies.

Strictly speaking, the history of the phrase "media sociology" is mostly associated with the study of *news* media. Key programmatic statements (Benson 2004; Gitlin 1978; Gans 1972; Jacobs 2009) and theories of the field, like *Mediating the Message*, which is newly subtitled *a media sociology perspective* in its third edition (Shoemaker and Reese 2013), pay little or no attention to non-news media. However, following secondary texts produced by sociologists in the United States and other parts of the English-speaking world for pedagogical purposes (e.g. Croteau et al. 2012; Hodkinson 2011), we define the "media" in media sociology as encompassing all forms of mass-mediated communication and expression, including, but not limited to, film, television, radio, books, magazines, videogames, popular music recordings, and online blogs. We use the somewhat outdated term "mass" deliberately to exclude mediated interpersonal communication, such as telephone calls, text messages, and Skype chats. According to American-British sociologist John B. Thompson, "mass" signifies that "products are available in principle to a plurality of recipients" (1995, 24). What distinguishes media *sociology* from media and communication studies is that it is not satisfied with studying media in its own terms. It relates media production, communication/discourse, and consumption to other important key sociological areas, like social inequality, stratification, social problems, collective action, and identity (Waisbord 2014a, 15). Media sociology, furthermore, is attentive to wider power structures and institutions, the problem of reconciling social structures and agencies that generate media representations, and the collective construction of

mediated communication, particularly of the technologies that facilitate it (ibid., 16-17).

Mapping the field of media sociology right now seems particularly important for several reasons:

1) There is some indication that American sociology has again begun to recognize the importance of the study of media in relation to social life. Sociology's premier disciplinary society in North America, the American Sociological Association, has—due to popular demand among its members—formally acknowledged media sociology as a subfield with the renaming of the Section on Communication and Information Technologies to that of Communication, Information Technologies, *and Media Sociology* in 2015.

2) Self-identified practitioners of media sociology are dispersed across several disciplines (e.g. communication, media studies, journalism, political science). Despite a recent important effort to bring these closer together (e.g. Waisbord 2014b), there is still much work to do.

3) Social life is ever increasingly structured by processes of mass mediation. While legacy media institutions still enjoy centrality in public communication and imagination today, traditional media are being challenged and altered by the increasing complexity and intertextuality of networked communication. Furthermore, the breaking down of boundaries between news and entertainment media, old and new media, media consumers and producers requires more sophisticated theoretical and methodological tools to explain social realities—which, inevitably, points to a wealth of new possibilities for a renewed media sociology.

In our view, it is important but in itself insufficient for sociologists to study media "inwards," focusing narrowly upon, for instance, actors and institutions producing media content, the content itself, and/or its reception and the technologies that enable this nexus of prosumption. We would argue, rather, that American media sociology needs to pursue a more expansive research agenda so that short bursts of scholarly innovation and appropriation are not followed by yet more evacuation of the study of media from the discipline. Therefore, the most important and lasting contributions are to be made by studying media "outwards," in terms of how they affect other realms of social life, particularly those accepted as firmly within the core areas of sociological inquiry. Recent works on mediatization are examples of this perspective.

Overview of the field

In 1910, Max Weber conceded that a sociology of the press would be an "enormous subject" (Weber 1988, 434; our translation). Despite the fact that the field has been dominated by studies of the news media for a long time after Weber's programmatic speech, media sociology in the 21st century cannot be restricted to news media when different discursive realms have become so closely intertwined organizationally and economically. Because we are interested in processes of mediation themselves and how they shape public discourse and imagination, help form opinions and identities, and mobilize people to collective action, we need to study different kinds of media at multiple levels of analysis. We will divide existing theory and research in media sociology[2] according to the more inward-perspectives 1) media production and technologies, 2) media communication and discourse, 3) media reception and effects, and the outwards-perspective 4) mediatization.

Media production and technologies

The sociological study of media production highlights the importance of organizational structures, routines, and norms. As mentioned above, an exceptionally prolific period of media sociology was the 1970s when a series of organizational studies of news production ("newsroom ethnographies") emerged. These studies were mostly interested in the social (and ideological) construction of news, some focused on organizational norms and routines, but all are united by an attempt to demystify journalistic professionalism, in particular the objectivity norm, which Tuchman (1972) deemed a "strategic ritual." Concurrently, Michael Schudson (1978) provided a comprehensive historical account of objectivity as a central occupational discourse in the professionalization of US journalism during the 19th and 20th centuries.

With a few notable exceptions (Eliasoph 1988; Ericson et al. 1989; Jacobs 1996b), the newsroom was not a popular object of study in the 1980s and 1990s. The rise of the internet, diversification of news production and upheaval within legacy news institutions, however, has demanded a "second wave of newsroom ethnography" (Cottle 2000), which has come upon us in the last ten years. These studies are particularly interested in technological innovations and convergence in the news business as well as new media work more broadly (Deuze 2007; Klinenberg 2005; Neff 2012) and are influenced by science and technology studies (Anderson 2013; Boczkowski 2004), new institutionalism (Boczkowski 2010; Ryfe 2012), and cultural sociology (Revers 2014; Revers forthcoming). Lewis (2012) took a sociology of professions approach to study the relation between traditional and participatory journalism.

Beyond news media and political communication, the rise of the internet and related ICTs has inspired numerous studies on how these innovations affected public life more generally. Critical studies of digital divides (Hargittai 2007; DiMaggio et al. 2004) shattered utopian visions of the internet as an invariably egalitarian social space with hard empirical data on persistent social inequalities on the web. Despite of that, sociological inquiry turned to online communities and identities, especially as the web became a space of sociality (Baym 2010; Holmes 1997; Jones 1998; Turkle 1995; Wellman 1998), including for less socially accepted communities, such as white supremacists (Adams and Roscigno 2005; Burris et al. 2000). Media sociologists also examined specific technological infrastructures, for instance Twitter (Murthy 2013) and computer games (Kirkpatrick 2013), as well as practices associated with these infrastructures, for instance hacking (Jordan 2008) and mobile communication (Ling and Donner 2009).

Another strand of production studies is concerned with political economies of media institutions that promote (usually disadvantageous) news outcomes—propagating homogenous discourses that serve to maintain the capitalist order (Bagdikian 2004; Doyle 2002; Fuchs 2008; Herman and Chomsky 1988; Herman and McChesney 1997; McChesney 2008). Indeed, Pierre Bourdieu's (1998) essay on the privatization of French television falls within the category of political economy. Later studies of the journalistic field have gone well beyond Bourdieu's own thinking about the subject, which was mainly concerned with market influence on media. These later studies in the Bourdieuian tradition considered political and economic pressures as equally important in shaping news institutions (Benson and Neveu 2005; Benson 2013; Rohlinger 2007; Couldry 2003; Hesmondhalgh 2006). Furthermore, the media systems perspective (Hallin and Mancini 2004; Hallin and Mancini 2012) has presented another more nuanced macro-theory of media than the political economy approach.

Beyond news production, sociologists have examined the culture industries and entertainment media as a whole (Hesmondhalgh and Baker 2011; Hesmondhalgh 2012; Vogel 2007). In the United States, these studies parallel, and at times predate, the newsroom ethnographies of the period. For example, Lewis A. Coser wrote about literary book publishing (Coser 1975; Coser et al. 1982); Paul M. Hirsch (1971) wrote about the popular music industry; and Paul DiMaggio (1977) wrote about creativity and mass culture. Sociological study of the production of culture, while not *necessarily* about mass media (e.g. Becker 1982), was often about just that in practice (e.g. Peterson 1977; Peterson 1982; Peterson 1985; Peterson and Anand 2004). These American sociologists often collaborated with each other, and the influence of French sociology is palatable (see DiMaggio 1979), but it wasn't until the early 1980s, when Pierre Bourdieu's work on fields of cultural production, using the example of the French literary field, was translated into English that it was widely taken up (Bourdieu 1983). Furthermore, there is a certain overlap here with production of culture studies that consider mediation of popular culture in the context of globalization (Crane et al. 2002; Crane 1992; Du Gay 1997; Dowd and Janssen 2011), specifically through TV (Bielby and Harrington 2008). More recently, other sociologists of culture undertook comprehensive studies of the celebrity culture industry (Gamson 1994; Rojek 2001; Van Krieken 2012), talk shows (Gamson 1998; Grindstaff 2002), and comics and manga (Brienza 2009; Brienza 2010; Brienza 2014; Brienza 2016; Kinsella 2000).

Media communication and discourse

Although much has been written about the role of mass-mediated communication and discourse in the formation of nation-states (e.g. Anderson 1983) and civil society (e.g. Habermas 1989), much of the historical understanding of media in the twentieth century has pitted it against the realization of a fully flourishing collective intellectual life. Despite not being a sociologist himself, Walter Lippmann's *Public Opinion* (1922) excoriated the political economy of mass media for enabling and perpetuating social malaise through simplified discourse and failure of what Mills (1959) would later term "the sociological imagination." Lippman also coined the phrase, "manufacture of consent," which was subsequently taken up and popularized by Herman and Chomsky (1988) in *Manufacturing Consent*.

Subsequent social psychological studies of political propaganda in the postwar period following the conclusion of World War II (e.g. Ellul 1965; Katz et al. 1954), alongside critique of Hollywood from the Frankfurt School (Adorno and Horkheimer 1947), reflected wider anxieties about the potentialities of subversive, coercive messaging across a range of mass media. This trend in the scholarly discourse is exemplified by Frederic Wertham's *Seduction of the Innocent*, published in 1954, which led to public outcry and Congressional inquiry resulted in the collapse of several entertainment periodicals and decades of self-censorship of American comics, enshrined by the Comics Code, irrespective of any direct evidence of harm from supposedly violent, lurid content (Lopes 2009). Numerous sociological studies of media content were published during this period (Auster 1954; Horton 1957; Horton and Strauss 1957; Johns-Heine and Gerth 1949). Cultivation theory (see Shanahan 2010), through classic studies of representations of violence on television starting in the 1970s, continued to infer a direct relationship between problematic content and discourse with social problems (Gerbner and Gross 1976).

Meanwhile, the influence of British cultural studies (and criticism thereof) upon American sociology is also discernible in a growing interest beginning in the 1960s in the "textual" characteristics of mass-produced popular culture (Carey 1969; Gans 1964) as well as interest, contra prior elitist diminutions of mass media and popular culture, in serious study of audiences, consumers, and fans (discussed in greater detail in the next section below). By the 1980s, however, there was a backlash in the discipline internationally against what Thompson calls "fallacy of internalism," i.e. a researcher who attempts to draw wider sociological conclusions from media purely on the basis of his or her own reading of it (Thompson 1990, 24), applicable to nearly all of the works previously cited in this section. Given this methodological reservation, the study of mass-produced popular culture was largely extirpated from core social science disciplines such as sociology and psychology in the United States. Although applied social science fields such as communications and legal studies are, in their own ways, concerned with the study of popular culture, the American permutation of contemporary cultural studies is most often regarded as a subfield of literary scholarship, where textual hermeneutics is still an entirely legitimate method of scholarship.

Nevertheless, occasional sociological contributions to the subject of media communication and discourse have continued to emerge. One of the most influential recent sociological contributions to mass communication research is framing theory, which originated at the intersection of psychology (cognitive frames of references) and sociology (categories of collective meanings)—not surprising given its original foundation (Goffman 1974). Early conceptions of framing in the sociology of news (Tuchman 1978; Gitlin 1980; Gamson and Modigliani 1989) not only recognized that the greatest influence of mass media on public opinion is to decide what is inside and outside the frame–following agenda-setting theory of media effects (McCombs and Shaw 1972)—but to provide people with interpretive schemas to make sense of the world around them. Frames vary in their effectiveness to resonate with preexistent understandings and thereby shape interpretations.

In the tradition of Frankfurt School, scholars have dealt critically with the significance of television for public life in general (Gitlin 2007), domestic relations (Spigel 1992), and the adoption of neoliberal values more specifically (Couldry 2010). The late English translation of Habermas' *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1989) has inspired numerous studies aiming at broader arguments about the influence of mass communication on public deliberation. They extended the theory in various ways, above all by presenting theories and accounts of *mediated* deliberation instead of Habermas' normative privilege of immediate, interpersonal deliberation and highlighting the multiplicity of public sphere*s.* Jacobs explored racial relations in the United States as interactions between mainstream and alternative publics and narratives (Jacobs 1996a; Jacobs 2000). Other works compared different national public spheres through analyzing news framings of abortion (Ferree et al. 2002) and immigration (Benson 2013). Another study examined news commentary in US newspapers and television as a distinct deliberative space (Jacobs and Townsley 2011).

A number of studies inspired by the social theory of the late Emile Durkheim focused on ritual qualities of media events (Alexander and Jacobs 1998; Cottle 2006; Dayan and Katz 1992). They thus emphasized the importance of second-order virtues of media events for social solidarity, irrespective of their substantive content. Relatedly, Ronald Jacobs' theory of the aesthetic public sphere stresses that discussion, critique,

and commentary about entertainment frequently has the added value of connecting people to more "important" matters of public debate (Jacobs 2012; Jones 2007; McKernan 2013; Roberge 2011; Wu 2011).

Media reception and effects

As mentioned in the introduction of this article, the first comprehensive series of audience reception studies emerged at Columbia University under the guidance of Paul Lazarsfeld. These studies were the first forceful critique of the simplistic hypodermic needle model of media effects, emphasizing instead that social networks are important intervening conditions between mass media and public opinion. The next important intervention in this vein explored the gap between intended meanings of cultural producers and interpreted meanings of cultural consumers (Hall 1973), which influenced research far beyond cultural studies. A prominent example of this active audience scholarship is Liebes and Katz's (1990) groundbreaking cross-national study on the TV show *Dallas*. Through focus groups they demonstrated that audiences engage much more critically with popular culture than is expected from them.

A great deal of audience research focused on electronic media, particularly television (sometimes subsumed as television studies) (Scannell 1996), often studying family TV viewing habits ethnographically (e.g. Lull 1990; Morley 1986) or the relationship between TV consumption and distant suffering (Chouliaraki 2006). Andrea Press (1991) examined how women watch television and the conditions under which they identify with characters (or not). Another study looked at the structure of global TV and its impact on cultural identities among viewers (Straubhaar 2007). Other research on audiences has focused on the relationship between reading habits and social stratification (Bennett 2009), book clubs (Long 2003), media consumption and democratic participation (Couldry et al. 2007).

Studies of passionately-engaged media consumers, "fans," emphasize the autonomy of the reader and diversity of textual interpretations. It originates in British studies of working-class culture and practice by the likes of Raymond Williams and Angela McRobbie. But the most important of these works in fan studies is, without question, Henry Jenkin's Textual Poachers (1992), an ethnography of fans. In this book, he argues that fans are not merely passive recipients but are, rather, active producers of meaning, "textual poachers" who "appropriate raw materials from the commercial culture but use them as the basis for the creation of a contemporary folk culture" (Jenkins 1992, 285). In his view, "[f]andom does not prove that all audiences are active; it does, however, prove that not all audiences are passive" (Jenkins 1992, 293). This intervention also de-emphasizes class and other forms of social difference by positing groups of fans, i.e. fandoms, as "Utopian community" (Jenkins 1992, 286). Although many researchers write about "active audiences" consuming a variety of mass media forms (e.g. Bolin 2012; Hayward 1997; Philo 2008), this has not been quite so enthusiastically taken up by sociologists…perhaps because its underlying utopianism seems so at odds with the ways in which the discipline normally understands the social world.

Perhaps more relevant to media sociology in this context is research on cultural consumption. As with cultural production, the "culture" in question need not be mass media, but it often is in practice. This work departs from American cultural studies perspectives in that it continues to emphasize the importance of forms of inequality, particularly class, while, in most cases, de-emphasizing interpretation. The focus is

upon the ways in which distinctive cultural tastes and practices reinforce inequality across time. French sociologist Bourdieu has produced the most magisterial intervention with Distinction: A Social Critique on the Judgement of Taste (1984) who argues that people's aesthetic preferences are both determined by and determining of their social class and that having the 'wrong' tastes can impede social mobility. However, this work is based upon a study of French society in the 1960s and might be both geographically and temporally specific. American sociologist Richard A. Peterson suggests just that, arguing that middle-class Americans have become "cultural omnivores," consuming both highbrow and popular art (Peterson 1992; Peterson and Kern 1996). However, they continue to remain distinct from the working classes, which consume only objects of popular culture.

With the rise of the internet, however, the line between media consumption and production blurred, which is what theoretical arguments about convergence (Jenkins 2006) and "prosumption" (Ritzer and Jurgenson 2010) suggest. Audiences are thus increasingly conceived as active participants by sociological research, which has probably become most visible in instances of collective mobilization in democratic movements (Earl and Kimport 2011; Lim 2012; Tufekci and Wilson 2012). Nevertheless, the ideological tension between American cultural studies-inflected optimistic theories of media consumption (e.g. Jenkins 1992) and the more pessimistic social-psychological "media effects" school (e.g. Bryant and Oliver 2009; Potter 2012) endures.

Studying media outwards: Mediatization

As mentioned above, we think that the most important contributions of media sociology are to be made regarding how media and mediated communication shape the social world. This has long been a concern in media sociology, whether in terms of how the logic of the media increasingly permeates other social institutions (Altheide and Snow 1979) or in terms of the change of social relations and dissociation of sociality and space through media technologies (Meyrowitz 1985). In fact, the impact of mass media upon individuals and society, while lacking empirical support, animated much of the early literature on media discourse (e.g. Lippmann 1922). These concerns were recently reinvigorated through a growing body of work on mediatization (Hepp 2013; Hepp and Krotz 2014; Lundby 2009) and research on the mediatization of institutions (Hjarvard 2008; Jansson 2002; Mormont and Dasnoy 1995), especially politics (Esser and Strömbäck 2014; Kepplinger 2002; Mazzoleni and Schulz 1999; Strömbäck 2008).

There has been a discussion on whether *mediation* was not the more appropriate term (Couldry 2008; Livingstone 2009) but mediatization seems to have prevailed. Mediatization builds on Thompson's (1995) work—who used the term mediazation—which argued that the emergence of mass media was constitutive for modernity. In the historical context of the rise of digital media, but by no means limited to technology, this perspective took up Thompson's argument and framed mediatization as a meta-process in late modernity (Krotz 2007). Hepp (2013) describes the process of mediatization in quantitative and qualitative terms: Quantitatively, forms of mediated communication expand, become more widely available, and shape more and more kinds of social relations. Qualitatively, media shape social relations and institutions in specific and patterned ways. As with most cutting-edge work in media sociology today, however, the network of mediatization researchers includes sociologists but the main protagonists are communication scholars.

Beyond mediatization, several media sociologists studied media outwards, which is a condition for being recognized by the larger discipline, especially its flagship journals. Benson and Saguy (2005) analyzed the mass-mediated discursive construction of immigration and sexual harassment in the US and France, arguing against simplified convergence arguments in cultural globalization debates. After his seminal book *The Media and Modernity* (1995), John Thompson continued his work on how mass media reconfigure social phenomena by focusing on political scandal (Thompson 2000).

Other works examined the influence of television on civil society and the public sphere (Dahlgren 1995) and global broadcasting on political cultural identities (Morley and Robins 1995). Jacobs' (1996, 2000) research compared news narratives in the African-American and mainstream press during times of racial crisis. This work showed how mass-mediated communication structures race relations in America. Andrea Press's (1991) early work is not primarily concerned with making an active audience argument but with how media representations interact with gender and social class hierarchies.

Future directions

Of course, even though we wish for a strengthening of media sociology within the general discipline, we deem it important that research is connected to communication and media studies for wider impact and cross-fruition. Waisbord (2014a) sees these connections strong in the areas of journalism studies, cultural studies, and technology studies but misses them in particular in public opinion, media effects, and political communication research.

Nevertheless, more than ever, we believe that American sociology needs to take back that which it has abandoned. In an age where interpersonal and mass communication blur on social media platforms such as Twitter and where new media conglomerates such as Google and Amazon aggregate oceans of data on consumer behavior, the theories and methodologies of sociology are more important than ever for a critical understanding of human life and its possibilities and limitations. In particular, there are several issues in media sociology that we think have received no or insufficient attention and should receive more in the future:

- Often media are not as important as they themselves suggest they are. Legacy media often generate prolonged public controversies around certain subjects that take lives of their own, that serve secondary (e.g. political) purposes but leave decisions of actors primarily involved unaffected. Refugees, for instance, seem to be unfazed by signals of restrictive or lenient asylum policies politicians relay through the media. Partly this has to do with the fact that many global citizens receive these messages only insofar as they enter their individually and digitally assembled discursive networks. Partly it is related to the "publicized opinion" phenomenon, that is, the perceived disconnect between public opinion and the media's construction of it. Future studies should study gaps between social groups' purposes, attitudes, and actions and the media representations of them while also recognizing the efficacy of media representations in their consequences.

- What happens to established institutions through the emergence of participatory forms of mediated communication? Are they simply undermined, or do they adjust and redefine themselves through new media infrastructures?

Here we are not thinking of broad-brush analyses but specific and nuanced examinations of institutional practices on the actor level.

- More generally, how are identities transformed through the augmentation of our private lives through social media? To what extent are these venues shaping or merely extending of our preexistent selves? What happens to individual autonomy as we get more and more entangled in the webs of networked communication?

- After seminal publications in this direction (Blumler and Gurevitch 1995; Hallin and Mancini 2004; Hallin and Mancini 2012), research on news media and political communication has become more transnational and comparative in scope in recent years. We hope that this trend continues across studies of media industries, especially when global forces or national differences are expected to be critical variables. For instance, while the media industries have been studied extensively in cross-national comparison, the varied economic and cultural impact of digital technologies on media systems has not (see Benson et al. 2012; Revers 2016 for exceptions).

- In the context of the growth of reflexivity in this era (Beck et al. 1994), we see an increase of self-examination and associated meta-discourses across the media industries. Besides the fact that these discourses are interesting in their own terms, how do they consider and relate to the increasingly participatory user/audience environment and/or to the contemporary experience of intellectual life?

- How does the introduction and adoption of new media technologies affect established social hierarchies, especially along the sociologically critical dimensions of race/ethnicity, gender, sexuality, and social class?

This is an indicative, but by no means exhaustive, list, and it by no means minimizes the pioneering work of past and present generations of American media sociologists. But by reviving and recognizing media sociology as a legitimate subfield, we hope that sociological inquiry will be better positioned to succeed in staying relevant in the 21st century and beyond and that sociology will remain at the heart of the social sciences.

References

Adams, J. and Roscigno, V.J. 2005. "White Supremacists, Oppositional Culture and the World Wide Web." *Social Forces*, **84**(2): 759–778.

Adorno, Theodor W. and Max Horkheimer. 1947. "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception." Pp. 20–167 in *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. London: Verso.

Alexander, Jeffrey C. and Jacobs, Ronald N. 1998. "Mass communication, ritual and civil society." Pp. 23–41 in *Media, Ritual and Identity*, edited by James Curran and Tamar Liebes. New York, NY: Routledge.

Altheide, David L. 1976. *Creating Reality: How TV News Distorts Events*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Altheide, David L. and Snow, Robert P. 1979. *Media logic*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.

Anderson, C. W. 2013. *Rebuilding the News: Metropolitan Journalism in the Digital Age*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Bagdikian, Ben H. 2004. *The New Media Monopoly*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Baym, Nancy K. 2010. *Personal Connections in the Digital Age*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Beck, Ulrich, Anthony Giddens, and Scott Lash. 1994. *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bennett, Tony, Mike Savage, Elizabeth Silva, Alan Warde, Modesto Gayo-Cal, and David Wright 2009. *Culture, Class Distinction*. London, UK: Routledge.

Benson, Rodney. 2004. "Bringing the Sociology of Media Back In." *Political Communication* **21**(2): 275–92.

Benson, Rodney. 2009. "Shaping the Public Sphere: Habermas and Beyond." *The American Sociologist* **40** (3): 175–97.

Benson, Rodney. 2013. *Shaping Immigration News: A French-American Comparison*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Benson, Rodney, Mark Blach-Ørsten, Matthew Powers, Ida Willig, and Sandra Vera Zambrano. 2012. "Media Systems Online and Off: Comparing the Form of News in the United States, Denmark, and France." *Journal of Communication* **62** (1): 21–38.

Benson, Rodney Dean and Erik Neveu. 2005. *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Benson, Rodney and Abigail C. Saguy. 2005. "Constructing Social Problems in an Age of Globalization: A French-American Comparison." *American Sociological Review* **70** (2):233–59.

Bielby, Denise D. and C. Lee Harrington. 2008. *Global TV: Exporting Television and Culture in the World Market*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Blumler, Jay G. and Michael Gurevitch. 1995. *The Crisis of Public Communication*. London, UK: Routledge.

Boczkowski, Pablo J. 2004. *Digitizing the News: Innovation in Online Newspapers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Boczkowski, Pablo J. 2010. *News at Work: Imitation in an Age of Information Abundance*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bolin, Göran. 2012. "The Labour of Media Use." *Information, Communication and Society* **15** (6): 796–814.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1983. "The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed." *Poetics* **12** (4–5): 311–56.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1998. *On Television*. New York, NY: New Press.

Brienza, Casey. 2009. "Books, Not Comics: Publishing Fields, Globalization, and Japanese Manga in the United States." *Publishing Research Quarterly* **25**(2): 101–117.

Brienza, Casey. 2010. "Producing Comics Culture: A Sociological Approach to the Study of Comics." *Journal of Graphic Novels and Comics* **1**(2): 105–119.

Brienza, Casey. 2014. "Sociological Perspectives on Manga in America." *Sociology Compass* **8**(5): 468–477.

Brienza, Casey. 2016. *Manga in America: Transnational Book Publishing and the Domestication of Japanese Comics.* London: Bloomsbury.

Bryant, Jennings, and Mary Beth Oliver (ed.). 2009. *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research*. New York: Routledge.

Burris, Val, Emery Smith, and Ann Strahm. 2000. "White Supremacist Networks on the Internet." *Sociological Focus* **33**(2):215–35.

Carey, James T. 1969. "Changing Courtship Patterns in the Popular Song." *American Journal of Sociology* **74**(6): 720–31.

Castells, Manuel. 2000. *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Chouliaraki, Lilie. 2006. *The Spectatorship of Suffering*. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Coser, Lewis A. 1975. "Publishers as Gatekeepers of Ideas." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* **421**(1): 14–22.

Coser, Lewis A., Charles Kadushin, and Walter W. Powell. 1982. *Books: The Culture and Commerce of Publishing*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Cottle, Simon. 2000. "New(s) Times: Towards a 'Second Wave' of News Ethnography." *Communications: The European Journal of Communication Research* **25**(1): 19–42.

Cottle, Simon. 2006. "Mediatized Rituals: Beyond Manufacturing Consent." *Media, Culture and Society* **28**(3): 411–32.

Couldry, Nick. 2003. "Media Meta-Capital: Extending the Range of Bourdieu's Field Theory." *Theory and Society* **32**(5-6): 653–77.

Couldry, Nick. 2008. "Mediatization or Mediation? Alternative Understandings of the Emergent Space of Digital Storytelling." *New Media and Society* **10**(3): 373–91.

Couldry, Nick. 2010. *Why Voice Matters: Culture and Politics after Neoliberalism*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Couldry, Nick, Sonia Livingstone, and Tim Markham. 2007. *Media Consumption and Public Engagement: Beyond the Presumption of Attention*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Crane, Diana. 1992. *The Production of Culture: Media and the Urban Arts*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Crane, Diana, Nobuko Kawashima, and Kenichi Kawasaki. 2002. *Global Culture: Media, Arts, Policy, and Globalization*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Croteau, David, William Hoynes, and Stefania Milan. 2012. Media/Society: Industries, Images, and Audiences. London, UK: Sage.

Dahlgren, Peter. 1995. *Television and the Public Sphere: Citizenship, Democracy, and the Media*. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Dayan, Daniel and Elihu Katz. 1992. *Media Events: The Live Broadcasting of History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Deuze, Mark. 2007. *Media Work*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1977. "Market Structure, the Creative Process, and Popular Culture: Toward an Organizational Reinterpretation of Mass-Culture Theory." *The Journal of Popular Culture* **11**(2): 436–52.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1979. "On Pierre Bourdieu." *American Journal of Sociology* **84**(6): 1460–74.

DiMaggio, Paul, Eszter Hargittai, Coral Celeste, and Steven Shafer. 2004. "Digital Inequality: From Unequal Access to Differentiated Use." Pp. 355–400 in *Social inequality*, edited by Kathryn M. Neckerman. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Dowd, Timothy J., and Susanne Janssen. 2011. "Globalization and Diversity in Cultural Fields: Comparative Perspectives on Television, Music, and Literature." *American Behavioral Scientist* **55**(5): 519–24.

Doyle, Gillian. 2002. *Media Ownership the Economics and Politics of Convergence and Concentration in the UK and European Media*. London, UK: Sage.

Earl, Jennifer and Katrina Kimport. 2011. *Digitally Enabled Social Change: Activism in the Internet Age.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Eliasoph, Nina. 1988. "Routines and the Making of Oppositional News." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* **5**(4): 313–34.

Ellul, Jacques. 1965. *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes*. New York, NY: Vintage.

Ericson, Richard Victor, Patricia M. Baranek, and Janet B. L. Chan. 1989. *Negotiating Control: A Study of News Sources*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Esser, Frank and Jesper Strömbäck (ed.) 2014. *Mediatization of Politics: Understanding the Transformation of Western Democracies*. Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK; New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ferree, Myra M., William A. Gamson, Jürgen Gerhards, and Dieter Rucht. 2002. *Shaping Abortion Discourse: Democracy and the Public Sphere in Germany and the United States*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Fishman, Mark. 1980. *Manufacturing the News*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Fuchs, Christian. 2008. *Internet and Society: Social Theory in the Information Age*. New York: Routledge.

Gamson, Joshua. 1994. *Claims to Fame: Celebrity in Contemporary America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Gamson, Joshua. 1998. *Freaks Talk Back: Tabloid Talk Shows and Sexual Nonconformity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Gamson, William A. and Andre Modigliani. 1989. "Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power: A Constructionist Approach." *The American Journal of Sociology* **95**(1): 1–37.

Gans, Herbert J. 1964. "The Rise of the Problem-Film: An Analysis of Changes in Hollywood Films and the American Audience." *Social Problems* **11**(4): 327–36.

Gans, Herbert J. 1972. "The Famine in American Mass-Communications Research: Comments on Hirsch, Tuchman, and Gecas." *The American Journal of Sociology* **77**(4):697–705.

Gans, Herbert J. 1979. *Deciding What's News: A Study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek, and Time*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Du Gay, Paul. 1997. *Production of Culture/cultures of Production*. London, UK: Sage.

Gerbner, George, and Larry Gross. 1976. "Living With Television: The Violence Profile." *Journal of Communication* **26**(2): 172–94.

Gitlin, Todd. 1978. "Media Sociology." *Theory and Society* **6**(2): 205–53.

Gitlin, Todd. 1980. *The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Gitlin, Todd. 2007. *Media Unlimited: How the Torrent of Images and Sounds Overwhelms Our Lives*. New York, NY: Metropolitan Books.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Grindstaff, Laura. 2002. *The Money Shot: Trash, Class, and the Making of TV Talk Shows*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1989. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry Into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hallin, Daniel C. and Paolo Mancini. 2004. *Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hallin, Daniel C. and Paolo Mancini. 2012. *Comparing Media Systems beyond the Western World*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hayward, Jennifer. 1997. *Consuming Pleasures: Active Audiences and Serial Fictions from Dickens to Soap Opera*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Hall, Stuart. 1973. "Encoding and Decoding in the Television Discourse." Mimeographed paper, Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham, England.

Hargittai, Eszter. 2007. "Whose Space? Differences Among Users and Non-Users of Social Network Sites." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* **13**(1): 276–97.

Hepp, Andreas. 2013. *Cultures of Mediatization*. John Wiley and Sons.

Herman, Edward S. and Noam Chomsky. 1988. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. London: Vintage.

Herman, Edward S. and Robert Waterman McChesney. 1997. *The Global Media: The New Missionaries of Corporate Capitalism*. London; Washington, D.C.: Cassell.

Hesmondhalgh, David. 2006. "Bourdieu, the Media and Cultural Production." *Media Culture Society* 28(2):211–31.

Hesmondhalgh, David. 2012. *The Cultural Industries*. London: SAGE.

Hesmondhalgh, David and Sarah Baker. 2011. *Creative Labour: Media Work in Three Cultural Industries*. London; New York: Routledge.

Hirsch, Paul M. 1971. "Sociological Approaches to the Pop Music Phenomenon." *American Behavioral Scientist* **14**(3): 371–88.

Hjarvard, Stig. 2008. "The Mediatization of Religion: A Theory of the Media as Agents of Religious Change." *Northern Lights: Film and Media Studies Yearbook* **6**: 9–26.

Hodkinson, Paul. 2011. *Media, Culture and Society: An Introduction*. London, UK: Sage.

Holmes, David. 1997. *Virtual Politics: Identity and Community in Cyberspace*. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Horton, Donald. 1957. "The Dialogue of Courtship in Popular Songs." *American Journal of Sociology* **62**(6): 569–78.

Horton, Donald, and Anselm Strauss. 1957. "Interaction in Audience-Participation Shows." *American Journal of Sociology* **62**(6): 579–87.

Jacobs, Ronald N. 1996a. "Civil Society and Crisis: Culture, Discourse, and the Rodney King Beating." *The American Journal of Sociology* **101**(5): 1238–72.

Jacobs, Ronald N. 1996b. "Producing the News, Producing the Crisis: Narrativity, Television and News Work." *Media Culture Society* **18**(3): 373–97.

Jacobs, Ronald N. 2000. *Race, Media, and the Crisis of Civil Society: From Watts to Rodney King*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Jacobs, Ronald N. 2009. "Culture, the Public Sphere, and Media Sociology: A Search for a Classical Founder in the Work of Robert Park." *The American Sociologist* **40**(3): 149–66.

Jacobs, Ronald N. 2012. "Entertainment Media and the Aesthetic Public Sphere." Pp. 318–40 in *Oxford Handbook of Cultural Sociology*, edited by Jeffrey C. Alexander, Ronald N. Jacobs, and Philip Smith. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Jacobs, Ronald N. and Eleanor Townsley. 2011. *The Space of Opinion: Media Intellectuals and the Public Sphere*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Jansson, André. 2002. "Spatial Phantasmagoria: The Mediatization of Tourism Experience." *European Journal of Communication* **17**(4): 429–43.

Jenkins, Henry. 1992. *Textual Poachers: Television Fans and Participatory Culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Jenkins, Henry. 2006. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Jones, Paul. 2007. "Beyond the Semantic 'Big Bang': Cultural Sociology and an Aesthetic Public Sphere." *Cultural Sociology* **1**(1):73–95.

Jones, Steve. 1998. *CyberSociety 2.0: Revisiting Computer-Mediated Communication and Community*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Jordan, Tim. 2008. *Hacking: Digital Media and Technological Determinism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Katz, Elihu. 2009. "Why Sociology Abandoned Communication." *The American Sociologist* **40**(3): 167–74.

Katz, Elihu and Paul Felix Lazarsfeld. 1955. *Personal Influence: The Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communications*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.

Katz, Daniel, Dorwin Cartwright, Samuel Eldersveld, and Alfred McClung Lee (ed.). 1954. *Public Opinion and Propaganda*. New York, NY: The Dryden Press.

Kepplinger, Hans Mathias. 2002. "Mediatization of Politics: Theory and Data." *Journal of Communication* **52**(4): 972–86.

Kinsella, Sharon. 2000. *Adult Manga: Culture and Power in Contemporary Japanese Society*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Kirkpatrick, Graeme. 2013. *Computer Games and the Social Imaginary*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Klinenberg, Eric. 2005. "Convergence: News Production in a Digital Age." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* **597**(1): 48–64.

Van Krieken, Robert. 2012. *Celebrity Society*. London, UK: Routledge.

Krotz, Friedrich. 2007. "The Meta-Process of 'mediatization' as a Conceptual Frame." *Global Media and Communication* **3**(3): 256–60.

Hepp, Andreas and Friedrich Krotz. 2014. *Mediatized Worlds: Culture and Society in a Media Age*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan,.

Lang, Kurt and Gladys Engel Lang. 1953. "The Unique Perspective of Television and Its Effect: A Pilot Study." *American Sociological Review* **18**(1): 3–12.

Lazarsfeld, Paul Felix Gaudet and Bernard Berelson. 1944. *The People's Choice: How the Voter Makes up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign*. New York, NY: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Robert King Merton. 1957. *Mass Communication, Popular Taste and Organized Social Action*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.

Lewis, Seth C. 2012. "The Tension Between Professional Control and Open Participation: Journalism and Its Boundaries." *Information, Communication and Society* **15**(6): 836–66.

Liebes, Tamar and Elihu Katz. 1990. *The Export of Meaning: Cross-Cultural Readings of Dallas*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lim, Merlyna. 2012. "Clicks, Cabs, and Coffee Houses: Social Media and Oppositional Movements in Egypt, 2004–2011." *Journal of Communication* **62**(2): 231–48.

Ling, Richard Seyler and Jonathan Donner. 2009. *Mobile Communication*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Lippman, Walter. 1922. *Public Opinion*. New York: Harcourt.

Livingstone, Sonia. 2009. "On the Mediation of Everything: ICA Presidential Address 2008." *Journal of Communication* **59**(1): 1–18.

Long, Elizabeth. 2003. *Book Clubs: Women and the Uses of Reading in Everyday Life*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lopes, Paul. 2009. *Demanding Respect: The Evolution of the American Comic Book*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Lull, James. 1990. *Inside Family Viewing: Ethnographic Research on Television's Audiences*. London, UK: Routledge.

Lundby, Knut. 2009. *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Mazzoleni, Gianpietro and Winfried Schulz. 1999. "'Mediatization' of Politics: A Challenge for Democracy?" *Political Communication* **16**(3): 247–61.

McChesney, Robert Waterman. 2008. *The Political Economy of Media: Enduring Issues, Emerging Dilemmas*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.

McCombs, Maxwell E. and Donald L. Shaw. 1972. The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media." *Public Opinion Quarterly* **36**(2): 176–87.

McKernan, Brian. 2013. "The Morality of Play: Video Game Coverage in The New York Times From 1980 to 2010." *Games and Culture* **8**(5): 307–29.

Meyrowitz, Joshua. 1985. *No Sense of Place: The Impact of Electronic Media on Social Behavior*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Morley, David. 1986. *Family Television: Cultural Power and Domestic Leisure*. London, UK: Comedia Pub. Group.

Morley, David and Kevin Robins. 1995. *Spaces of Identity: Global Media, Electronic Landscapes and Cultural Boundaries*. London, UK: Routledge.

Mormont, Marc and Christine Dasnoy. 1995. "Source Strategies and the Mediatization of Climate Change." *Media, Culture & Society* **17**(1): 49–64.

Murthy, Dhiraj. 2013. *Twitter: Social Communication in the Twitter Age*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Neff, Gina. 2012. *Venture Labor: Work and the Burden of Risk in Innovative Industries*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Park, Robert E. 1922. *The Immigrant Press and Its Control*. New York, NY: Harper and Bros.

Park, Robert E. 1923. "The Natural History of the Newspaper." *The American Journal of Sociology* **29**(3): 273–89.

Park, Robert E. 1938. "Reflections on Communication and Culture." *The American Journal of Sociology* **44**(2): 187–205.

Park, Robert E. 1940. "News as a Form of Knowledge: A Chapter in the Sociology of Knowledge." *The American Journal of Sociology* **45**(5):669–86.

Park, Robert E. 1941. "News and the Power of the Press." *The American Journal of Sociology* **47**(1):1–11.

Peterson, Richard A. (ed.). 1977. *The Production of Culture*. London, UK: Sage.

Peterson, Richard A. 1982. "Five Constraints on the Production of Culture: Law, Technology, Market, Organizational Structure and Occupational Careers." *Journal of Popular Culture* **16**(2): 143–153.

Peterson, Richard A. 1985. "Six Constraints on the Production of Literary Works." *Poetics* **14**(1-2): 45–67.

Peterson, Richard A. 1992. "Understanding audience segmentation: From elite and mass to omnivore and univore." *Poetics* **21**(4): 243–58.

Peterson, Richard A. and N. Anand. 2004. "The Production of Culture Perspective." *Annual Review of Sociology* **30**: 311–334.

Peterson, Richard A. and Kern, Roger M. 1996. "Changing highbrow taste: From snob to omnivore." *American Sociological Review* **61**(5): 900–07.

Philo, Greg. 2008. "Active Audiences and the Construction of Public Knowledge." *Journalism Studies* **9**(4): 535–44.

Pooley, Jefferson and Elihu Katz. 2008. "Further Notes on Why American Sociology Abandoned Mass Communication Research1." *Journal of Communication* 58(4): 767–86.

Potter, W. James. 2012. *Media Effects*. London, UK: Sage.

Press, Andrea L. 1991. *Women Watching Television: Gender, Class, and Generation in the American Television Experience*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Revers, Matthias. 2014. "The Twitterization of News Making: Transparency and Journalistic Professionalism." *Journal of Communication* **64**(5): 806–26.

Revers, Matthias. 2016. „Digital Media and the Diversification of Professionalism: A US-German Comparison of Journalism Cultures." Pp. 228–246 in *The Crisis of Journalism Reconsidered: Democratic Culture, Professional Codes, Digital Future*, edited by Jeffrey. C. Alexander, Elizabeth B. Breese, and Maria Luengo. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Revers, Matthias. Forthcoming. *Contemporary Journalism in the US and Germany: Agents of Accountability*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ritzer, George and Nathan Jurgenson. 2010. "Production, Consumption, Prosumption: The Nature of Capitalism in the Age of the Digital 'prosumer.'" *Journal of Consumer Culture* **10**(1): 13–36.

Roberge, Jonathan. 2011. "The Aesthetic Public Sphere and the Transformation of Criticism." *Social Semiotics* **21**(3): 435–53.

Rohlinger, Deana A. 2007. "American Media and Deliberative Democratic Processes." *Sociological Theory* **25**(2): 122–48.

Rojek, Chris. 2001. *Celebrity*. London, UK: Reaktion Books.

Ryfe, David M. 2012. *Can Journalism Survive: An Inside Look at American Newsrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Scannell, Paddy. 1996. *Radio, Television, and Modern Life: A Phenomenological Approach*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Schlesinger, Philip. 1978. *Putting "Reality" Together: BBC News*. London, UK: Constable.

Schudson, Michael. 1978. *Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Shanahan, James. 2010. *Television and Its Viewers: Cultivation Theory and Research*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Shoemaker, Pamela J. and Stephen D. Reese. 2013. *Mediating the Message in the 21st Century: A Media Sociology Perspective*. London, UK: Routledge.

Spigel, Lynn. 1992. *Make Room for TV: Television and the Family Ideal in Postwar America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Straubhaar, Joseph D. 2007. *World Television: From Global to Local*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strömbäck, Jesper. 2008. "Four Phases of Mediatization: An Analysis of the Mediatization of Politics." *The International Journal of Press/Politics* **13**(3): 228–46.

Thompson, John B. 1990. *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Thompson, John B. 1995. *The Media and Modernity: A Social Theory of the Media*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Thompson, John B. 2000. *Political Scandal*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Tuchman, Gaye. 1972. "Objectivity as Strategic Ritual: An Examination of Newsmen's Notions of Objectivity." *American Journal of Sociology* **77**(4):660–79.

Tuchman, Gaye. 1978. *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Tufekci, Zeynep and Christopher Wilson. 2012. "Social Media and the Decision to Participate in Political Protest: Observations From Tahrir Square." *Journal of Communication* **62**(2):363–79.

Tunstall, Jeremy. 1971. *Journalists at Work: Specialist Correspondents: Their News Organizations, News Sources, and Competitor-Colleagues*. London, UK: Constable.

Turkle, Sherry. 1995. *Life on the Screen: Identity in the Age of the Internet*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Vogel, Harold L. 2007. *Entertainment Industry Economics: A Guide for Financial Analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Waisbord, Silvio. 2014a. "Introduction: Reappraising Media Sociology." Pp. 1–21 in *Media Sociology: A Reappraisal*, edited by Silvio Waisbord. Cambridge, UK: Politiy Press.

Waisbord, Silvio (ed.). 2014b. *Media Sociology: A Reappraisal*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Weber, Max. 1924. "Rede auf dem ersten Deutschen Soziologentage in Frankfurt 1910." Pp. 431-449 in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Soziologie und Sozialpolitik*. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr.

Wellman, Barry. 1998. *Networks in the Global Village: Life in Contemporary Communities*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Wertham, Fredric. 1954. *Seduction of the Innocent: The Influence of Comic Books on Today's Youth*. New York, NY: Reinhart.

Wirth, Louis. 1948. "Consensus and Mass Communication." *American Sociological Review* **13**(1):1–15.

Wu, Jingsi. 2011. "Enlightenment or Entertainment: The Nurturance of an Aesthetic Public Sphere Through a Popular Talent Show in China." *The Communication Review* **14**(1):46–67.

Endnotes

[1] From the opposite perspective, there seems to be an absence of sociology in some areas of communications in which sociologists made foundational contributions, for instance news framing studies (Waisbord 2014a, 3).

[2] We included works that frame its questions and explains findings sociologically, including 1) works by sociologist on media, 2) works by scholars who got a Ph.D. in sociology but hold academic positions in other disciplines, 3) scholars of other disciplines who make ample use of sociological theories and terminologies, who were often trained by sociologists.